

Sutherland, Cleckley and Beyond: White-Collar Crime and Psychopathy

Frank S. Perri¹, Terrance G. Lichtenwald² & Edyta M. Mieczkowska³

¹ Department of Law, Rockford, State of Illinois, USA

² Department of Psychology, Rockford, State of Illinois, USA

³ Department of Corporate Compliance (AML), Northbrook, State of Illinois, USA

Correspondence: Frank S. Perri, Department of Law, P.O. Box 5411, Rockford, Illinois, 61125, USA. E-mail: frankperri@hotmail.com

Received: August 21, 2014

Accepted: September 30, 2014

Online Published: November 10, 2014

doi:10.5539/ijps.v6n4p71

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v6n4p71>

Abstract

Scholarship on white-collar crime by Edwin Sutherland and on psychopathy by Hervey Cleckley influenced criminological and behavioral research on personality traits in the twentieth century and beyond. Over seventy years have passed since their publications, yet white-collar crime scholarship historically and personality traits associated with such offenders to date remains sparse despite the enormity of damage caused by this crime. The authors' analysis contributes to a clearer historical understanding of why empirical white-collar crime scholarship aimed at developing a white-collar offender profile(s) is highly underrepresented in the behavioral and criminological fields relative to non-white-collar crime. The authors found that a plausible partial explanation for the lack of research can be traced to 1) Sutherland's antagonistic view toward the contributions by the behavioral disciplines, 2) minimizing scholarship advocating a multiple factor approach to understanding criminal behavior, and 3) rejection of an inferential statistical methodology applied to criminological research. Secondly, due to Sutherland's legacy on the direction and method of criminological scholarship, the authors find that Sutherland's ambivalence on the role of personality traits and psychopathy in relation to criminal behavior stymied criminological research for over half a century on the development of a white-collar offender profile(s). Moreover, since Cleckley, sparse empirical scholarship by the behavioral sciences has failed to examine the potential implications of psychopathy's role as a white-collar offender behavioral risk factor giving rise to misperceptions about this offender class.

Keywords: Edwin Sutherland, white-collar crime, fraud, differential association, Hervey Cleckley, psychopathy

1. Introduction

In 1940, sociologist and criminologist Edwin Sutherland, considered an influential scholar of the 20th century, wrote an article in the *American Sociological Review* titled *White-Collar Criminality*. Sutherland offered to debunk the myth that criminality was reserved for those of the lower rungs of society maintaining that educated, socio-economically well-off individuals are capable of engaging in crime. Although Sutherland was not the first to comment and publish on the issues surrounding white-collar crime, according to white-collar crime scholar Gilbert Geis, he was considered a pioneer in putting "the concept front and center in the world of social science" (Schoepfer & Tibbetts, 2012, p. 67). In addressing Sutherland's issue with crime causation, Sutherland advocated for a reorientation away from an emphasis on biological, genetic and individual personality characteristics to explain in part or whole criminality emphasizing a more parochial sociological framework focusing solely on the socialization or learning process within close personal and/or social groups to explain the acquisition of criminal attitudes and cognitions (Boduszek & Hyland, 2011). Differential association theory was Sutherland's major contribution to criminology positing that criminal behavior is learned by interacting with others who engage in criminality producing unique rationalizations, motives and neutralization techniques attributable to different crime classifications including white-collar crime.

On the one hand, criminologists have generally acknowledged that Sutherland's white-collar crime conceptualization was one of the most important contributions to the field of criminology (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2011), yet the slow pace of development of white-collar crime research in the wake of Sutherland's crucial

contribution is somewhat mystifying (Friedrichs, 2007) resulting in a sizeable imbalance between criminological scholarship devoted to what is commonly referred to as conventional crime or street crimes and white-collar crime (McGurrin, Jarrell, Jahn, & Cochrane, 2013; Simpson, 2013). Scholarship imbalance is ironic given the billions of dollars lost to white-collar crime that dwarfs the costs of non-white-collar crimes (Maier & Imazeki, 2013; Friedrichs, 2007). Consider the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners conservatively estimates global fraud at over three and a half trillion dollars (ACFE, 2014).

The authors agree with Sutherland's encouragement of white-collar crime scholarship that he viewed was lacking during his lifetime. However, his abandonment of a multiple factor approach to explaining criminal behavior, an antagonistic attitude towards behavioral science scholarship coupled with rejecting inferential statistical analysis, which is concerned with probabilities and examining the strength of relationships between variables, sabotaged his own goal of refining white-collar crime scholarship. It is the authors' finding that the convergence of the above dynamics stymied scholarship for decades resulting in delaying, to our detriment, a more sophisticated understanding of an offender class that causes enormous damage both emotionally, physically and financially upon society. Instead, sociological and criminological explanations of white-collar crime have focused mainly on group dynamics while ignoring and rejecting individual differences attributable to personality traits such as psychopathy (Freidrichs, 2007; Ray, 2007; Perri, 2013). Empirical data that would help formulate and drive scholarship toward explaining their behavioral traits is virtually negligible when compared to non-white-collar offenders (Perri, 2011a).

Due to Sutherland's enormous stature in the sociological and criminological fields, his views prevailed in influencing future scholars throughout the decades, but not by encouraging scholarship in developing offender profile(s) that could be helpful, for example, in white-collar crime investigations. In addition, the authors postulate that Sutherland's positions were not related to the best interest of collecting, analyzing, and publishing data to better understand white-collar criminals, but rather to justify sociology as the only discipline to explain criminology and to secure his legacy within his discipline. Furthermore, the authors posit that in reviewing his publications, one gets the sense that Sutherland emits mixed messages on his position regarding the relevance of personality, pathologies and psychopathy even though he claims to advocate for a pure sociological explanation of criminal behavior. On the one hand, he appears to understand that individual personality differences may be linked to criminal behavior and on the other hand he dismisses them as risk factors.

In contrast, a contemporary of Sutherland, psychiatrist and pioneer in the study of psychopathy, Hervey Cleckley published *The Mask of Sanity: An Attempt to Clarify Some Issues about the So-Called Psychopathic Personality* (1941), which delineated personality traits attributable to psychopathic individuals. Although Cleckley did not specifically refer to the concept of white-collar crime, he did illustrate concepts that would have applied to Sutherland's scholarship such as frauds, unethical and criminal behaviors. Furthermore, Cleckley wrote case studies on psychopathic individuals, including educated professionals and those in the business community, which interestingly parallel the type of offenders Sutherland referred to in his article as being educated and in the upper-echelons of society. Yet, even less researched within the behavioral science field are personality trait risk factors of white-collar offenders although it has been over 70 years since the publication of the *Mask of Sanity*. The consequence of this lack of research exposing white-collar offender behavioral traits created a void whereby academic and non-academic circles resorted to making highly erroneous offender character assumptions increasing the risk of being exploited by this offender class both financially and at times being victims of their violence (Perri, Brody & Paperny, 2014; Perri, 2011a).

Part one traces the evolution of Sutherland's positions on the relevance of personality traits and the role of psychopathy as a factor in explaining criminal behavior, including that of white-collar offenders and his research methodologies by reviewing his textbooks, articles and commentary by other scholars. In order to better understand Sutherland's evolution and to give as complete an overview of his positions as possible to illustrate his influence on the direction and methodology of criminological research, the authors reviewed all eleven volumes of his textbooks from 1924 to 1992 that he authored and co-authored even though he passed away in 1950. Given the limitations of space for the article, the authors attempted to include the most salient aspects of Sutherland's position on issues of methodology, personality and psychopathy although the authors recognize that there are nuances worthy of discussion.

In part two, the authors review Cleckley's *Mask of Sanity* to determine if there were any insights in Cleckley's analysis that reflect psychopathic individuals that engaged in white-collar criminal behaviors. The authors caution that personality traits should not be interpreted as the cause of crime, but whether they may serve as a risk factor for crime to occur. Contemporary research does suggest that personality traits such as psychopathy should not be ignored as anomalies because they may at times be symptomatic of potential white-collar criminal

behavior especially when criminal thinking traits are present (Ragatz, Fremouw, & Baker, 2012; Perri, 2011b; Perri, Brody & Paperny, 2014). Yet, the application of psychopathy as a risk factor for white-collar criminality as refined by Dr. Robert Hare in his development of the Psychopathic Checklist-Revised (PCL-R) or other reliable psychopathic measures, is woefully lacking when compared to violent criminals that reveals a robust correlation between violent crime and psychopathy.

The authors conclude that the study of white-collar crime requires a multiple disciplinary and multiple factor approach to fill in gaps explaining criminal behavior risk factors that one discipline may not be able to fulfill and vice-versa coupled with quality empirical scholarship to improve our understanding of this offender class. It will take all hands pulling together on the proverbial ship oars to gather information on this type of offender to create a profile that is more accurate and not simply based on theoretical conjecture. The goal should be coupled with assisting scholars, white-collar investigations, those in related fields that encounter these offenders such as law enforcement, forensic accountants, auditors, fraud investigators and those working within organizations be it government, for profit and non-for profit organizations.

2. Sutherland, White-Collar Crime and Psychopathy: 1924-1950

Seventeen years before the publication of the *Mask of Sanity*, Sutherland (1924) *Criminology, First Edition* unequivocally endorsed a multiple factor explanation of crime causation (Laub & Sampson, 1991, p. 1411) elaborating that criminology is concerned with crime as a personal and group phenomenon drawing information from multiple disciplines including but not limited to legal, sociological, and psychological professions to explain criminal behavior (Sutherland, 1924, p. 11). Not only did he advocate for a multiple factor approach, but endorsed data collection of individual factors for comparisons of criminal and non-criminal groups, detailed records of the development of personalities, longitudinal studies detailing the life cycle of criminal behavior and that it is “desirable to have as much information as possible accumulated by those who come in contact with the criminal” (1924, pp. 86-88). Sutherland noted that explaining causation of crime is a combination of individual and social factors (1924, p. 111).

In addition, in examining potential behavioral correlates to criminal behavior, “One type of personality that seems to be closely connected with criminality and not to be clearly in the group of mental abnormalities is the psychopathic personality...the concept has not been clearly defined, methods of diagnosis have not been standardized, and the classification of types of psychopathic personalities is not satisfactory” (1924, p. 122). Sutherland went on to state that some have erroneously equated criminality with psychopathy and vice versa and the authors posit that Sutherland was correct in this statement (1924, p. 123). At this point Sutherland appeared to acknowledge that psychopathy might have some impact on criminal behavior stating, “[t]here is good reason to believe that the psychopathic personalities, and especially those of the egocentric type, will get into difficulty with other people more frequently than the average individual... [W]hen the term psychopathic personality is considered... [It] is apt to include criminality, and which is the product of previous social interaction” (1924, p. 124).

In examining Sutherland’s *Principles of Criminology, Second Edition*, (1934), it is not significantly different from his 1924 edition although a shift develops in which he begins to lay the ground work for his theory of differential association even though a multiple factor approach is still evident in which biological, personality, social processes are still considered as a framework for crime causation (1934, p. 48). The conclusions as to the role of psychopathy in explaining criminal behavior is similar to the 1924 edition (Sutherland, 1934, p.105). In addition Sutherland introduces the concept of white-collar offenders by crediting sociologist Edward Ross with the term “white-collar criminaloid” (Ross, 1907) stating that these offenders, “are by far the most dangerous to society of any type of criminals from the point of view of effects on private property and social institutions” (Sutherland, 1934, p. 32).

Moreover, Sutherland’s alignment with a multiple factor approach to criminology was evidenced by his praise for sociologists, such as Harvard’s Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, who applied a multiple factor approach coupled with embracing a scientific approach to the study of criminology whose work Sutherland cited in his 1924 and 1934 edition. For example, in a letter to the Gluecks, in response to their forthcoming publication titled *500 Criminal Careers* (1930), Sutherland wrote in a letter dated September 27, 1929, that the book was “a very great contribution to the literature and methods of criminology” (Laub & Sampson, 1991, p. 1412).

Yet, according to Gaylord and Galliher (1988), Sutherland had reached a theoretical impasse in the early 1930s in that he was unable to reconcile multiple causes or a multiple factors approach coupled with inferential statistic methodologies to construct a general theory of crime causation.

By 1932 and beyond, Sutherland increasingly rejects his own multiple factor position displaying vehement antagonism toward the behavioral sciences, especially psychiatrists, and those sociologists who advocated for a multiple factor approach to studying criminology as Sutherland outlined in the 1924 edition (Laub & Sampson, 1991; Gaylord & Galliher, 1988). Intra and inter-disciplinary rivalries emerged as reflected in future debates and publications. Sutherland sought a theory of crime causation that contrasted with the interpretation of behavior made by certain psychologists and psychiatrists in terms of particular traits or characteristics such as egocentricity (Sutherland, 1932, p. 56). It was “Sutherland’s goal to use social process as an explanation for individual behavior” (Gaylord & Galliher, 1988, p. 114).

Furthermore, during the 1930s Sutherland began to express his disapproval of inferential statistical research by shifting away from this scientific method of collecting and analyzing data to test theories to a conversion to analytic induction as a methodological tool. Social scientists use analytic induction to search for similarities in broad categories of social phenomena and in sociological papers, this term could also be used to mean the search for “universals” in social life, where “universal” meant without exception or complete (Seale, 1999). Generally, the process is one in which the researcher looks for cases that are similar to the proposed concept to support, for example, a universal truth about human behavior or in this case the cause of criminal behavior. Analytic induction’s formal objective is causal explanation rejecting deductive or inferential statistics that produce probabilistic statements allowing for predictions (Seale, 1999). Those that advocate for analytic induction believe their method is scientifically sounder because of the guarantee of causation rather than inferential statistics searching for predictability through correlations between variables.

Alfred Lindesmith, a former student of Sutherland at the University of Chicago, joined the sociology department at Indiana University in 1936 sharing his analytic induction method of scientific inquiry with Sutherland. It was by the induction methodology that Sutherland was able to justify his theory of differential association and not by the science based inferential statistical association methodologies available at the time used by the Gluecks and other disciplines such as biology. Sutherland noted Lindesmith’s influence on the methodology of analytic induction stating,

When Lindesmith came to Indiana University, I became acquainted with his conception of methodology... The methodology is not concerned with averages, standard deviations, or coefficients of correlation... The methodology assisted me greatly in formulating problems and in testing hypotheses (Schuessler, 1973, pp. 17-18).

Beginning in 1937, Sutherland’s attitude towards the Gluecks’ science based scholarship changed to the point that the Gluecks’ research was marginalized or outright dismissed, their methodologies attacked as flawed and unreliable, coupled with not so subtle hints of attacking their professional integrity especially when their conclusions focused on behavioral science explanations (Laub & Sampson, 1991, p. 1413). Sutherland’s attacks appeared odd in that the studies by the Gluecks that Sutherland reviewed followed similar methodologies that he previously praised. As noted by Laub and Sampson, a “shift in Sutherland’s disciplinary and methodological outlook resulted in a theory that virtually required him to destroy individual-level or non-sociological, perspectives on crime” (1991, p. 1404).

Moreover, Sutherland perceived accolades sociologists, such as the Gluecks were receiving for the multiple factor approach to criminology that took into account behavioral science, economics, biology and law, as a threat to his stature within the sociological community, the intellectual status of sociological criminology as the only discipline to explain crime causation coupled with the fact that he perceived himself to be the leader of sociological criminology (Laub & Sampson, 1991, p. 1435). For example, noted sociologist Walter Reckless stated that the Gluecks were preeminent in the field of sociological research; sociologist Donald Taft acknowledged the importance of the Gluecks’ longitudinal research emphasizing the “painstaking type of research which the Gluecks more than any other investigators are furnishing (Laub & Sampson, 1991, p. 1420). Yet, the price paid for a lack of allegiance to one discipline by the Gluecks, namely sociology, while entertaining a multiple factor approach and publishing in law, psychiatric, sociological, psychological and educational journals was steep.

As white-collar crime scholar Gilbert Geis observed, “the Gluecks belong to no single academic discipline, and they suffer the déclassé fate of aliens and intruders” (1966, p. 188). In a 1937 letter to the Gluecks criticizing the use of inferential statistics, Sutherland displays his support of analytic induction stating, “There is no statistical procedure by which a statistically significant association can be translated into a cause” (Sutherland, 1937, p. 12). The Gluecks responded to Sutherland’s criticism of statistical interpretations stating, “If one could not ever make such an inference from statistical associations, it is hard to see how any science would be possible” (Laub &

Sampson, 1991, p. 1416). Yet, professor of sociology at Indiana University, Karl Schuessler noted that Sutherland's methodology was simple but effective... "he was uncanny in his ability to spot errors in statistical logic—witness his unraveling of the Gluecks" (Schuessler, 1973, p. xxxv). Analytic induction was politically strategic during Sutherland's period for sociologist allowing this methods users the ability to avoid criticism of quantitative analysis by producing causal laws that explained human behavior (Seale, 1999, p. 85).

Conversely, the Gluecks had little patience for criminologists wedded to any one explanation for causation regardless of the discipline driven by data arguing, "Neither 'hunches' nor theoretical speculations, can conjure away the facts, even though those facts may not fit neatly into various preconceptions about human nature and crime causation" (Glueck & Glueck, 1951, p. 762). At one point, Sheldon Glueck referred to Sutherland's idea of differential association as a "roof without a house" (Glueck, 1956, p. 99). However, Schuessler counters that Sutherland's "dominant interest was not in methodological issues, but rather in building a valid explanation of crime...and that his opinions as to a proper methodology should carry at least as much weight as those of specialists in logic and method who have never engaged in criminological research" (Schuessler, 1973, p. 228). Few, if any, sociologist would dissent with Sutherland's methodology (Schuessler, 1973, p. xxxv).

In examining Sutherland's *Principles of Criminology, Third Edition* (1939), although he does not appear to altogether abandon a multiple factor explanation for criminal behavior, there are signs that he is attempting to neutralize the relevance of behavioral science as not being reliable, but again reflecting an ambivalence of whether to incorporate behavioral science in his differential association theory. Analytic induction provided Sutherland with a methodology that he believed allowed the development of a universal generalization that would explain all criminal behavior (Sutherland, 1939, p. 66). Sutherland outlined Lindesmith's methodology in his text book stating:

The procedure he [Lindesmith] followed consists of the following steps: first a rough definition of the entity to be explained is formulated; second, a rough statement of a hypothetical explanation of the entity is formulated; third, one case is studied in the light of the hypothesis to determine whether the factual data in that case fit the hypothesis; if they do not fit, it is necessary either to re-formulate the hypothesis or else to re-define the entity so that the case is excluded; fourth, by a continuation of this procedure of examination of cases, re-definition of the entity, and re-formulation of the hypothesis, a universal relationship must be reached. The negative case is the essential point in the procedure, that is, one which calls for a re-definition of the entity or a re-formulation of the hypothesis. Investigation should continue until no more negative cases can be discovered. Practical certainty may be reached after a small number of cases have been examined—perhaps ten or fifteen. Studies of conceptual segments of criminality in this manner should result in a series of general propositions regarding those segments, and from such general propositions a general body of a theory may be developed (Sutherland, 1939, p. 66).

Analytic induction allowed Sutherland to organize a diverse set of facts into a single theoretical abstraction called differential association (Laub & Sampson, 1991, p. 1418). By adhering to a single theoretical abstraction, this allowed Sutherland the ability to reject a multiple factor stance and embrace analytic induction as a credible alternative methodology that spoke of absolutes and not correlations. Thus, even if could be proven to Sutherland that there was a high correlation between two favorable variables, the association is irrelevant as Geis and Goff (1986) have noted that "it was one of Sutherland's favorite statements that 85 percent of anything could not be a cause, it had to be 100 percent or it was not a theory...Indeed, if poverty did not always cause crime, then poverty could not qualify as part of a theoretical causal statement" (1986, p. 9).

By adopting analytic induction, Sutherland was able to protect his theory from inferential statistical research constraints, criticisms and competitive theories (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1980). Adopting analytic induction allowed Sutherland the luxury of not having to collect data to support his theory because he was dealing with concepts and not facts because the concept was the evidence. Sutherland adopted standards of what he considered to be scientific adequacy that permitted an ad hoc interpretation of research results in ways consistent with differential association. Thus by the time the 1939 *Principles of Criminology, Third Edition* was released, Sutherland found a method to close the possibility that other disciplines might have something to contribute to the explanation of crime allowing him to interpret all phenomena in a manner consistent with a pure sociological theory of crime (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), claiming proprietary rights to the study of criminology (Laub & Sampson, 1991).

Yet, under the heading "Considerations in a Theory of Criminal Behavior" Sutherland states that there are several considerations in evaluating theories of criminal behavior such as individual differences, situational and

cultural processes; individual differences may include physiological deviations, psychopathy and mental/emotional deviations (Sutherland, 1939, p. 3). Situational and cultural process may place emphasis on small groups such as family, neighborhoods, political and economic systems together with differential association processes; “[A]ll of these must be considered and most of them included in a final organization of thought regarding criminal behavior (1939, p. 3).” Under the heading “A Theory of Criminal Behavior” (Sutherland, 1939, p. 4), the fifth proposition out of seven states that “individual differences among people in respect to personal characteristics or social situations cause crime only as they affect differential association or frequency and consistency of contacts with criminal patterns (1939, p. 6).”

Moreover causation of crime may take into account “(a) biological, (b) personality, (c) primary social groups, (d) broader social processes ... The theory of criminality which may be derived finally will probably weave these various elements into an integrated and compact system of thought” (Sutherland, 1939, p. 55). In addition, Sutherland addressed the relevance of psychiatry and its contribution to explain criminal behavior from the perspective of personality states, “the point of view of personality is not necessarily in conflict with the approaches from the points of view of primary groups and social processes” (1939, p. 56). Specially referencing psychopathy, there appears to be more conceptual clarity, but its application to criminality is not as of yet acceptable, but its relevance is not all together rejected either. What is interesting in examining Sutherland’s insights below is that it reflects ongoing refinement of psychopathy into sub-types. Sutherland goes on to state:

The psychopathic personality is definitely different from the psychotic person. The psychopathic personality manifests abnormalities in emotional life but not the break with reality which characterizes the psychotic. Psychopathic personalities are generally classified in three groups, the egocentric, the inadequate, and the vagabond. The egocentric person has a generalized tendency to self-reference, and a lack of social feeling. He is characterized by defiance, refusal to submit to authority, and aggressive attitudes of superiority. The inadequate reacts by dependence, helplessness, and often by sulking. The vagabond resorts to flight, which may take the form of vagabondage in the literal sense; alcoholism and drug addictions are often interpreted as symbolic methods of flight. Other classifications are: schizoid, paranoid...and epileptoid...[T]he method of diagnosis of psychopathic personality is not at all standardized or objective (1939, p. 109).

Sutherland included a heading titled “Conclusion Regarding Crime and Psychopathy” stating “psychopathic personality is a vague concept and its relation to criminality is unknown either in quantitative or qualitative term... The methods of diagnosis of the psychoses and of the psychopathic personality are not standardized and the diagnoses are not reliable” (1939, p. 116). The large portion of criminals found to be psychopathic is explained by the lack of standardization and by the preconception that criminality must be due to psychopathy” (1939, p. 116). Consequently, “psychiatrists are, to some extent, abandoning their diagnoses and classifications and trying to understand the processes at work in the development of crime and delinquency rather than to determine the quantitative importance of any particular psychopathy or of all psychopathies” (1939, p. 117). In fact, “many of the so-called psychopathies are results rather than causes of criminal behavior; and second, that social processes and relations generally underlie the psychopathies” (1939, p. 117).

However, as one can observe from his writings, Sutherland displays a mixed message on the role personality plays explaining criminal behavior as reflected in a 1942 speech Sutherland gave titled *Development of the Theory* to the Ohio Valley Sociological Society stating his theory on differential association probably would have to take account of personality traits (Sutherland, 1942). The authors theorize that Sutherland acknowledged that individual differences and not just group interactions may be a risk factor for criminal behavior given that he incorporated them in previous textbooks. However, the intra-disciplinary rivalry that advocated a multiple factor scientific methodology approach to criminological studies and inter-disciplinary rivalry where Sutherland discounted the contributions of the behavioral sciences forced Sutherland to take an absolutistic approach in order to protect the legacy of his contribution and to propel sociology as an academic discipline worthy of recognition and application in the criminal justice system alongside psychology and psychiatry. In his speech, Sutherland addressed but encountered resistance on the need to refine his theory of differential association by incorporating individual differences stating:

What is the relation of personal traits to these cultural patterns in the genesis of criminal behavior? This, to some extent, is the question of the invention of criminal behavior. I believe it is the most important and crucial question in criminological theory. When I prepared the first edition of the statement of differential association and submitted it for criticisms, I believe that the person’s susceptibility to the criminal pattern was a factor. Under criticism this was dropped, on the ground that his susceptibility was largely, if not wholly, a product of his previous associations with criminal and anti-criminal

patterns, and another proposition was substituted: Personal traits have a causal relation to criminal behavior only as they affect the person's associations. This proposition [fifth proposition in 1939] has been questioned more frequently and more vigorously than any other part of the theory. In view of the extent of the disagreement I must be wrong. In fact I am fairly convinced that the hypothesis must be radically changed at this point. My difficulty is that I do not know what to change it to. I am convinced that the basic principle is sound and that modification is preferable to abandonment (Sutherland, 1942, p. 25).

In the 1947 *Principles of Criminology Revised, Fourth Edition*, Sutherland makes a significant decision to become absolute in his theory of differential association, claiming in his first one out of nine propositions that all criminal behavior is learned (1947, p. 6). Interestingly, in the *preface* of the fourth edition, Sutherland indicates that he made modifications so that his theory of crime is not "so absolutistic" when contrasted to earlier editions, but in fact his position did become increasingly parochial to the point where Sutherland isolated himself and the sociology field from considering individual differences such as what role personality has on criminal behavior when contrasted to Sutherland's earlier editions cited above. In addition, we observe the calcification of Sutherland's rejection of a multiple factor approach, the irrelevance of individual differences in the explanation of criminal behavior, increased antagonism to the behavioral sciences and a lack of empirical evidence to support his theory of differential association that Sutherland has been formulating for over a decade by 1947.

By embracing analytic induction as the scientific method, Sutherland's development of a general theory of crime causation included a rejection of multiple factor approach as being unscientific (Laub & Sampson, 1991, p. 1418). This conversion is clearly seen in his fourth edition in which Sutherland argued, "any scientific explanation consists of a description of conditions which are always present when a phenomena occurs and which are never present when the phenomena occurs" (1947, p. 23); in essence a perfect explanation of causation, not one based on probabilities but on analytic induction. Although Sutherland indicated in the fourth edition that "much futile argument has been devoted to controversies between the statistical and non-statistical methods" (1947, p. 66), he clearly does not accept other methodologies as worthy stating that the "multiple factor theory is entirely misplaced...[T]his theory should be recognized as an admission of defeat...[T]he criminologist can carry his conclusions beyond this multiple factor theory and reduce that series of factors to simplicity by methods of abstraction" (1947, p. 67).

One could argue that Sutherland adopted what Hirschi and Selvin (1970) termed the "false criteria of causality" which explains why Sutherland had to remove from his 1947 fourth edition textbook the heading found in his 1939 third edition textbook titled "Considerations in a Theory of Criminal Behavior" and the fifth proposition referencing biological and personality as causation factors where the theory of criminality "will probably weave these various elements into an integrated and compact system of thought" (Sutherland, 1939, p. 55). If the relationship between two variables is not perfect, the variable is not causal and less than perfect association implied multiple-factor causation which Sutherland would not consider. Furthermore, by the time Sutherland enters the 1940s, he expressed a "strong antipathy for psychiatry" (Gaylord & Galliher, 1988, p. 135), striving for a pure sociological reading of criminal causation (Laub & Sampson, 1991).

Sutherland was quick to jump to sociology's defense whenever he perceived a threat from outsiders (Gaylord & Galliher, 1988, p. 137) with an eagerness to promote sociology and gain for it the respect and recognition he believed it deserved (1988, p. 143). Sutherland believed in the importance of maintaining disciplinary boundaries, attacked outsiders such as psychiatrists and psychologists when they encroached on what he believed to be sociology's territory while discounting legal, economic and biological explanations of behavior (Gaylord & Galliher, 1988, p. 164). In fact, Sutherland even went so far as to express regret that non-sociologists received funds for research in criminology (Cohen, Lindesmith, & Schuessler, 1956, p. 270). Consider Sutherland's statement on personality and the behavioral sciences reflecting the above sentiments:

The central thesis of the psychiatric school is that a certain organization of the personality, developed entirely apart from criminal culture, will certainly or probably result in criminal behavior regardless of social situations; criminal behavior is a necessary or almost necessary expression of the personality; criminal patterns are said to be omnipresent for selection by a person with this organization of the personality....This psychiatric approach, in general, has great prestige at the present time, but it will probably run its course and disappear from current thought after a short period (Sutherland, 1947, p. 55).

Sutherland modified the material under the heading "Conclusion Regarding Crime and Psychopathy" stating, "Certain psychiatrist, to be sure, have reported that they have found a large proportion of criminals to be

psychopathic” (Sutherland, 1947, p. 116). Consequently, “[T]he preconception of this school of thought is shown in the extreme form in a report by psychiatrists on the medical aspects of crime to the effect that a diagnosis of mental disease is permissible even when the criminal has shown no evidence of mental disease other than his criminal behavior (Sutherland, 1947, p. 116). The major trend in psychiatry, as well as other disciplines, is away from that extreme position...no trait of personality has been found to be closely associated with criminal behavior...the explanation of criminal behavior must be found in social interaction” (Sutherland, 1947, p. 117). However, again, in referencing the mixed message that the authors find in Sutherland’s position on personality traits he states: “Some statistically significant differences in personality traits of delinquency and personality traits of non-delinquents have been found, but these are not as great as the difference between delinquency rates of males and of females. The explanation of criminal behavior must be found in social interaction in which both the behavior of a person and the overt or prospective behavior of other persons play their parts” (Sutherland, 1947, p. 117).

2.1 Post-Sutherland: 1950-1992

Interestingly in Sutherland and Cressey (1955), *Principles of Criminology Fifth Edition*, the authors do mention Kraepelin typologies that Cleckley cites in the *Mask of Sanity* outlining psychopathic traits psychiatrist Dr. Emil Kraepelin observed. The Sutherland and Cressey (1960), *Principles of Criminology, Sixth Edition*, does not offer any new revelations about their position on personality traits and psychopathy per se; however, they do remove the position that the psychiatric approach will lose its influence over time and the removal of this position is also found in future editions of their textbook. In Sutherland and Cressey (1966), *Principles of Criminology Seventh Edition*, the authors, again, do not advance the concept of psychopathy and its potential link to criminality. Instead Sutherland and Cressey state:

[a]person may be psychopathic or not, depending on the preconception of the person making the examination. Because it is difficult to define or identify a psychopath, the label “psychopathic personality” can be applied to almost anyone...The concept is often designated a “waste-basket category” into which not-otherwise-explicable criminal behavior is tossed...The term “psychopathic personality” as commonly understood, is useless in psychiatric research. It is a diagnosis of convenience arrived at by a process of exclusion. It does not refer to a specific behavioral entity. It serves as a scrap basket to which it relegated a group of otherwise unclassified personality disorders and problems (1966, p. 169).

Sutherland and Cressey (1974), *Criminology Ninth Edition*, and their 1978, *Criminology, Tenth Edition* are similar and again advance positions from previously mentioned works downplaying the importance of psychopathy; however the 1974 ninth edition does reference Dr. Robert Hare, *Psychopathy: Theory and Research* (1970) but not in the 1978 tenth edition. What is interesting is that the authors cite outdated scholarship on psychopathy dating back to the 1940s to debunk psychopathies potential role in criminality. For example, they note:

Numerous persons have attempted to define the concept of *psychopathic personality* with some degree of rigor and to account for the formation of psychopathic personalities. The most careful investigations of psychopathic personalities among criminals were made by Cason (1943) many years ago... [H]e found 202 terms which have been used more or less synonymously with the term *psychopath*. He then counted fifty five traits or characteristics which are generally held to be present among psychopaths, and thirty behaviors which are frequently characterized as “forms of psychopathic behavior”. A study of inmates [Cason, 1946] held at the Psychopathic Unit of the Federal Medical Center revealed that...the traits which are generally regarded as characterizing the psychopaths were not as useful in differentiating the most psychopathic from the least psychopathic (1978, pp. 162-163).

The authors go on to state, “These studies seem to justify a conclusion that the concept of psychopathic personality is as useless in the interpretation of criminal behavior as was the older concept moral imbecile which has been completely discarded by scholars in the field” (Sutherland & Cressey, 1978, p. 163). What is mystifying is that Cleckley offered one of the most comprehensive lists of traits associated with psychopathy starting in 1941 and they are not listed in this edition or any edition stating “the method of diagnosing psychopathic personality is not at all standardized or objective...because it is difficult to define or identify a psychopath, the label psychopathic personality can be applied to anyone” (Sutherland & Cressey, 1978, p. 162). They further state that psychiatrists and psychology generally have no acquaintance with the field of criminology trained mainly,

[T]o give intelligence, aptitude, interest, and personality tests, and to conduct therapeutic interviews...Almost anyone can be trained in a very short period of time to give the tests in a routine manner. The psychiatrist's training is not focused on behavioral problems...and has practically no opportunity to become acquainted with the body of knowledge in psychology or criminology. The sociologist is the only member of the professional group who has an academic training in criminology and penology although he has no training in clinical methods but concerned with general interpretations of crime rather with diagnosis of individual offenders (Sutherland & Cressey, 1974, p. 621).

Lastly, in *Principles of Criminology Eleventh Edition*, Sutherland, Cressey and Luckenbill (1992) mention with more clarity common traits reflective of psychopathy delineated in the scholarship of the time such as an individual who is callous, lacks emotions, sensitivity, is impulsive, cannot foresee the consequences of his or her actions (1992, p. 126) is irresponsible, lacking genuine affection and empathy for others, and as experiencing little guilt or remorse for wrongful behavior (1992, p. 140). However the authors indicated that "the idea that criminality is associated with psychopathy is questionable... [B]ecause it was difficult to define or identify a psychopath, the label "psychopathic personality" could be applied to almost anyone (Sutherland et al, 1992, p. 140)."

What is ironic about Sutherland and progeny on rejecting behavioral science as a partner in creating a model for white-collar criminal behavior is that the concept of white-collar crime has been plagued by definitional debates for decades as to what in fact white-collar crime entails and who are its offenders. When Sutherland was asked to elaborate on the characteristics of white-collar offenders, he responded "he was not sure" (Geis, 2012, p. 8). As authors Schoepfer and Tibbetts (2012) state in addressing issues facing white-collar crime research: "If we can't define it, we can't measure it, if we can't measure it, we can't explain it" (2012, p. 80). Yet, even if we take into account definitional obstacles, through refinement, scholarship is capable of refining characteristics and potentially developing an empirical model. Consider the evolutionary path of Cleckley's observations to Dr. Robert Hare developing the Psychopathic Check List Revised (PCL-R).

2.2 Application to White-Collar Crime

Reflecting the spirit of the above publications, Sutherland addressed the application of personality, individual pathologies and psychopathy in his article titled *White-Collar Criminality* (1940). It was Sutherland's motive to extend his theory of differential association to white-collar crime (Sutherland, 1940, p. 10). Sutherland "repeatedly used the belief in the psychological normality of the white-collar criminal as an argument against the psychological explanation of crime" (Coleman, 2002, p. 184). Sutherland rejected the notion that poverty or individual personality traits derived from poverty were instrumental as a risk factor as to whether someone decided to engage in crime or not regardless of the crime classification stating, "the assumption that an offender must have some pathological distortion of the intellect or the emotions seems to be absurd, and if it is absurd regarding the crimes of businessmen, it is equally absurd regarding the crimes of persons of the lower classes" (Cohen, Lindesmith & Schuessler, 1956, p. 96).

In the *White Collar Crime* article he states "crime is in fact not closely correlated with poverty or with psychopathic conditions associated with poverty (Sutherland, 1940, p. 2), psychopathic and sociopathic conditions...do not apply to white-collar criminals" (p. 12). For example he states that "the theories of the criminologists that crime is due to poverty or to psychopathic and sociopathic conditions statistically associated with poverty are invalid because, first, they are derived from samples which are grossly biased with respect to socio-economic status; second, they do not apply to the white-collar criminals; and third they do not even explain criminality of the lower class, since the factors are not related to a general characteristic of all criminality (Sutherland, 1940, p. 12). Yet, within the same article the mixed message the authors believe Sutherland emits states: "The sociopathic and psychopathic factors which have been emphasized doubtless have something to do with crime causation, but these factors have not been related to a general process which is found in white-collar criminality and lower class criminality and there they do not explain the criminality of either class" (1940, p. 10).

The authors interpret the above statements as psychopathy may increase the probability of engaging in criminal behavior, but it is not an automatic explanation for crime and this is a reasonable position in that personality is not the cause of crime which is reflected in Sutherland's earlier text books. Consequently, the authors theorize that this lack of clarity may have contributed to the stunting of a natural development of understanding criminality in a holistic manner that may have enhanced Sutherland's own theory. For example, white-collar crime scholar James Coleman states "[it] is generally agreed that personal pathology plays no significant role in the genesis of white-collar crime" (Coleman, 2002, p. 184); in fact, this conclusion has been so widely accepted that only a few empirical studies on the issue have actually been done" (Coleman, 2002, p. 185). This erroneous

assumption that became the norm within academic circles, perhaps, assists in partially explaining why for decades criminological studies have not incorporated personality traits in the study of white-collar crime as vigorously as they could have.

Complexions of this ambiguity on Sutherland's part are reflected in his book *White-Collar Crime: The Uncut Version*, Sutherland (1983, p. 263) which is the same book as his 1949 version titled *White Collar Crime*. However the 1983 version incorporated the names of the offenders that were left out of the 1949 version. In these texts, Sutherland goes on to acknowledge other scholars, citing Clinard (1946), who propose that the theory of differential association should be supplemented with an understanding of what role personality plays in crime. Sutherland states, "[C]ertainly white-collar crimes, like other crimes, are not adequately explained by differential association...supplements to the hypothesis are needed" (Sutherland, 1983, p. 263). In a discovered undated fragment, additional insights into issues of individual susceptibility toward crime, Sutherland does acknowledge that some individuals may be more susceptible to engaging in crime than others (Sutherland, 1973, p. 42).

Yet, in illustrating the mixed messages the authors believe are emitted by Sutherland, he goes on to state, "the hypothesis that crime is due to personal and social pathologies does not apply to white collar crime, and if it does not explain these crimes such pathologies are not essential factors in crimes in general (Sutherland, 1983, p. 264). Sutherland posed questions that he did not answer to those who believed the theory of differential association needed to be supplemented by personality traits such as what are the personality traits that should be regarded as significant that are not already included in the concept of differential association given that personality traits are the product of social interaction (Sutherland, 1983, p. 263).

2.3 Limitations and Consequences

Sutherland believed he developed a theory that explained the cause of crime regardless of its crime classification, adopted a methodology that would accommodate his theory in order to avoid statistical criticism, did not collect data with his chosen methodology to support his theory, built a reputation by denouncing others who did invest their energies in a scientific manner, and claimed that expertise in criminology was the domain of sociology alone. Although the spirit of analytic induction might seem worth preserving, initial claims for analytic induction was overly ambitious in attempting to compete on the same grounds as quantitative research as a viable alternative (Seale, 1999, p. 85). Consider that as early as 1952, Donald Cressey states that Sutherland's theory would probably need to be subjected to empirical verification, but that "[A] formula of this kind has not been developed, and preliminary attempts have indicated that its development will be extremely difficult" (Cressey, 1952, p. 44). Interesting, the *Principles of Criminology* textbooks starting with the 7th edition (1966) until the eleventh and last edition in 1992 state that the statement of differential association "is not precise enough to stimulate rigorous empirical test, and it therefore has not been proved or disproved" (Sutherland & Cressey, 1966, p. 98).

Although Sutherland should be given credit for trying to explain criminal behavior, his scholarship and ultimately his motivation is not to assist in criminal investigations or improve investigation techniques even though it was his belief that his field was the most qualified to offer opinions on criminal matters (Sutherland & Cressey, 1974, p. 621). Yet, a distinction must be made between an academic viewpoint of crime and an investigators/law enforcements viewpoint on crime. Although Sutherland received accolades from those within his discipline, academic achievement should not be confused or extrapolated to mean investigative technique advancements assisted by offender profiling. In fact in the *Principles of Criminology, Eleventh Edition*, Cressey addresses his disappointment with the trend that criminologists were beginning to expand outside of theoretical research on criminological issues to more applied, investigative aspects of criminology stating:

A sound explanation of crime must be extremely broad and may not be especially enlightening or valuable for purposes of controlling crime...This trend is unfortunate. If the search for generalizations goes out the window, criminology will become even more of a hodgepodge than it is now (Sutherland et al, 1992, p. 20).

Cressey's statement is interesting in light of what Sutherland stated in the 1934 second edition as to general explanations: "A universal explanation of crime, if it would be discovered, would probably be extremely broad and not especially enlightening or valuable for purposes of [crime] control (1934, p. 19). Moreover, to advance a profile would have meant that he would have had to cooperate with other disciplines to understand both the individual risk factors, specifically static and dynamic risk factors that make someone susceptible to crime together with social processes. Static risk factors represent factors that cannot be modified such as date of birth, criminal history, race, etc. while dynamic factors include factors that are subject to modification over time such as alcoholism, personality traits, and social skills.

Consequently, Sutherland may have stymied the growth of white-collar crime scholarship in understanding the individual and not just social processes that influence the offender. He influenced generations of other scholars that failed to take into account a multiple factor approach to understanding white-collar offenders and introduced a methodology that was acceptable but highly flawed. A byproduct of Sutherland's position was that there would be no merging of scholarship through cooperation with law enforcement practices and the behavioral sciences to develop profiles of white-collar offenders that over the decades of refinement of such a profile may have mitigated against the damage of this offense. The impact of Sutherland's scientific view of criminology cannot be overstated given that virtually no empirical research is guided by analytic induction (Laub and Sampson, 1991), and yet this was Sutherland's legacy that he left to future criminological scholars to follow for decades.

It is understandable why Gaylord and Galliher (1988) state that the theory of differential association became the preeminent sociological theory of criminology for over half a century since "it represented the kind of criminological theory that sociologists found easy to accept and endorse" (1988, p. 165). In addition, Sutherland's role in annexing criminology as the province of sociology succeeded and as such sociologist Robert Merton compared Sutherland's *Principles of Criminology* to such disciplinary classics as Samuelson's *Economics* and Gray's *Anatomy* as books that "leave an enduring impress on generations of students" (Merton, 1971, p. vii).

It appears that Sutherland understood, even though not explicitly admitting, that he could not avoid the criminal personality and would be confronted with the realization that there are those criminals who act independently without learning criminality from others. Sutherland (1950, p. 554) illustrates a consistent theme of ambivalence to the role of relevance of personality to criminality and questioning whether "psychiatrists have a monopoly of knowledge of human personality and human behavior... Other disciplines, such as psychology, social work, and sociology, have as much training as does psychiatry, and have points of view, hypotheses, and techniques which should be used, together with psychiatry" in analyzing offenders. Then Sutherland and Cressey note that "the sociologist is the only member of the professional group who has an academic training in criminology and penology although he has no training in clinical methods but concerned with general interpretations of crime rather with diagnosis of individual offenders" (Sutherland & Cressey, 1974, p. 621).

Herein the weakness of their position is exposed. How is law enforcement, for example, to utilize his theory of differential association when investigating white-collar crime and its offenders when Sutherland was dismissive of the scientific method and according to their own position cannot give specific insights into any one offender that would have been useful to law enforcement used today by agencies such as the Federal Investigation Bureau to better understand the behavioral characteristics of white-collar offenders (Goldstein, 2011)? Too often "academics study crime from afar" focusing on general theories and abstractions without data to back up theories coupled with a lack of specificity as to its application to investigations (Kessler, 1993, p. 222). Although the distinction between developing a model of crime that is applicable to fighting crime as opposed to a model of crime that can be used as a general theory of crime in an educational setting may appear slight, it is a distinction that has created an enormous chasm in attacking white-collar crime for decades.

In addition, the authors could not find any reference to Cleckley's *Mask of Sanity* in any of the reviewed material which in hindsight is not surprising given that Sutherland became "vehemently anti-psychiatry" (Laub & Sampson, 1991, p. 1412). For example, most sociologists have a long standing aversion to biological and/or behavioral explanations of human behavior as Rowe and Osgood (1984) further note, "in most sociological treatments of crime and delinquency, genetic explanations are either ignored or ridiculed" (p. 526). The authors of this paper see this exclusion as significant because even though the methods of measuring psychopathy were not well developed during Sutherland's time, his textbooks after his death do not reflect the contributions behavioral science plays in understanding personality and/or psychopathy as a risk factor for criminal behavior and in fact, his textbooks that he co-authored reflect outdated scholarship. In fact Sutherland's position when one reads his textbooks starting with the 1947 version and beyond on psychopathy's role in criminality is aptly summarized in this manner: if scholarship opinions differ as to the link between criminality and psychopathy, these differences of opinion neutralize their relevance to the study of criminal causation. Sutherland's position on abandoning a multiple factor approach to explaining criminality actually undermined the development of his theory of differential association by excluding other disciplines in enhancing its explanation of crime causation.

Moreover, there does not appear to be efforts after the 1947, fourth edition to make modifications to the theory of differential association without changing its basic premise just as Sutherland did between his third and fourth editions. In the prefaces beginning in the sixth edition and forward, co-author Donald Cressey explicitly states that there would be no formal modifications to theory despite criticisms and the authors of this paper see Cressey's position as a set-back to their own positions on crime causation given that it stunted their ability to

develop a scientific sociology that Sutherland was aiming toward. For example, if we accept Sutherland's position that criminality is a learned process, how might personality facilitate one's sophistication in learning how to be a criminal? Yet to answer such questions would have required Sutherland, his co-authors and those that agreed with his position to collect data using procedures from disciplines they rejected as relevant.

Consequently, a principal problem with Sutherland's differential association theory applied to white-collar crime is that it fails to resolve why some, but not all, people are drawn to criminal behaviors in the work environment where they learn requisite attitudes and behaviors for white-collar offending in addition to the fact that there are white-collar offenders who do not receive support or guidance in committing this offense and instead wish to keep the crime concealed from others (Walters, 2002, p.151). Unless we are willing to concede that the overall business environment is criminogenic, one would still need to explain why some are better able to resist these temptations than others, differential association theory falls short of furnishing a complete rationale for white-collar offending no differently than other theories that have tried to explain white-collar crime (Walters, 2002, p. 132).

3. Cleckley, White-Collar Crime and Psychopathy

In contrast it was not Cleckley's aim to develop a theory of crime causation or reflect on white-collar crime. Cleckley documented criminal tendencies but examined them as a psychiatrist, yet there are apparent overlaps in their work that deserve attention. For example, Cleckley documented behaviors that one could interpret as pertaining to white-collar crime describing frauds, identity thefts, and forgeries together individuals Sutherland mentioned such as physicians, attorneys, and executives (Cleckley, 1941; 1988). Moreover, Cleckley appeared to agree with Sutherland in that the term psychopathy is mistakenly used interchangeably with criminality, but that it was a manifestation that displayed itself apart from criminality stating, "The term psychopath (or antisocial personality) as it is applied by various psychiatrists and hospital staffs sometimes becomes so broad that it might be applied to almost any criminal (Cleckley, 1988, p. 263). The psychopath...continues to be treated as a petty criminal at one moment, as a mentally ill person at the next, and again as a well and normal human being—all without the slightest change in his condition having occurred" (Cleckley, 1988, p. 188). Granting the essential vagueness of the term, and disputing no one's right to it, I (who am using it only for convenience) maintain that the large group of maladjusted personalities whom I have personally studied and to whom the diagnosis has been consistently applied differs distinctly from a group of ordinary criminals" (Cleckley, 1988, p. 263).

Psychopathy, which involves traits of lack of conscience, remorselessness, egocentricity, exploitation, manipulation, and antisocial behavior—is considered a fraud offender risk factor (Bromberg, 1948; Hare, 1999; Perri, 2013). Not all criminal psychopaths are violent and incarcerated criminals; some are unethical and predatory business associates (Walsh & Hemmens, 2008). Specifically, according to industrial psychologist Dr. Paul Babiak and forensic psychologist Dr. Robert Hare from the University of British Columbia, psychopathic white-collar criminals fraudulent activities may reflect a virulent mix of criminal thinking and behavioral traits, including a sense of entitlement, a propensity to deceive, cheat, and manipulate, a lack of empathy and remorse and the view that others are merely resources to be exploited—callously and without regret (Carozza, 2008, p. 38).

Psychopathic behavior is a social problem that cannot be ignored especially its link to criminal behavior in business and other organizational settings (Bromberg, 1948, p. 40). Although not a comprehensive explanation for white-collar crime, the authors agree with Benson and Simpson (2009) that if individuals harbor certain personality traits "we should not be particularly surprised" when they commit white-collar crime (p. 51). Moreover, even though Sutherland may have distanced himself from behavioral explains to criminality, his recognition and exposure of criminality at the organizational level is significant. Thus, it would not be surprising to learn that in an organizational context, psychopathy has been related to irresponsible leadership and increased incidences of white-collar crime (Babiak, Neumann, & Hare, 2010; Gudmundsson & Southey, 2011). Psychopathic offenders, more than others, are responsible for organizational white-collar crime because they search for weakness and vulnerability in other people or organizations to exploit with executives displaying a list of short-term achievements but in the long term destroy the internal culture and spirit of an organization (Hakkanen-Nyholm & Nyholm, 2012).

Ragatz, Fremouw and Baker (2012) replicated Walters and Geyer (2004) study by examining how white-collar offenders differ from non-white-collar offenders on criminal thinking and psychopathic traits. Results demonstrated white-collar offenders had lower scores on lifestyle criminality but scored higher on some measures of psychopathic traits compared with non-white-collar offenders while white-collar versatile who committed white and non-white offenses were highest in displaying criminal thinking traits. White-collar

offenders displaying psychopathic traits sway more toward being egocentric, pathological liars, charming, conning, narcissistic, patronizing toward others, and attitudes of entitlement when compared to non-white-collar psychopathic offenders (Ragatz et al, 2012).

Ray and Jones (2011) examined the relationship between psychopathy and attitudes towards white-collar crime, and intentions to commit white collar crime. In applying the Psychopathic Personality Inventory-Revised (PPI-R), they found self-centered impulsivity that entails blaming others for their own mistakes, manipulative behaviors and a disregard for norms together with cold-heartedness that were positively associated with white-collar criminal attitudes and intentions to commit white-collar crime. Results also revealed a significant positive association between Machiavellian and egocentricity with intentions to commit white collar crime. Psychopathic white-collar offenders high in conscientiousness prefer planned rather than spontaneous behavior and are able to effectively control and regulate their impulses by keeping their behavior in check, controlling their destructive impulses, and preventing detection (Perri, 2013; Perri, 2011a).

3.1 Limitations and Consequences

To date, the behavioral science field as a whole has not engaged in rigorous scholarship to illuminate insights on white-collar offenders. What is problematic when the individual characteristics of white-collar offenders are ignored is that important factors in their offending patterns may be overlooked. What is a potential historical explanation for this void by the behavioral sciences in researching this offender class? White-collar crime scholar Gilbert Geis, not wedded to any one particular discipline to explain criminality, noted that the reason sociology took dominion over criminology was because they were aggressive in making criminology their domain and also because other fields such as psychology, psychiatry and law showed little interest during Sutherland's time (Geis, 1976). Although psychopathy has become a highly researched personality disorder predicting criminal behavior, "there is little understanding as yet how psychopathy contributes causally and under what circumstances" to criminal behavior in general (Skeem, Polaschek, Patrick & Lilienfeld, 2011, p. 126).

While several experts in the field allude to the idea of psychopathy in the corporate world, very little empirical research is available for white-collar crime psychopaths (Lessa & Lessa, 2012) and research on the behavioral profile of these offenders is lacking (Ragatz et al, 2010). There appears to be indirect evidence of a relationship between the personality traits of psychopathy when they combine with criminal thinking patterns creating a negative synergy increasing the risk of white-collar criminal behavior (Perri, 2013). However, current evidence tying psychopathy to negative outcomes within a business environment context is woefully understudied and in need of further empirical refinement. Its application to white-collar criminality cannot simply be based on anecdotal evidence of an expression of psychopathy (Smith & Lilienfeld, 2012). For example, Dr. Reid Meloy noted that securities fraud offender Bernard Madoff who ruined the financial and emotional lives of thousands of people and that of organizations displayed psychopathic traits (Creswell & Thomas, 2009). Consider Harvard professor and clinical psychologist Ellsworth Fersch observations of Enron's CEO Jeffrey Skilling (Fersch, 2006, p. 107):

Skilling possessed the traits of a corporate psychopath. He was manipulative, glib, superficial, egocentric, shallow, and impulsive, and he lacked guilt, remorse and empathy. Skilling ruined thousands of people's lives by committing insider trading and fraud. Billions were lost overnight including retirement and life savings. Since Skilling knew that illegal business practices were going on and could have easily stopped or reported them... In court Skilling told lie after lie.

Although exposure of the psychopathic traits of business leaders is important given the positions of authority they hold with the potential for destruction, there does not appear to be a discipline wide impetus to verify anecdotal evidence of traits that are an expression of psychopathy amongst researchers even though empirical tools are available and there is enough of a sample size to draw from given many are in prison and might agree to a PCL-R assessment. In contrast, there appears to be an interest in assessing violent offenders; consider female serial killer Aileen Wournos who was administered the Hare PCL-R receiving a score of 32 out of a possible score of 40 (Myers, Gooch, & Meloy, 2005). Double homicide offender Brian Dugan received a PCL-R score of 37 out of a possible score of 40 (Gregory & Barnum, 2009). Although Dr. Fersch's and Dr. Meloy's observations are anecdotally accurate, we need to start applying the PCL-R or other reliable psychopathic measures to the Jeffrey Skilling and Bernard Madoffs of the world who are capable of destroying lives albeit in a different form.

A consequence due to a lack of scholarship illustrating white-collar offender profiles are the misperceptions that white-collar crimes represent out of character offenses where offenders experienced a temporary moral lapse

because educated, law-abiding citizens who work are less apt to engage in crime with values more in line with leading ethical lives (Brody et al, 2012). For example, it is often noted by scholars that white-collar criminals are perceived as being “one-shot criminals”, not likely to engage in criminality on a wide spread basis (Benson & Simpson, 2009) or they are more likely to be “accidental offenders” representing something different than the conventional public image of street-level criminals (Dorminey, Fleming, Kranacher, & Riley, 2010). As one academician who interviews white-collar offenders believes, they are just “ordinary people who made mistakes” (Goodman, 2010, para. 8), “really nice, everyday people” (Weigel, 2013, para. 4). Yet consider the statements of a former executive who engineered a one hundred million dollar fraud scheme plotting in a murder for hire scheme against those that would testify against him desiring to kill witnesses himself including their children if necessary (Rudolf, 2012).

Too often projecting an unsubstantiated value system on offenders because they do not resemble the conventional, shiftless, street-level offender exposes others to unforeseen risks. Adults convicted of white-collar crimes are often serial offenders no differently than non-white-collar offenders who display a criminal history throughout their lives (Weisburd, Waring & Chayet, 2001) countering the belief white-collar offenders “do not have a commitment to crime as a way of life” because the loss of “social status, respectability, money, a job, and a comfortable home and family” deters them from a criminal lifestyle unlike street level criminals who have no concern about how criminality affects their future or status (Shover & Wright, 2001, p. 369).

White-collar offenders “do not form a homogenous group with respect to their pattern of offending, level of deviance, attitudes toward crime, or social identity” (Walters & Geyer, 2004, p. 280). Consider the misperceptions that exist due to a lack of scholarship on examining behavioral characteristics of white-collar offenders and their linkage to violence. There has been an unsupported assumption that because the classification of white-collar crime is labeled non-violent, it is assumed that the offender is also non-violent. Consequently, the phenomenon that white-collar offenders are violent is understudied (Brody & Kiehl, 2010) due to the fact that unfounded behavioral characteristics have been inured to this offender class through projecting a value system onto this offender that is unsubstantiated (Perri et al, 2014). One U.S. federal court judge stated: “White-collar criminals are not people who are threatening the lives of others... They are not violent people” (Wheeler, Mann & Sarat, 1988, p. 63).

Consider how white-collar criminals are perceived to be non-violent by academicians: “There are some notable differences involved [with] white-collar criminals compared with...criminals on the lower rungs of the offense ladder. For one thing, white-collar criminals pose no physical danger...Violence is not their thing” (Hobbs & Wright, 2006, p. 79). Current research rejects such a notion given some white-collar offenders harbor deviant criminal personality traits no differently than non-white-collar offenders, thus it is not a fiction that white-collar offenders will resort to violence as a solution to a problem no differently than non-white-collar crime (Perri & Lichtenwald, 2007). A sub-group of white-collar criminals, resort to violence to one, silence individual(s) who have detected or could potentially detect their fraud, and two, to prevent disclosure of fraud: hence the name “fraud-detection homicide” (Perri, 2011a, p. 228).

4. Conclusion

Over seventy years have passed since the publications of Sutherland’s and Cleckley’s scholarship and to date scholarship on white-collar offenders is still woefully languishing despite the tremendous costs: financial, emotional and reputational to society. The authors conclude that a plausible partial explanation for this dearth in scholarship is due to the neglect by the behavioral sciences to focus some of their attention to white-collar crime and the legacy Sutherland left behind that discouraged an inter-disciplinary collaborative environment to collectively try to come up with explanations to crime causations and individual susceptibilities.

Criminal psychiatrist Dr. Walter Bromberg, a contemporary of Sutherland and Cleckley, believed that debates should not evolve around which discipline, behavioral science or sociology, has the complete answer to explaining criminal behavior, but what contribution each discipline can make in the explanation of such behavior (Bromberg, 1948, p. 4). Further stating in his book *Crime and the Mind* in which he referenced both Sutherland and Cleckley, displayed the type of spirit encouraged toward this understudied crime classification and its offenders:

The psychological approach to crime does not minimize the extensive and valuable contributions from related fields of investigation in the evaluation of factors in crime. Sociology has not only traced and described the influence of unfavorable environmental and cultural factors in producing crime; it has as well supplied a mighty stimulus for the development of prevention and treatment techniques. The sociologist will continue to demonstrate these potent environmental factors and to bring about further

amelioration of situations which society cannot afford to neglect. It is the responsibility of the psychiatric criminologist, however, to describe and delineate the emotional mechanisms which play a specific role in the criminal reactions of maladjusted individuals to their social background (Bromberg, 1948, p. 4).

Conflict of Interests

This study authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this article in International Journal of Psychological Studies.

References

- ACFE. (2014). *2014 report to the nation*. Retrieved May 14, 2014, from <http://www.acfe.com/rtn/docs/2014-report-to-nations.pdf>
- Babiak, P., Neumann, C., & Hare, R. (2010). Corporate psychopathy: Talking the walk. *Behavioral Science and the Law*, 28(2), 174-193.
- Benson, M., & Simpson, S. (2009). *White-Collar Crime: An opportunity perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Boduszek, D., & Hyland, P. (2011). The theoretical model of criminal social identity: Psycho-social perspective. *International Journal of Criminal and Sociological Theory*, 4(1), 604-615. Retrieved from <http://pi.library.yorku.ca/ojs/index.php/ijest/article/view/32125>
- Brody, R. G., & Kiehl K. A. (2010). From white-collar crime to red-collar crime. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 17(3), 351-364. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13590791011056318>
- Brody, R. G., Melendy S., & Perri, F. S. (2012). Commentary from the American Accounting Association's 2011 annual meeting panel on emerging issues in fraud research. *Accounting Horizons*, 26(3), 513-531. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2308/acch-50175>
- Bromberg, W. (1948). *Crime of the mind*. Philadelphia: J.P. Lippincott Company.
- Carozza, D. (2008). These men know snakes in suits. *Fraud Magazine*, 22(4), 36-43. Retrieved from <http://www.fraud-magazine.com/article.aspx?id=404>
- Cason, H. (1943). The psychopath and the psychopathic. *Journal of Criminal Psychopathology*, 4, 522-527. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/ort/18/2/297/>
- Cason, H. (1946). The symptoms of the psychopath. *Public Health Reports*, 61(51), 1833-1853. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/4585951>
- Cleckley, H. (1941). *The mask of sanity* (1st ed.). St. Louis: Mosby.
- Cleckley, H. (1988). *The mask of sanity* (5th ed.). St. Louis: Mosby.
- Clinard, M. (1946, June). Criminological theories of violations of wartime regulations. *American Sociological Review*, 11, 258-270. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2087110>
- Cohen, A. K., Lindesmith, A., & Schuessler, K. (1956). *The Sutherland papers*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Coleman, J. W. (2002). *The criminal elite: Understanding white-collar crime*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Creswell, J., & Thomas, L. (2009, January 24). *The talented Mr. Madoff*. Retrieved May 14, 2014 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/25/business/25bernie.html?pagewanted=all>
- Dorminey, J. W., Fleming, A. S., Kranacher, M., & Riley, R. A. (2010). Beyond the fraud triangle. *Fraud Magazine*, 26(5), 18-25. Retrieved from <http://www.fraud-magazine.com/article.aspx?id=4294970127>
- Fersch, E. L. (2006). *Thinking about psychopaths and psychopathy*. New York, NY: iUniverse.
- Friedrichs, D. O. (2007). *Trusted criminals: White collar crime in contemporary society* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Gaylord, M., & Galliher, J. (1988). *The criminology of Edwin Sutherland*. USA: Transaction Books.
- Geis, G. (1966). Review of ventures in criminology. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 57, 187-188. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1141294>
- Geis, G. (1976). Editorial. *Criminology*, 14, 303-304. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1976.tb00025.x>

- Geis, G. (2012). From early white-collar bandits and robber barons to modern-day white-collar criminals. In D. Shichor, L. Gaines, & A. Shoepfer (Eds.), *Reflecting on White-Collar and Corporate Crime* (pp. 63-83). Illinois: Waveland Press Inc.
- Geis, G., & Goff, C. (1986). Edwin H. Sutherland's white-collar crime in America: An essay in historical criminology. *Criminal Justice History*, 7, 1-31.
- Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1930). *500 criminal careers*. New York: Knopf.
- Glueck, S. (1956). Theory and fact in criminology. *British Journal of Delinquency*, 7, 92-109.
- Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1951). Note of plans for further "unraveling" juvenile delinquency. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 41, 759-762.
- Goldstein, M. (2011). *FBI behavior analysts apply serial killer profiling to white collar crime*. Retrieved May 15, 2014 from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/04/20/fbi-white-collar-serial-killers_n_851479.htm
- Goodman, M. (2010, April 15). *The embezzler next door*. Retrieved May 14, 2014 from <http://abcnews.go.com/Business/white-collar-crime-fraudsters-embezzlers-family-friends-neighbors/story?id=10378038>
- Gottfredson, M., & Hirschi, T. (1990). A general theory of crime. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Hall, Livingston. 1937. A Reply to Professor Sutherland's Review of Later Criminal Careers. *Harvard Law Review*, 51, 389-93.
- Gregory, T., & Barnum, A. (2009, November 6). Brian dugar's brain the subject of sentencing hearing. Retrieved May 14, 2014 from, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2009-11-06/news/0911050936_1_functional-magnetic-resonance-imaging-sentencing-hearing-fmri
- Gudmundsson, A., & Southey, G. (2011). Leadership and the rise of the corporate psychopath: What can business schools do about the "snakes inside? *e-Journal of Social and Behavioral Research in Business*, 2(2), 18-27. Retrieved from http://www.ejsbrb.org/upload/e-JSBRB_Gudmundsson_Southey_2011_2.pdf
- Hakkanen-Nyholm, H., & Nyholm, J. (2012). *Psychopathy and the law*. New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781119944980>
- Hare, R. (1970). *Psychopathy: Theory and research*. New York: John Wiley.
- Hare, R. (1999). *Without conscience*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Hirschi, Y., & Selvin, H. (1970). False criteria of causality. In M. Wolfgang, L. Savitz, & N. Johnston (Eds.), *The sociology of crime and delinquency* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Hirschi, T. & Gottfredson, M. (1980). Introduction: The Sutherland tradition in Criminology. In T. Hirschi, & M. Gottfredson (Eds.), *Understanding Crime*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.
- Hobbs, D., & Wright, R. (2006). *The sage handbook on fieldwork*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kessler, R. (1993). *The FBI*. NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Laub, J. H., & Sampson. (1991, May). The Sutherland-Glueck debate: On the sociology of criminological knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96(6), 1402-1440. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/229691>
- Lesha, J., & Lesha, D. (2012). Psychopathy and white collar crime: A review of literature. *SEEU Review*, 8(2), 1-18. Retrieved from <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/seeur.2012.8.issue-2/v10306-012-0017-2/v10306-012-0017-2.xml>
- Lilly, J., Cullen, F., & Ball, R. (2011). *Criminological theory: Context and consequences* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maier, M. H., & Imazeki, J. (2013). *The data game* (4th ed.). New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- McGurrin, D., Jarrell, M., Jahn, A., & Cochrane, B. (2013). White collar crime representation in the criminological literature revisited, 2001-2010. *Western Criminology Review*, 14(2), 3-19. Retrieved from <http://wcr.sonoma.edu/v14n2/McGurrin.pdf>
- Merton, R. (1971). *Foreword to the Masters of sociological thought: Ideas in historical and social context*, Lewis Closer. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Myers, W. C., Gooch, E., & Meloy, J. R. (2005). The role of psychopathy and sexuality in a female serial killer. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 50(3), 1-6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1520/JFS2004324>

- Perri, F. S. (2011a). White collar criminals: The 'kinder, gentler' offender? *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 8(3), 217-241. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jip.140>
- Perri, F. S. (2011b). The flawed interview of a psychopathic killer: What went wrong? *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 8(1), 41-57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jip.128>
- Perri, F. S. (2013). Visionaries or false prophets. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 29(3), 331-350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1043986213496008>
- Perri, F. S., Brody, R. G., & Paperny, J. M. (2014). Debunking the myth of the out of character offense. *Journal of Forensic & Investigative Accounting*, 6(1), 1-51. Retrieved from <http://www.bus.lsu.edu/accounting/faculty/lcrumbley/jfia/Articles/v6n2.htm>
- Perri, F. S., & Lichtenwald, T. G. (2007). Fraud detection homicide: A proposed FBI crime classification. *Forensic Examiner*, 16(4), 18-29. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/225071.pdf>
- Ragatz, L., & Fremouw, W. (2010). A critical examination of research on the psychological profiles of white-collar criminals. *Journal of Forensic Psychological Practice*, 10(5), 373-402. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15228932.2010.489846>
- Ragatz, L., Fremouw, W., & Baker, E. (2012). The psychological profile of white-collar offenders: Demographics, criminal thinking, psychopathic traits, and psychopathology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(7), 978-997. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093854812437846>
- Ray, J. (2007). *Psychopathy, attitudinal beliefs, and white collar crime*. Retrieved July 22, 2014, from <http://www.mendeley.com/research/psychopathy-attitudinal-beliefs-white-collar-crime-3/>
- Ray, J., & Jones, S. (2011). Self-reported psychopathic traits and their relation to intentions to engage in environmental offending. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 55, 370-391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0306624X10361582>
- Ross, E. A. (1907). *Sin and society*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Company.
- Rowe, D., & Wayne, O. W. (1984). Heredity and sociological theories of delinquency: A reconsideration. *American Sociological Review*, 49, 526-540. <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/2095466?uid=3739664&uid=2129&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=21104665792843>
- Rudolf, J. (2012). *Aaron hand, disgraced mortgage broker, pleads guilty to murder-for-hire plot arranged from prison*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2095466>
- Schoepfer, A., & Tibbetts, S. G. (2012). From early white-collar bandits and robber barons to modern-day white-collar criminals. In D. Shichor, L. Gaines, & A. Schoepfer (Eds.), *In Reflecting on White-Collar and Corporate Crime*. Illinois: Waveland Press Inc.
- Schuessler, K. (1973). *Edwin H. Sutherland on analyzing crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Seale, C. (1999). *The quality of qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Shover, N., & Wright, J. (2001). *Crimes of privilege*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Simpson, S. (2013). White-collar crime: A review of recent developments and promising directions for future research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 39, 309-331. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071811-145546>
- Skeem, J., Polaschek, D., Patrick, J., & Lilienfeld, S. (2011). Psychopathic personality: Bridging the gap between scientific evidence and public policy. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 12(3), 95-162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1529100611426706>
- Smith, S., & Lilienfeld, S. (2012). Psychopathy in the workplace: The knowns and unknowns. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 18(2), 204-218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.11.007>
- Sutherland, E. H. (1924). *Criminology* (1st ed.). Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1932). Social process in behavior problems. *Publications of the American Sociological Society*, 26, 55-61.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1934). *Principles of Criminology* (2nd ed.). Chicago: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1937). *The Gluecks' later criminal careers: An appraisal by Edwin Sutherland*. Harvard Law School Library, Cambridge, Mass.
- Sutherland, E.H. (1939). *Principles of Criminology* (3rd ed.). Chicago: J.B. Lippincott Company

- Sutherland, E. H. (1940). White-collar criminality. *American Sociological Review*, 5(1), 1-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2083937>
- Sutherland, E. H. (1942). Development of the theory. In K. Schuessler (Ed.), *On analyzing crime* (pp. 13-29). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1947). *Principles of Criminology* (4th ed.). Chicago: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1949). *White collar crime*. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1950). The sexual psychopath laws. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 40(5), 543-554. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1137845>
- Sutherland, E. H. (1973). *On analyzing crime*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1983). *White collar crime: The uncut version*. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
- Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1955). *Criminology* (5th ed.). Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1960). *Criminology* (6th ed.). Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1966). *Criminology* (7th ed.). Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1970). *Criminology* (8th ed.). Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1974). *Criminology* (9th ed.). Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1978). *Criminology* (10th ed.). Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Sutherland, E. H., Cressey, D. R., & Luckenbill, D. F. (1992). *Principles of Criminology* (11th ed.). New York: General Hall, Inc.
- Walsh, A., & Hemmens, C. (2008). *Introduction to criminology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Walters, G. (2002). *Criminal belief systems: An integrated-interactive approach theory of lifestyles*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Walters, G., & Geyer, M., (2004). Criminal thinking and identity in male white collar offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31(3), 263-281. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093854803262508>
- Weigel, J. (2013). *Remarkable woman*. Retrieved May 14, 2014, from <http://www.chicagotribune.com/features/life/ct-tribu-remarkable-pope-20130105,0,4731331.story>
- Weisburd, D., Wheeler, S., Waring, E., & Bode, N. (1991). *Crimes of the middle class: White collar offenders in the federal courts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Weisburd, D., Waring, E., & Chayet, E. F. (2001). *White collar crime and criminal careers*. New York, NY: Weisburd Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511499524>
- Wheeler, S., Mann, K., & Sarat, A. (1988). *Sitting in judgment*. Yale University Press.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).