CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To reach a good result, of course the researcher uses some theories to support the analysis. It is necessary because in scientific study, using theory is the most important thing to get the best result. The interdisciplinary approach will be used in this American studies research. Therefore, the researcher would like to explain two theories namely theory of crimes, and theory of addiction.

In short, according to Stephen P. Borgati." theoretical framework is a collection of interrelated concept, like a theory but not necessarily so well worked-out. A theoretical framework guides your research, determining what things you will measure, and what statistical relationship you will look for". (Borgatti:1).

The theoretical framework of research related to the philosophical basis on which the research take pale, and forms the link between the theoretical aspects and practical components of investigation undertaken. The theoretical framework. Therefore, "it has influences for every decision made in the research process" (Borgatti: 3)

A. American Video Games

A video game is an electronic game that involves interaction with a user interface to generate visual feedback on a video device such as a TV Screen or computer monitor. The word video in video game traditionally referred to a raster display device, but as of the 2000s, it implies any type of display device that can produce two or three dimensional images. Some theorist categorize video games as an art form, but this designation is controversial. (*Amanda kudler: 1*)

The electronic systems used to play video games are known as platforms; in addition to general purpose computers like a laptop or desktop being used, there are devices created exclusively for the playing of video games. Platforms range from large mainframe computers to small handheld computing devices. Video games are developed and released for specific platforms; for example, a video game such as arcade games, in which the video game components are housed in a large. (*Amanda kudler: 2*)

Typically coin operated chassis, while common in the 1980s in video arcades, have gradually declines due to the widespread availability of affordable home video game consoles(PlayStation 4, x box one and Nintendo switch) and video games on desktop or laptops and Smartphones.

The input device used for games, the game controller, varies across platforms. Common controllers include gamepads, joysticks, mouse devices, keyboards the touchscreens of mobile devices, or even a person's body, using a Kinect sensor. Players view the game on a display device such as a television or computer monitor or sometimes on virtual reality head mounted display googles. There are often game sound effects, music and voice actor lines which come from loudspeakers or headphones. Some games

in the 2000s include haptic, vibration, creating effects, force feedback peripherals and virtual reality headsets. (*Amanda kudler: 1*)

In the 2010's the commercial importance of the video game industry is increasing. The emerging Asian markets and mobile games on smartphones in particular are driving the growth of the industry. As of 2015, video games generated sales of USD 74 billion annually worldwide, and were the third largest segment in the U.S. entertainment market, behind broadcast and cable TV. (*Amanda kudler: 5*)

Video game in the United States is one of the fastest growing entertainment industries in the country. According to a 2010 study released by the entertainment software association, the computer and the video game industry added US \$4.9 billion to the economy of the United States. There are some estimates that by 2015 the worldwide gaming industry will possibly reach \$70.1 billion. In statistics collected by the ESA for the year 2013, a reported 58% of American households now owns at least one dedicated game console, PC or smartphone. (*Amanda kudler: 5*)

There are many kinds of games which created by USA for example; A vampire story, Age of Empires, Bully, Counter Strike, Delta Force, DOTA, God of War, Halo games, Infinity Blade, and many more. Almost game in the world has been created by game company in America. The game has been created by USA is not only for play but the game have been created because for increase the economy. Because almost popular game in the world are made from United States. And because almost country in the world try to follow the product from America. (*Kudler, Amanda: 5*).

B. Theory of Crimes

1. Criminality in Definition

The concept of "criminality" refers to the propensities of persons to commit criminal acts. These propensities can be determined with the help of the above-named characteristics of criminal acts. According to Gottfredson and Hirschi, criminal acts promise an immediate profit or an easy satisfaction of needs, are exciting, have few long-term benefits, require low skills or planning, and often result in pain and troubles for the victims. The typical qualities of offenders correspond to these characteristics of criminal acts: "In sum, people who lack self-control will tend to be impulsive, insensitive, physical (as opposed to mental), risk-taking, short-sighted, and nonverbal, and they will tend therefore to engage in criminal and analogous acts. (Gottfredson and Hirschi: 90 –91)

Since these traits can be identified prior to the age of responsibility for crime, since there is considerable tendency for these traits to come together in the same people, and since the traits tend to persist through life, it seems reasonable to consider them as comprising a stable construct useful in the explanation of crime" (Gottfredson and Hirschi: 90 –91). In addition to this description of the elements of self-control,

(Hirschi and Gottfredson: 82) defined the concept in general as a propensity to avoid acts whose long-term costs exceed the immediate or short-term benefits. However, they also defined self-control as the difference between people regarding their tendency to avoid criminal actions regardless of their current circumstances (Gottfredson, Hirschi: 82).

For Gottfredson and Hirschi, self-control is identical to "criminality"; this is also shown by the fact that they include a longer segment from an older publication in their 1990 book, in which they replace the concept of criminality with self-control: "Criminality (self-control) ... refers to stable differences across individuals in the propensity to commit criminal (or equivalent) acts" (Hirschi and Gottfredson: 58)

They felt that the concept of "low self-control" is more suitable than the concept of "criminality". In their opinion, one does not need special characteristics to behave criminally. They stated that criminality clarifies that people who behave criminally have a particular characteristic that others do not have (Gottfredson and Hirschi: 88).

Gottfredson and Hirschi defined "crime" as "... acts offorce or fraud undertaken in pursuit of self-interest". This definition does not build on the legal definition of crime as an offense. It enables them to determine the nature of criminal acts themselves as scientists independent of political decisions. ((Gottfredson and Hirschi : 90-91))

From their point of view, one and the same action, when carried out in different contexts, can be defined as criminal or not criminal. For them, the definition of crime is the essential initial point of their theory: "The central concept of a theory of crime must be crime itself". For Gottfredson and Hirschi, almost all criminal acts are banal and trivial, need only short preparation, have little permanent consequences, and often do not produce the result that the offender had expected.

It is important that they look at different criminal acts as interchangeable, because these show the same qualities, such as immediateness and effortlessness. Therefore, differences between serious and simple, between instrumental and expressive crime, or between violent and property crime—even delinquency between status offenses and other criminal acts—are meaningless and misleading (ibid.: 22).

This definition of the nature of crime has not remained indisputable in the literature. The so-called white-collar crime is often stated as an example of a kind of offense that cannot be explained by the universal theory of crime (e.g., Friedrichs and Schwartz 2008). Nevertheless, Gottfredson and Hirschi have contradicted this regularly (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990: 180). (Hirschi and Gottfredson: 22.), for example, with the argument that this activity only exhibits gradual differences to usual crimes.

In 1990, Michael R. Gottfredson and Travis Hirschi published the general theory of crime—a universal theory of crime that claims to be able to explain "all crime, at all times" (Gottfredson and Hirschi: 117). The central constructs of this theory are self-control and criminal behavior; low self-control is the most important predictor for delinquent behavior.

This theory is a control theory, and it claims to be able to explain a wide range of criminal acts and "analogous" behavior (for example, divorces or accidents) with low self-control. Both for the development of self-control and for an explanation of delinquent behavior, the family is the most important institution. Other institutions, such as schools or neighborhoods, play only a secondary role or no role at all. The general theory of crime belongs to the most cited and theoretically as well as empirically tested criminological approaches. (Gottfredson and Hirschi: 117)

Most studies that have tested the assumptions of the general theory of crime placed their main focus on the relationship between self-control and delinquent

behavior. In this chapter, however, the question of the formation of self-control is emphasized. By and large, the chapter does not raise the claim to describe the general theory of crime as such. In the following, merely those facets of the theory that are relevant for answering the questions of the study at hand are emphasized. (Gottfredson and Hirschi: 117).

The general theory of crime is often also called the self-control theory. This term, however, ignores the fact that Gottfredson and Hirschi built their universal theory of crime on two central concepts, namely, "crime" and "criminality". (Gottfredson and Hirschi: 117).

C. Theory of addiction

Theory of addiction. In many cases, addiction theorists have now progressed beyond stereotyped disease conceptions of alcoholism or the idea that narcotics are inherently addictive to anyone who uses them. The two major areas of addiction theory—those concerning alcohol and narcotics—have had a chance to merge, along with theorizing about overeating, smoking, and even running and interpersonal addictions.(*Stanton Peele & Bruce K. Alexander: 10*)

Yet this new theoretical synthesis is less than meets the eye: It mainly recycles discredited notions while including piecemeal modifications that make the theories marginally more realistic in their descriptions of addictive behavior. These theories are described and evaluated in this chapter as they apply to all kinds of addictions. *Stanton Peele & Bruce K. Alexander: 10*)

They are organized into sections on genetic theories (inherited mechanisms that cause or predispose people to be addicted), metabolic theories (biological, cellular adaptation to chronic exposure to drugs), conditioning theories (built on the idea of the cumulative reinforcement from drugs or other activities), and adaptation theories (those exploring the social and psychological functions performed by drug effects). *Stanton Peele & Bruce K. Alexander: 10*)

While most addiction theorizing has been too unidimensional and mechanistic to begin to account for addictive behavior, adaptation theories have typically had a different limitation. They do often correctly focus on the way in which the addict's experience of a drug's effects fits into the person's psychological and environmental ecology. In this way drugs are seen as a way to cope, however dysfunctionally, with personal and social needs and changing situational demands.

Yet these adaptation models, while pointing in the right direction, fail because they do not directly explain the pharmacological role the substance plays in addiction. They are often considered—even by those who formulate them—as adjuncts to biological models, as in the suggestion that the addict uses a substance to gain a specific effect until, inexorably and irrevocably, physiological processes take hold of the individual.

At the same time their purview is not ambitious enough (not nearly so ambitious as that of some biological and conditioning models) to incorporate nonnarcotic or nondrug involvements. They also miss the opportunity, readily available at the social-psychological level of analysis, to integrate individual and cultural experiences.

The enormity of the implications of the genetic transmission of addictive impulses is driven home by several theories claiming that people are compelled by chemical imbalances to form unhealthy, compulsive, and self-destructive interpersonal relationships. Tennov (1979) maintained that such "limerent" people, who are in every other way indistinguishable from other people, have a biological propensity to fall head-over-heels in love and create disastrous romantic attachments.

Liebowitz (1983) proposed that a failure in neurochemical regulation—similar to that hypothesized to cause manic-depressive reactions leads people (almost exclusively women) to fall heatedly in love, often with inappropriate partners, and to become inordinately depressed when the relationships fail. These theories illustrate mainly the temptation to believe that compelling motivations must have a biological source and the desire to mechanize human differences, imperfections, and mysteries.

Peele and Brodsky (1975), in the book *Love and Addiction*, also described interpersonal relationships as having addictive potential. The thrust of their version of interpersonal addiction, however, was exactly the opposite of that in Liebowitz (1983) and Tennov (1979): Peele and Brodsky's aim was to show that any powerful experience can form the object of an addiction for people predisposed by combinations of social and psychological factors.

Their approach was antireductionist and rejected the deterministic force of inbred, biological, or other factors outside the realm of human consciousness and experience. Their work signaled a burst of addiction theorizing in areas other than substance abuse, the bulk of which—paradoxically—sought to analyze these phenomena at a biological level. The result has been the proliferation of biologic theories to account

both for the range of compulsive involvements people form and for the tendency some people show to be addicted to a host of substances.

Smith (1981), a medical clinician, has posited the existence of an "addictive disease" to account for why so many of those who become addicted to one substance have prior histories of addiction to dissimilar substances (cf. "The Collision of Prevention and Treatment" 1984).

It is impossible to explain—as Smith attempts to do—how innate, predetermined reactions could cause the same person to become excessively involved with substances as disparate as cocaine, alcohol, and Valium. In examining the generally strong positive correlations among tobacco, alcohol, and caffeine use, Istvan and Matarazzo (1984) explored the possibilities both that these substances are "linked by reciprocal activation mechanisms" and that they may be linked by their "pharmacologically antagonistic . . . effects" (p. 322). The evidence here is rather that substance abuse exceeds biological predictability. The fact of multiple addictions to myriad substances and nonsubstance-related involvements is *primary evidence* against genetic and biological interpretations of addiction.

Nonetheless, neuroscientists put forward biological theories of just this degree of universality. One researcher (Dunwiddie 1983: 17) noted thatdrugs of abuse such as opiates, amphetamine, and cocaine can pharmacologically stimulate many of the brain centers identified as reward centers.... On the other hand, there is considerable evidence that certain individuals have an enhanced liability for drug abuse, and frequently misuse a variety of seemingly unrelated drugs.

It is interesting to speculate that for various reasons, perhaps genetic, perhaps developmental or environmental, the normal inputs to these hypothetical "reward pathways" function inadequately in such individuals. If this were the case, there may be a biological defect underlying poly-drug abuse.

While piling hypothesis upon hypothesis, Dunwiddie's description presents no actual research findings about drug abusers, nor does it present a specific hypothetical link between deficient "reward pathways" and "polydrug abuse." It would seem the author thinks people who get less reward from drugs are more likely to abuse them.

Milkman and Sunderwirth's (1983) neurological model of addiction is not limited to drug abuse (as nothing in Dunwiddie's account would so limit it). These authors believe that addiction can result from any "self-induced changes in neurotransmission," where the more neurotransmitters that are involved "the faster the rate of firing," leading to the "elevated mood sought by cocaine users, for example" (p. 36).

This account is actually a social-psychological one masquerading as neurological explanation, in which the writers introduce social and psychological factors such as peer influence and low self-esteem into their analysis by suggesting "that the enzyme produced by a given gene might influence hormones and neurotransmitters in a way that contributes to the development of a personality potentially more susceptible to . . . peer group pressure".

Both Dunwiddie's and Milkman and Sunderwirth's analyses cloak experiential events in neurological terminology without reference to any actual research that connects biological functioning to addictive behavior. These models represent almost

ritualistic conceptions of scientific enterprise, and while their analyses are caricatures of contemporary scientific model building, they come unfortunately close to mainstream assumptions about how the nature of addiction is to be interpreted.

For many people, one of the biggest contributing factors to the development of addiction is genetics. In other words, because of their genetic make-up, some people are just more prone to the disease than others. According to a study published in Psychology Today, the link between genetics and addiction is as high as 40 percent in some people.

Environmental factors may also play a role in the development of addiction. Childhood trauma, high levels of stress, low parental involvement and peer pressure may all lead to experimentation with substances. And studies show that the earlier a person has their first experience with drugs or alcohol, the more likely he or she is to develop addiction later in life. Drug or alcohol abuse may also be an attempt to self-medicate an undiagnosed or untreated mental illness.

Video game addiction exists. It has all the features you need to classify an addiction: losing jobs and loved ones; withdrawal symptoms like cold sweats and anger; developing migraines and back problems and, very occasionally, death. And it's occurring around the globe, but especially in America, the UK, and parts of Asia (China, Korea, and Japan).

Gaming addiction has become a topic of increasing research interest. Over the last decade there has been a significant increase in the number of empirical studies examining various aspects of video game addiction compared to the preceding decade. This has resulted in a wide-ranging selection of review papers focusing on

different aspects of the topic. These include general literature reviews of video game addiction, reviews of online (as opposed to offline) gaming addiction, reviews of the main methodological issues in studying video game addiction, reviews of structural characteristics and their relationship with video game addiction, reviews of video game addiction treatment, reviews of video game addiction and comorbidity/convergence with other addictions such as gambling addiction and Internet addiction, and miscellaneous review papers on very specific aspects of video game addictions such as social responsibility, screening instruments, or reviews refuting that video game addiction even exists.

It is no secret many diverse people play video games across the world (Duggan, 2015), sometimes for extended amounts of time. Therefore, it is of little surprise that concerns about 'game addiction' have drawn substantial amounts of attention in the news and academic literature (Charlton, 2002). The interest in video game addiction has spurred parent groups and some researchers to link video games to children's problematic behaviors, lack of social integration, and academic dysfunctioning. Many of these concerns also fit with stereotypes of gamers as physically unfit, socially awkward, and disengaged from work and school, despite evidence to suggest these stereotypes of gamers are false (Kowert, Festl & Quandt, 2015). In recent years various privatized treatment centers across the United States, Western Europe and Asia have emerged, specifically aimed at treating a "video game addiction" disorder (Russon, 2016).

However, most video game players do not appear to experience substantial difficulties with balancing their expected social roles outside games with those inside (Przybylski, Weinstein & Murayama, 2016). At extreme levels of playing, some video gamers have been shown to be encumbered with some problems, albeit not always directly related to their actual video gaming

(Chan & Rabinowitz, 2006). At present, there is debate among scholars about the degree to which concerns about video game addiction represent the emergence of a new disorder as opposed to cycles of moral panic focused on new media (Bowman, 2016; Ferguson, 2013; Price, 2014; Theis, 2016).

Debates over, and research on, video game addiction have been around nearly as long as video games themselves (e.g. Soper & Miller, 1983 and see Griffiths, 1991). More than three decades of research have resulted in a wide diaspora of conceptualization and assessment instruments, most, if not all, of which suffer from serious problems.

The instruments lack clinical validation, lack norm scores, lack information on measurement specificity, lack standardized assessment, lack longitudinal case follow-up, are essentially atheoretical, and suffer from fundamental psychometric issues such as an implicitly assumed, but potentially inappropriate reflective measurement model (King et al., 2013; Van Rooij, Schoenmakers & de Mheen, 2017; Van Rooij, Van Looy, & Billieux, 2016). During these three decades, debates persisted over the prevalence, appropriate symptomatology, causal nature and even basic existence of video game addiction (e.g. Griffiths, 2008; Wood, 2008), but no clear resolution has been reached.

Despite the ultimate lack of clarity, there is a current push to institutionalize video game addiction as formal diagnostic categories in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) and International Compendium of Diseases (ICD), drafted by the American Psychiatric Association and the World Health Organization, respectively. While this type of standardization might have some positive effects, it remains unclear to what extent professional organizations have balanced careful investigation of a prospective psychological phenomenon against the driving potential of a societal narrative, impacting the scientific and medical processes in a negative manner (Bowman, 2016; Copenhaver, 2015).

Arguably, one result might be tunnel-vision like focus by the social science and medical communities on a reduction of video gaming altogether, locked in the substance use or gambling disorder metaphor (Billieux et al., 2015). This approach might detract from efforts that aim to understand gaming, and problematic gaming in particular, as an everyday and largely normative behavior that may go awry for some individuals as many other behaviors can (APA, 2013; Bowman, 2015; Ferguson, 2013; Price, 2014; Theis, 2016). Below, we consider the advent of the two formal proposals for video game addiction disorders.