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It is a common belief that the biological and psychological merits of criminology play a crucial role in introducing a child to a life of criminality. When looking at the context of "Nature vs. Nature," the involvement of John's children's acts of criminal activities has sparked a debate on whether John's son Alex, who has started a life in crime, is a result of his inherited genes or the environment under which he had to survive. Before we embark on this journey, this document will consider both the biological and psychological theories of criminology that have put forth vastly different views to reach an unbiased understanding of Alex's choices; this document will also consider different phenomena of criminology, such as genetics and social norms, in support of our argument.

**Biological Views**

Firstly, there is a common belief in the biological theory of criminology, which hints that the genetic predisposition of hormones, minerals, or chemicals in the body can contribute to a pathway that allows individuals to choose a life of crime. This theory puts forth that an inadequate diet is a contributor to criminal behavior (Biological Theory, 2024); the theory highlights that a lack of chemicals, minerals, and or an improper diet are likely to increase the risk of developing an antisocial personality disorder such as depression or cognitive issues over some time; with this claim, we have confirmed that an improper diet or an undeveloped brain can certainly influence negative behavior in individuals thus leading to the act of pursuing a life in crime.

**Psychological Views**

Secondly, this material also exploits the individual psychological theory of criminology, Nature, which argues that personality develops in response to childhood experiences (Individual Psychological Theory of Criminology, 2024); this theory is crucial to our claim as it is a common conception that a child who has been negatively influenced or comes from a background of a poor upbringing typically embodies poor character development. From analyzing this theory, we can state that a child who grows up in a hostile environment is more prone to participate in criminal activities. Additionally, some other commonalities of this theory to consider are family dynamics, parental neglect, and or abuse, all common denominators contributing to the likeliness of a child growing in a delinquent manner. The theory also suggests that peer pressure and social norms are major contributors to a child's behaviors, decision-making skills, and or personality.

**Theory Support**

In support of the claims made by the theories explored in the previous paragraphs, we have considered that both theories are of valid merits and, as such, should be classified as contributing factors to John's children choosing a life of criminality. We have arrived at this decision since it is, in fact, a fact that Alex grew up in a hostile environment plagued with negative parental influences such as burglary and drug trafficking. We have also considered that Alex grew up in an environment where the lines between positivity and negativity became blurred and seen as a norm, facing struggles within a challenging economy and limited job opportunities. In theory, when we look at John's children's circumstances, we can state that environmental factors are the number one influence on their choices.

**Evidence from Sophia Tutorials**

In support of our theory, we can take a closer look at the context of genetics, which states that early life adversity and parenting decisions have an epigenetic effect on a child's developing brain that can impact their future behavior (Genetic, 2024), along with the context of crime in criminology that states that the region of a country where an individual grew up in, as well as the cultural traditions of our ancestors, who brought with them their systems of law and their understanding of what's counted as crime (Crime in Context, 2024). Within these two perspectives, we can state that John's children have inherited his actions because of their limited environment and opportunities. As a result, we can agree that the social norms, environment, and childhood experiences that John's children endured were one of a socioeconomic status plagued with commodities, such as family dynamics of a negative nature, that have significant contributors to Alex's and his sisters' choices.

**Counterargument**

On the other hand, we can make the counterargument through the perspective of the biological theory and the context of crime, which suggests that John's children's acts of criminality resulted from them being depressed or socially imbalanced from the status of their environment and opportunities available. Within this perspective, we can assume that the genetic predisposition towards an antisocial personality or other acts of negativity showcased through Alex's actions were inherited from his environment rather than his father's. Within this theory, we would negate John's influences and only focus on the environment, and chances are, Alex would still make the same choices.

**Conclusion**

Finally, while both the biological and psychological theories have their merits, we believe that parental influence is the most likely scenario that played a part or outright introduced John's children to a life of criminality along with substantial environmental influence. The views of the theories covered in this material support this position by highlighting the environmental factors, such as John himself being a drug trafficker and a burglar, which leads us to believe that John's actions have negatively impacted his kids. Furthermore, while both merits are valid, it is a reminder that human beings are complex and that there are multiple factors to consider when looking at elements of criminality in human beings.
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