

Substantive (Content-Related) Characteristics of Deviant Behavior as a Social and Psychological Phenomenon

Valentina B. Salakhova^a, Aleksandr V. Bulgakov^b, Irina E. Sokolovskaya^c
Rina S. Khammatova^{d,e} and Mikhail N. Mikhaylovsky^{d,e}

^aUlyanovsk State University, Ulyanovsk, RUSSIA; ^bRussian State University for the Humanities, Moscow, RUSSIA; ^cAcademy International Independent Ecological and Political University, Moscow, RUSSIA; ^dPlekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow, RUSSIA; ^eSechenov first Moscow State Medical University, Moscow, RUSSIA

ABSTRACT

The article is dedicated to an important social problem of contemporary Russian society - to deviant behavior in the system of social relations. Deviant manifestations are not unique and new, however their study becomes especially important now, during a critical period of the Russian society development. In contemporary society the interaction of a personality, family and society is performed in the context of high-quality transformation of public relations which cause not only positive, but also negative changes in various spheres of social life. Various difficulties arising in the course of adaptation of representatives of these or those social groups to market economy generate deformation of interpersonal communications, dissociation of generations, loss of traditions. The diverse forms of social pathology increasing on a great scale, criminalization of social milieu, sharp weakening of standard and moral regulation of public relations, - these and other negative tendencies in the development of contemporary society set an extremely important task for psychological science on studying the nature, objective laws of deviant behavior and its subjects - the deviant personality (deviant) and anti-social communities. In this regard, the article is directed towards the study of a concept, essence and experience of researches of deviant behavior both in domestic, and in foreign psychological science. The leading approach to the study of this problem is a holistic, systemic and dialectic approaches which provide an integrity and comprehensiveness of the research relying on a holistic personal development, considering the history of a personality. The results of theoretical analysis of deviant behavior are considered in the article. The overview of development of this concept is provided from ancient times to the present. The conclusions have been made on substantive characteristics of deviant behavior as a social and psychological phenomenon. Materials of the article are of practical importance to psychologists, social workers and the staff of educational institutions.

KEYWORDS

Deviant behavior, reformation and correction of the personality, domestic and foreign researches on a problem of deviant behavior, personality and society

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 21 August 2016
Revised 12 September 2016
Accepted 24 October 2016

CORRESPONDENCE Valentina B. Salakhova ✉ valentina_nauka@mail.ru

© 2016 Salakhova et al. Open Access terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) apply. The license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, on the condition that users give exact credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if they made any changes.



Introduction

The influence of deviant milieu on society, distribution of its morals, increase in number of different manifestations of deviance (criminal behavior, suicide behavior, dependent behavior), all this is a reality of a contemporary social situation. With respect to this, the study of problems of forming a deviant personality an impact of social relations on manifestation of deviations is of great importance. At the same time it is important to consider that the analysis of such a complex problem as deviant behavior is impossible in a separation from real interrelations of the personality with the milieu, taking into account only a limited set of factors.

Deviant behavior as a social phenomenon creates a set of problems of contemporary society and issues connected with it, the search for answers of which is very important. The solution of problems connected with the diverse forms of the person's behavior deviations lies not in one plane – it is multidimensional, and it explains the interest in this perspective by the scientists of all humanities. In the history of studying a problem of deviant behavior there were attempts of an unambiguous decision within one approach, however behavior of the person, and, therefore, and deviant behavior is the systemic phenomenon, dependent both on the intrapsychic determinants, and on a situation and a context (Zmanovskaya, 2004). Therefore, researches of behavioral deviance are conducted in psychology, sociology, pedagogics, philosophy, culturology, criminology, and many other disciplines. In the long term the systemic solution of various problems connected with deviant behavior is seen in a complex interaction of a set of disciplinary approaches. In case of such formulation of the question, in our opinion, the deviant behavior as an object of research appears not as a one-aspect phenomenon, and as a difficult, complex phenomenon, and the most promising, considering the nature of deviations of the person, will be a consideration of deviant behavior from positions of the social and psychological approach. To this end, to clear out the specifics of studying deviant behavior as a social and psychological phenomenon, it is necessary to address a more detailed analysis of various points of view on a problem of deviance of the person.

In modern science the problem of deviant behavior is well studied as there is a set of empirical researches and the developed composition of approaches explaining this phenomenon from various points of view (Durkheim, 1994; Zmanovskaya, 2004; Clayburgh, 2004; Kudryavtsev, 1989; Myasishev, 1998; Lorentz, 1994, etc.). There is a set of definitions of this concept within the most different theoretical orientations. At the same time, the process of knowledge of deviant behavior has not stopped: new researches arise that aim to look even more deeply into the essence of this object of study stimulating the emergence of new aspects of understanding this reality. Therefore, the development of a subject of deviant behavior continues, represented as the process of developing this knowledge, and as a process, having the history of its own and prospects. In this regard, to gain an insight into the essence of such difficult phenomenon as deviant behavior, it is also necessary to consider the development of studying various forms of manifestation of deviance in a historical retrospective, to retrace how the understanding and a concept of deviant behavior were taking

shape, to reveal the tendencies which had established in researches of deviance in behavior and to plan the prospects of further studying the essence of the considered subject.

Methodological Framework

The interest to various sorts of violations of social and cultural norms by a person associated with issues of a substantial character of morality and immorality as well as with a possibility of preventing the formation of negative mindsets in an individual has been present in works of many thinkers, beginning with ancient times. Looking back upon the history of explaining deviant behavior it is important to note that earlier perceptions of deviant behavior are determined by generalized understanding of the world – a characteristic holistic perception of external reality peculiar of that period was not capable of understanding the variety of interrelations between people. First understanding of deviant behavior deals with person's acts that are disapproved of by society members which are disgraceful of the human's being from ethical points of view. Correspondingly, the first forms of social regulation were oriented towards the perceptions of what is good and appropriate and what is forbidden and rejected any deviations from the rules and customs established in the society.

The first philosophers who made a contribution to understanding the issue of deviance from the virtue were Socrates (V century B.C.) and his disciple Plato (V century B.C.). They believed that a man committed an evil act unintentionally, not knowing what the good was, if he knew what the virtue was then he was capable of big-hearted deeds (Skripnik, 1992). According to Aristotle (IV century B.C.) manifestations of moral evil acts are associated with the violation of the golden mean principle: the vicious deeds are those which were committed in each certain case “with outrunning the ones in an excessive way or in a defective way” (Guseinov, 2002). The position like that in the issue of deviance in behavior represents the first rudiments of the category “norm”.

Theocentric understanding of the world was characteristic of the Medieval period since religion was a dominant factor of social and moral outlook of that time. That is why the major problem connected with man's behavioral deviations was the problem of theodicy caused by a conflict between the absolute virtue of the Lord and real existence of the evil in the world. G.V. Leibnitz (1646-1716) in a self-named treatise explains the moral evil by an imperfection of things and deviant behavior is recognized as a sin, as a punishment for which the man endures physical sufferings that fell upon him because of the God's will. The most significant philosopher of earlier Christianity – Augustin Aurelius (IV century B.C.) made an attempt to drive out the evil from the ontological environment that gave a conclusion that everything that came from God is good and deviant behavior of the person as well (Rabinovich, 1992).

In the epoch of New Time the problem of deviant deeds of a person from moral norms acquires a socially determined character. The first social thinkers in the framework of such understanding of deviant behavior was an English philosopher T. Gobbs (1689) who set his foot on a true scientific path, having turned down the idea of external divine power as a source of man's behavioral deviations and a moral duty in the society. T. Gobbs (1689) asserted that by nature people wish what they like and under the influence of fear they try to



avoid the evil that threatens them. The wishes themselves which come from living nature are not malicious but the actions that come from them and when they are in conflict with people's duties.

After the Great French Revolution and the bourgeoisie started playing the dominant roles, German philosopher M. Stirner (1806-1856) went down in history as a clearly defined apologist of egoism – self-sufficiency of the person was in the centre of attention. In order to reveal the character of this self-sufficiency the philosopher considers the spirit as the most important factor of social and individual life. In the process of formation the spirit becomes separate from the flesh. Separation is perhaps Stirner's central studied process. Denying all norms of behavior M. Stirner asserted that the primary source of right and morals was power and might of a separate person and consequently the problem of deviant behavior as such can not exist (Titarenko, 1984). The similar pattern of thoughts was refuted by the supporters of Marxism.

According to Marx (1818-1883) deviant behavior is caused by social injustice, associated with private property and exploitation of one class by the other. According to historical and materialistic doctrine it is the conflicts of material life, the existing conflict between production forces and production relations that can explain various forms of public conscience and its pathology. Notions of freedom, justice, right and politics, morals and religion and other superstructural phenomena and ideological forms (consequently, all range of relations, views and institutes in the field of socio-normative regulation and social deviations) are, according to Marxism, a product of historical development that is why their characteristics should be made up from certain historical positions. Historical materialism refutes an approach to moral, legal, political and other ideas and norms as abstract "eternal truths". This, of course, does not imply the denial of universal human values, "simple norms" and rules of human life (Kudryavtsev, 1989). Correspondingly, deviant behavior is the product of an individual epoch and it should be considered in the context of economic, political and socio-cultural peculiarities. The further history of studying deviant behavior is associated with the rise and development of capitalist relations in the XX century. The society in this period is in a great need for such knowledge which can be used in practice for the purpose of improving production processes. Such need for applied knowledge but not for speculative philosophic schemes gave a strong push to the development of natural science and science on the whole. The analysis of current processes and phenomena comes to the foreground with a systematic division of an object into separate objects for a more detailed study of the considered phenomena's essence. That is why the XIX century became a starting stage for the development of disciplinary knowledge – in a number of scientific problems which were solved in previous years in the framework of philosophical speculations new objects start being identified for specific studies by separate disciplines. In particular, sociology, psychology start being distinguished in the field of philosophy, the fundamentals of biological researches are established.

The development of knowledge about deviant behavior was in the framework of these processes which starts being developed in the XIX century in the field of biologic and sociologic approaches. Scientists in this period consider deviance in human behavior not only as a moral –morality reality but as a phenomenon which was determined by a number of factors- on the one hand, by

biological nature of the man on the other hand by events taking place in the society. Within the framework of the biologic trend of researches in the XIX century connected with the study of deviant behavior the works of an Italian doctor-psychiatrist Ch. Lombroso (1835-1909) should be noted first of all, who offered the biosociological theory that linked criminal behavior of the man with his anatomical organization. However, some time later, British doctor Ch. Goring (1870-1919) proved the incorrectness of Lombroso's theory since there is a similar anatomical organization both in criminals and in people who never committed crimes.

A prominent place among biological theories is occupied by the evolution approach offered by Charles Darwin (1809-1882) on the basis of the natural selection and heredity. From the point of view of this approach, scientists consider various aspects of human behavior as a manifestation of hereditary programs of species. In the framework of the biologic trend the idea of Darwin's evolution approach gained further development in K. Lorentz's ethological conception who explains various phenomena of human behavior, for example, aggression first of all, by an inborn instinct of struggle for existence (Lorentz, 1994). V. Efroimson (1971), a genetic scientist is also a supporter of the evolution theory who proves that thousand years of evolution have created the prerequisites of successive vertical transmission for hereditary ethical reactions. In the framework of bio-criminology in the middle of the 1960-s in the XX century W. Pierce's (1839-1914) studies were conducted. His studies lead to the conclusion that the presence of criminal chromosome in men identifies their predisposition to criminal behavior (Baron, 2000). At the same time the critics of this approach point out that deviance of criminal chromosome carriers may not be the consequence of the chromosome abnormality but individual peculiarities associated with it.

Anatomical theory also gained development in the XX century explaining the nature of deviant behavior. In particular, W. Sheldon (1917-2007) substantiated a link between the types of somatic and physical constitution of a human and forms of behavior as well as between the types of temperament and behavior (Gippenreiter, 1982). Apart from traditional biologic theories new approaches arise linking deviant behavior with various factors. The influence of hormones is identified among other biologic determinants of deviant behavior. Dabbs (1917-2007) and Morris (1834-1896) on the example of 4 thousand war veterans came to the conclusion about the connection between the level of testosterone and inclination to anti-social behavior (Baron, 2000). The study of convicts in 1970 led G. Eisenk (1916-1997) to the conclusion that genetically laid individual and psychological characteristics of the personality correspond to an advantageous orientation of the personality that is an extraverted type of the personality characterized by his being turned towards the environment is more apt to commit crimes than an introverted one – concentrated on his own interests (Selchenok, 2000). Other researchers point out a stable link between a chemical dependence and such characteristics as elevated sensitivity and a declined ability to endure stress (Nelson-Jones, 2000). Additional biological factors of deviant behavior can be: brain injuries, organic brain diseases, certain properties of the nerve system.

In the framework of the sociological field of studying deviant behavior in the XX century E. Durkheim's Lorentz (1994) anomie conception within which



deviant behavior is considered as a consequence of normative and axiological disintegration of the society (Durkheim, 1994). E. Durkheim's ideas got further development in the works of V. Pareto (1848-1923), R. Merton (1910-2003) recognizing contradictions between groups and various social forces for example, innovators and conservatives as key causes of deviant behavior (Kravchenko & Dobrenkova, 1996). Another conception that became wide spread in the XX century was a conception connected with the analysis of the interaction types between the society and a deviant. Sociologist G. Bekker's theory is referred to such kind of theories which is called "the stigmatization theory" since it explains deviant behavior by the capability of influential society groups to brand members of less influential social groups as a "deviant" (Becker, 1961). Another representative of the stigmatization theory I. Hoffman (1984) distinguishing three types of stigmas divided dichotomically into "normal" whose behavior coincides with socially expected and "stigmatized" whose appearance and way of life deviates from commonly accepted norms of one or another social community (Hoffman, 1984).

According to another sociological theory – investing, the essence of deviant behavior consists in the absence of any values in the life of a person (Ritzer, 2002). Attachment theory or differential communication defines the essence of deviant behavior as a loss of the tendency by the people to show affection or even to love those whom they are attached to (Ritzer, 2002). The essence of deviant behavior can be described by means of a notion "social role". So, according to the role theory of social behavior people can assume various roles including as deviants (Dobrenkova, 1996). On the whole, in the XX century further differentiation of deviant behavior goes on which is expressed in the development of a great number of approaches in the framework of various disciplines. In this regard, one of the most fruitful areas of studying deviant behavior in the XX century was a psychological one aiming to find the causes of behavioral deviances in the mind of a person, in changes of the personality structure, a special organization of various spheres of consciousness, that is in the inner world of a person.

Psychodynamic theories that came from the psychological analysis of Z. Freud (1856-1938) reveal the origin of deviance in the man's behavior as a result of a constant conflict between unconscious inclinations. A substantial role in the pattern of internal conflicts is played by bad object relations (relations with parents who are the major objects in the child's world) having an influence on behavior of a person throughout the entire life and arising in the form of various psychic pathologies (Kernberg, 2001). Further studies of essential characteristics of deviant behavior in the framework of the psychoanalytical orientation are developed by neo-freudians through the nature of aggressiveness which is viewed as the major cause of violent crimes in psychoanalytical works. Aggressive energy of destruction is caused by inborn, unconscious inclinations: Z. Freud (2005) – libido; A. Adler (1991) – attaining the purpose of superiority over the others; E. Fromm (1998) – masochistic aspiration to death, sufferings; K. Horny (1942) – longing for security, the need for pleasure; V. Shutz – the need for support and approval from closest environment (Zmanovskaya, 2004).

The existential and humanistic approach born in the course of discussions with psychoanalytical theories, very popular in the XX century in psychology of development and children psychology considers deviance in behavior as a

sequence of a child's loss of the agreement with his own feelings and impossibility to find meaning and fulfill himself in the established conditions of upbringing. Unlike the psychological analysis considering the personality as determined by unconscious processes existential and humanistic psychology makes an emphasis on the supreme demonstration by a personality of such qualities as spiritual existence and self-actualization.

The conception of Austrian psychiatrist V. Frankl (1990) deserves a greatest interest in the framework of the existential approach determining the personality's normality and abnormality by peculiarities of its positions in relation to life and death. In the same course I.S. Kon's (1989) existential phenomenology explains the nature of anomie by fulfillment and unrealized potential of existential capabilities of a person (Zakharova, 2005). The next significant approach in psychology of deviant behavior is behaviorism which unlike psychoanalytical and existential –humanistic approaches that mainly orient to the study of internal dynamics of personality development investigates the observed behavior directly. Representatives of behaviorism and neobehaviorism B. Skinner (1904-1990), E. Thorndyke (1874-1949), D. Watson (1878-1958) and others prove that the environment completely determines the essence of behavior including behavioral deviance (Dobrenkova, 1996). The theory of social learning developed by A. Bandura (2000) represents a fruitful development of the classical theory of learning in accordance with which deviant behavior of a man is socially determined because the skills of immense complexity that require special learning stand behind it.

In the framework of neobehaviorist theoretical orientation of social psychology it is necessary to point out the conception of frustration and aggression by D. Dollard (1980) that consists in the provision that the presence of aggressive behavior presupposes the presence of frustration and vice versa. Along with the analysis of deviant behavior in the context of social factors' action the neobehaviorist social and psychological orientation deals with the interpersonal interaction being developed in the theory of outcomes interaction by H.H. Kelley (1986).

The following leading area of international social psychology is cognitivism in the framework of which the study of deviant behavior gained a specific course. From the positions of the so-called conformity theories (Heider, 1982; Newcomb, 1953; Festinger, 2002; Osgood, 1955) deviant behavior can be explained by specific features of the cognitive system of a deviant, directed towards the demonstration of deviance in some or another forms – aggression, addiction, crime and so on. Thus, deviant behavior is seen as an outcome of relation of the cognitive structure of a deviant to social norms, expectations expressed in deviations from them. In the framework of interaction orientation social psychologist T. Shibutani (1999) defines deviant behavior in three types: 1) intention to adapt to norms and values of the standard group whose pictures of the world are different from people's views who possess a prestigious status or power;

2) deviant behavior arises impulsively as a result of temporary loss of self-control, especially under the influence of strong excitement;

3) third type of deviant behavior is compulsive. Such disorders as drug addiction, insults in a weak provocation and alcohol abuse are fixations. (Shibutani, 1999)



Apart from the theories of international social psychology which were considered it is worth noting the theory of aggression as a social and psychological phenomenon, the conception of social deviance by R. Harre (2003) and the theory of voluntary risk behavior by S. Ling (2003) which testify that deviant behavior is the result of a complex interaction of processes that take place in the society and in the mind of a person. Deviant and normative behavior – two constituents of social and role behavior of equal value. Overcoming frustration – the obstacle which arose in the path of achieving a goal is displayed through socially significant actions. Any deviant behavior implies not only the tendency to destruct or shift a frustrating block but an energy concentration (physical and mental) required for the intention implementation. An anti-frustrating action is always accompanied by a certain share of risk but not necessarily bears a destructive character. The character of deviant behavior, orientation of energetic potential of a person are dependent firstly, on how he is trained to respond to arising difficulties (by constructive or destructive actions); secondly, on how the society stimulates social and innovative, constructive actions of the personality (Kraihy, 2003)

Domestic psychological studies of the XX century on problems of deviant behavior were mainly dedicated to problem children and teenagers who represent a group of elevated social risk or as formed criminals. L.S. Vygotsky (2000), A.N. Leontiev (1997), S.L. Rubinstein (2007), D.I. Feldstein (1987), S.A. Belicheva (1994), V.N. Myasishev (1988) and others point out that behavior of teenagers is distinguished by a number of specific features: insufficiency of life experience and a low level of self-criticism, suggestion and impulsiveness, longing for a prestigious status in a reference group and a heightened feeling of independence and so on. These peculiarities can be neutralized or directed into a social- positive course only under favourable conditions of upbringing, otherwise, they will acquire a negative orientation.

B.S. Bratus (1988) defines deviant behavior as deviations in functioning mechanisms of personal and meaning aspirations, in particular, in deforming the bonds of real and ideal purposes as a basis of implementing current activity. The level of mental health of a personality is negatively affected by both “adhesion” of ideal and real purposes and another polar variant – hyperseparation of these purposes. L.G. Ageeva (2005) regards the defect of the personality’s socialization as a source of deviant behavior. The defect is defined as a source that forms critical situations of the personality’s social functioning. In this context the socialization defect can be viewed as a feature of the personality deformation under the influence of a critical interaction situation of the personality with the environment.

Developing social psychology of behavior on the basis of the study of teenagers Yu.P. Platonov (2006) agrees with E.V. Zmanovskaya’s (2004) point of view and defines deviant behavior as steady behavior of the personality deviating from the most important social norms, causing a real damage to the society or personality itself and accompanied by its social maladaptation. Domestic social psychology of deviant behavior is developed by Yu.A. Clayburgh (2004) who by studying teenage groups considers deviant behavior as a social and psychological phenomenon in the context of the personality’s dispositional system.

Results

Thus, the conducted theoretical and methodological analysis of the problem of content-related characteristics of deviant behavior as a social and psychological phenomenon allow us to make the following conclusions. In the period of the ancient times “deviant” deeds were deviations from a moral life, the violation of the temperance principle, a form of moral evil. Antique ethics presupposed the regulation of an individual’s deeds by means of the mind capable of guiding his behavior. Ancient thinkers’ reasoning about deviant behavior were reduced to one thing that “immoral” deeds of the man were viewed as a secondary product of God’s will unconditionally ascending to the origin and not linked with social reality. Despite such “external” explanation of the man’s behavior, it should be noted that it is in Christianity perceptions of constructiveness and destructiveness of the man’s behavior were laid down as the most axiological criteria.

Deviant behavior in the works of philosophers and thinkers beginning with ancient times and up to the XX century were considered mainly from ethical and moral positions. In this perspective it is perceived as a holistic phenomenon being explained on the basis of criteria of good and evil. Such an approach gives us substantial answers to many questions associated with the explanation of the character of deviant behavior pointing to main directions of studying the phenomenon of behavioral deviance – peculiarities of the inner world of an individual and social relations. However, as it was pointed out, deviant behavior is viewed in a rather generalized way – so, the influence of the rational origin of the human nature was only intuitively understood as a possibility of overcoming moral evil but in essence certain mechanisms, conditions, factors which contribute to diminishing the probability of deviation manifestation in behavior are not considered. At the same time, the so-called “animal” origin of the man does not necessarily push the man to demonstrate undignified deeds but only under certain conditions. Just like an intelligent man is not always capable of moral actions. That is why the necessity of further study of the essence of deviant behavior determined the tendency of a more detailed analysis of the deviant behavior phenomenon.

Biological theories explain deviant behavior from the position of biological determinants of human behavior. However, the research results in this field show that their action does not have a direct influence but only creates a propensity for the manifestation of deviations. Besides, up-to-date knowledge makes it possible to state that not some certain form of deviant behavior (for example, disposition to crimes) is inherited but certain individual and typical properties increasing the probability of forming deviant behavior, for example, impulsiveness and an aspiration to leadership. That is why, to understand the essence of deviant behavior it is necessary to take into account the factors of another plane. The most significant of them are the determinants connected with social relations.

Sociological conceptions traditionally explain the phenomenon of deviant behavior by the action of social factors, that is by peculiarities of social relations in this or that period of the society development. However, along with macro-social factors in the sociological field deviant behavior is also explained by micro-social factors. So, in the theories of social unrest and investment the activity of an individual in manifestation of deviance in behavior gains a great importance



which is natural, since the environment represents a body of separate subjects. That is why, the essence of deviant behavior can be expressed as a result of social interaction and social interrelations.

Thus in international psychology the essence of various forms of deviant behavior is disclosed by the action of intrapersonality processes. At the same time, in a majority of presented conceptions, deviant behavior of a person is determined by also social experience that is by some or other events, relations happening to a man in the process of his life activity. The behaviorism representatives consider deviant behavior as a result of the social environment impact only. In this respect, we can already observe the orientation of foreign psychological theories towards the interaction of social and psychological factors. Domestic psychologists adhere to similar points of view in the framework of their theoretical developments. On the whole, domestic psychological studies of deviant behavior also stick to the line according to which deviations in behavior have a social and psychological dependence. To this end, it is worth noting a peculiar stress on the study of deviant behavior in teenage years which is emphasized by a decisive significance of this period in the life of a person in view of transformations of social impacts on personality peculiarities of a teenager. And this significant point is the formation of the system of values and meaning in the personality of a teenager which transforms the impact of socialization factors in a personal aspect in the form of transformation of social values in the ready system of values of a personality.

Discussions

As a result of the conducted theoretical and methodological analysis of both foreign and domestic literature on the problem of deviant behavior it is possible to say that a presented scope of views on the phenomenon of deviant behavior enables us to speak about a thorough exploration of this problem. However, consideration of deviant behavior in various aspects overlooks the systemic character of the deviant behavior phenomenon. The scientists who adhere to biological and psychological approaches, try to explain deviations by natural factors, psychological peculiarities of the personality. Natural prerequisites of some peculiarities of mentality, of course, exist but they act indirectly but through social factors. In its turn, social conceptions of the deviant behavior essence reveal it as a result of processes, social relations. However, they do not explain why in the same social conditions people behave in different ways, for example, not all representatives of the poorest strata of the population show deviance and vice versa.

In the framework of designated genesis of studying deviant behavior, further development of knowledge about deviant behavior should be considered in two directions:

1. further differentiation in additional disciplinary researches of deviant behavior – in pedagogics, culturology, conflictology and etc.
2. an aspiration to unite various theories, to build a holistic system of knowledge about deviant behavior that is seen in the development of synthesized and interdisciplinary conceptions.

Specificity of the first trend consists in considering deviant behavior as it was said above in a narrow, purely disciplinary aspect. However, in general the problem of deviant behavior as a social and psychological phenomenon

nevertheless, comes into the field of interaction of many factors the account of which represents an individual complex in each specific direction. On the one hand, individual features of the man can contribute to deviant behavior, on the other hand this phenomenon may not correspond to public norms and values, and finally – committing a deviant deed depends on situational factors. Such complexity of the deviant behavior phenomenon naturally leads to a great number of questions the answers to which the scientists see in many aspects. Discussions, talking over these questions and general tendencies of science development have led to the construction of interdisciplinary, complex conceptions of deviant behavior. From these positions, first of all one should return to philosophical understanding of the phenomenon of deviant behavior. To understand the source of deviant behavior philosophy traditionally turns its attention to the notion of “moral evil”. Russian scientists A.P. Skripnik refers the existence of conflicting tendencies in culture to the causes of manifestation and escalation of the moral evil that identify the possibility of their degradation and development of one of them at the expense of the existence of the other thus forming the probability of falling into the evil. (Skripnik, 1992). Thus, deviant behavior is thought of in the framework of global, public processes. In the same way, S.E. Stepanova (2004) defines deviant behavior as “a sub-product of life of the society that acts as a required mechanism of self-regulation of public processes”.

A synthetic form of arising moral and social evil is offered by domestic ethics scientists P.A. Kropotkin (1991) who combined perceptions of natural rooting of aggression and the possibility of its realization in the social form. P.A. Kropotkin’s (1991) views are similar to conceptual understanding of man’s nature by E. Fromm (1998) who relies on the provision that the majority of aggressive manifestations of the personality does not consist in individual instincts but in the whole personal expression. On the one hand the man becomes aggressive because he is aggressive by nature, on the other hand the origins of aggressiveness and sadism should be sought in his character that is formed under the influence of the system of values, customs, traditions, norms. On the whole, E.S. Medvedeva (2005) considering in a dialectic context defines deviant behavior as a “certain existence of the man’s behavioral essence that presupposes the violation of the social norms in the society”. Another approach, a bit different from the previous ones but in essence a synthesized approach is offered by N. Smelzer who tries to put in order anthropocentric, psychological and social approaches suggesting looking at deviance as a development process.

He distinguishes eight factors in the development of a “deviant career”: creation of norms, essence of norms, performing a deviant act, recognition of this act as deviant, recognition of a person as deviant, stigmatization, stigmatization sequences, group forms of deviation which are set up in the order of deviation genesis (Tolstykh, 1988). So, “synthesized” conceptions of deviant behavior additionally testify to a complex range of factors that are involved in manifesting and developing deviant behavior of a person. The conversation again drifts to the fact that deviant behavior as behavior of a person in general is built out of individual peculiarities under the influence of social interrelations.

Conclusion

Thus, taking into account multiple views, deviant behavior is thought of as a result of social processes between society and a certain personality.



On the one hand we see that there are serious causes for deviant behavior in the society itself, for example, social disorganization and social inequality. On the other hand we naturally come to understanding the role of individuality of certain person in the socialization process of his personality and under the conditions of a certain situation. In the end, deviant behavior is represented as a complex social and psychological phenomenon, associated with interrelations of biological prerequisites, personality development and its interrelation with social milieu and environment. In this sense, deviant behavior as a phenomenon should be considered through a social and psychological approach (Salakhova, 2016).

Social and psychological aspect of studying deviant behavior is referred to a subject of social psychology. Firstly, the problem of deviant behavior depends on the interrelation between the personality and society, their interaction. Secondly, deviant behavior depends on the position of a personality in a group – dynamics of interpersonal relations development in deviant groups, on the character itself of joint activity of deviant persons in groups and forms of communication and interaction that are being built up. And finally, the peculiarities of deviant behavior depend on the formation of personal characteristics of an individual.

Taking the above mentioned into account, we determine deviant behavior as a complex range of acts, actions of a person who is formed in ontogenesis under the influence of social milieu, social relations and on the whole, social experience. That is why a teenage and adolescent age becomes a very important period in this process. Further, in the process of socialization personal peculiarities modeling deviations from social norms develop and as a result the behavior with deviations is formed as an outcome of interrelation of social factors and peculiarities of a personality. Thus, deviant behavior is a complex range of acts, actions of a person who forms personal attitude to social norms in the process of socialization. This personal attitude consists in the fact that under certain social situations the choice in favour of deviation from social norms takes place (Salakhova, 2016).

Recommendations

The article can be very useful to psychologists, teachers and social workers and other specialists who work with various types of deviance and can be used in training students majoring in psychology to work in the field of anti-social behavior prevention.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Valentina B. Salakhova holds a PhD., Associate Professor of pedagogy and psychology, Faculty of Humanities of the Ulyanovsk State University, Ulyanovsk, Russia.

Aleksandr V. Bulgakov holds a Doctor of Psychology, Professor, Professor of the department of social and legal psychology, «Russian State University for the Humanities», Moscow, Russia

Irina E. Sokolovskaya holds a Doctor of Psychology, Associate Professor of Psychology and Pedagogy, Chairperson, International independent environmental and

political University of the Academy International Independent Ecological and Political University, Moscow, Russia.

Rina S. Khammatova holds a PhD., Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, of the Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow, Russia; Associate Professor, Department of theory and technology of education in higher education, The Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University, Moscow, Russia.

Mikhail N. Mikhaylovsky holds a PhD., Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, of the Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow, Russia; Associate Professor, Department of nursing activities and social work, The Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University, Moscow, Russia.

References

- Adler, F. (1991). *Criminology*. New York : McGraw-Hill, 595 p.
- Ageeva, L.G. (2005). Defective socialization of pupils of secondary school. *Journal of Social Work*, 6, 113-119.
- Bandura, A. (2000). *Teenage aggression: study of the influence of education and family relations*. Moscow April Press: Eksmo-Press, 509 p.
- Baron, R. (2000). *Aggression*. St.Petersburg: Peter, 351 p.
- Becker, G. (1961). *Modern sociological theory*. Moscow: Foreign Literature, 325 p.
- Belicheva, S.A. (1994). *Basics of preventive psychology*. Moscow: RIC Consortium "Social health of Russia", 221 p.
- Bratus, B.S. (1988). *Anomalies person*. Moscow: Thought, 304 p.
- Clayburgh, Y.A. (2004). *Social psychology of deviant behavior*. Moscow: Sfera, 416 p.
- Dobrenkova, V.I. (1996). *American sociological thought*. Moscow: Intern. Univ of business and exercise, 556 p.
- Dollard, J. (1980). *Frustration and Aggression*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 209 p.
- Durkheim, E. (1994). *Suicide: a sociological study*. Moscow: Thought, 399 p.
- Efroimson, V. (1971). Pedigree altruism. *Problems of Philosophy*, 6, 193-213.
- Feldstein, D.I. (1987). *The psychology of the modern teenager*. Moscow: Pedagogy, 240 p.
- Festinger, L.A. (2002). *Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 291 p.
- Frankl, V. (1990). *Man's Search for Meaning*. Moscow: Progress, 368 p.
- Freud, Z. (2005). *Introduction to Psychoanalysis*. St.Petersburg: Peter, 384 p.
- Fromm, E. (1998). *Anatomy of human destructiveness*. Moscow: AST-Ltd., 672 p.
- Gippenreiter, Y.B. (1982). *Psychology of individual differences*. Moscow: MGU, 319 p.
- Gobbs, T. (1989). *Works in 2 vols*. Moscow: Thought, 129 p.
- Guseinov, A.A. (2002). *Ethics*. Moscow: Gardarika, 472 p.
- Harre R. (1977). The ethogenetic approach: Theory and practice. *Experimental social psychology*. NY.; L. 10, 283-314.
- Heider, F. (1982). *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. London: Psychology Press, 336 p.
- Hoffman, I. (1984). *Presentation of Self. Modern foreign social psychology*. Moscow: Moscow University Press, 188-196.
- Horney K. (1942). *Self-Analysis*. N.Y.: W.W.Norton & Co. 283 p.
- Kelley, H.H. (1986). *The social Psychology of Groups*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 339 p.
- Kernberg, O.F. (2001). *Aggression in personality disorders and perversions*. Moscow: Class, 367 p.
- Kon, I.S. (1989). *Psychology of early adolescence*. Moscow: Education, 255 p.
- Kraihiy, B. (2003). *The social psychology of aggression*. St.Petersburg: Peter, 336 p.
- Kravchenko, E.I. & Dobrenkova, V.I. (1996). *American sociological thought*. Moscow: Intern. Univ business and et., 556 p.
- Kropotkin, P.A. (1991). *Ethics: selected works*. Moscow: Politizdat, 491 p.
- Kudryavtsev, V.N. (1989). *Social rejection*. Moscow: Legal Literature, 365 p.
- Leontiev, A.N. (2005). *Activities. Consciousness. Personality*. Moscow: Academy, 352 p.



- Lorentz, K. (1994). *Aggression: (a so-called "evil")*. Moscow: Progress Univ. company "Universe", 271 p.
- Ling S. (1993). On the razor's edge: a socio-psychological analysis of the risk of intentional. *Social and humanitarian sciences. Patriotic. and zarub l-ra. Ser. 11. Sociology. 2*, 97-102.
- Medvedeva, E.S. (2005). *The essence and the existence of deviant behavior*. PhD Thesis. Krasnoyarsk, 180 p.
- Merton R. (2006). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Moscow: AST, Keeper, 880 p.
- Myasishev, V.N. (1998). *Psychology relations*. Moscow: Institute of Practical. Psychology, 362 p.
- Nelson-Jones, R. (2000). *Theory and practice of counseling*. St.Petersburg: Peter, 456 p.
- Newcomb, T.M. (1953). An Approach to the Study of Communicative Acts. *Psychological Review*, 60, 393–404.
- Osgood, C.E. (1955). The Principle of Congruity in the Prediction of Attitude Change. *Psychological Review*, 62, 42–55.
- Pareto V. (2011). *Transformation of Democracy / translate Italy. M. Yushima*. Moscow: "The territory of the future" Publishing House, 208 p.
- Platonov, Yu.P. (2006). *Social psychology of behavior: Proc. manual for students enrolled in the direction of psychology and specialties*. St.Petersburg: Peter, 459 p.
- Rabinovich V.L. (1992). *Augustine of Hippo (Blessed). Confession. History of my distress*. Moscow: Institute of Human Sciences of the USSR, 335 p.
- Ritzer, G. (2002). *Modern sociological theory*. St.Petersburg: Peter, 686 p.
- Rubinstein, S.L. (2007). *Fundamentals of general psychology*. St.Petersburg: Peter, 720 p.
- Salakhova, V.B., Oschepkov A.A., Lipatova N.V., Popov P.V., Mkrtumova I.V. (2016a). Features of Social Attitudes and Value Orientations of Youths and Adolescents Prone to Auto-Aggressive Behavior. *International journal of environmental & science education*, 11(16), 9017-9025.
- Salakhova, V.B., Ovsyanik O.A., Shmeleva N.B., Lvova E.N., Shabanova O.V. (2016b). The Problem of Higher Education in the Executive System of Russian Government. *International journal of environmental & science education*, 11(4), 9883-9889.
- Shibutani, T. (1999). *Social pskhologiya*. Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix, 540 p.
- Skripnik, A.P. (1992). *Moral evil in the history of ethics and culture (something to work on, what they think the philosophers)*. Moscow: Politizdat, 351 p.
- Stepanova, S.E. (2004). *The moral consciousness and behavior of young people in modern conditions*: PhD Thesis. Cheboksary, 25 p.
- Titarenko, A.I. (1984). *Antiidei: the experience of sociological and ethical analysis*. Moscow: Politizdat, 478 p.
- Tolstykh, A.A. (1988). *Adults and children: the paradoxes of communication*. Moscow: Education, 125 p.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (2000). *Psychology*. Moscow April Press: Eksmo-Press, 1007 p.
- Zakharova, E.A. (2005). *Humanistic approaches to the process of overcoming the deviant behavior of teenagers in educational research in Russia, USA*: PhD Thesis. Moscow, 190 p.
- Zmanovskaya, E.V. (2004). *Deviancy*. Moscow: Academy, 288 p.