Sociology and durkheim social disorganization

SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION AND IT'S TYPES: DEFINITION OF SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION: Social Disorganization theory began around the late 1800s. Social Disorganization refers to organizations and institutions failing in communities or neighborhoods, preventing these areas from overcoming the crime and issues of the day. The social disorganization theory is a key component in the study of criminology. Theories under the umbrella of social disorganization seek to identify and predict trends in criminal or deviant behavior among groups within a social network.

The effort is designed to address criminal activity and the variables that might predict undesired behavior within a community. According to Elliott and Merrill: " Social disorganization are the totality of human personalities and conscious and unconscious attitudes, their crystallized and uncrystallized ideas and institutions which in complex interrelationships make up the framework of human existences. Social organization refers to the way people relate themselves to one another. It also refers to the way in which person and groups making up a society are somehow held together. Read alsoSociology and Social Integration.

Social organization and social structure are interchangeable concepts both referring to any interrelated system of role and statuses. " Ogburn and Nimkoff said that: " When the harmonious relationship between the various parts ofcultureis disturbed, social disorganization ensues. Social disorganization implies some breakdown in the organization of society. It is a relative phenomenon. Social organization and social disorganization is the dual aspects of the whole functioning of society. The social disorganization theory attributes crime and delinquency to communities where failing

communal institutions, such asfamily, church, local government and schools, are found. According to this theory, communal relationships reinforce positive behavior, a sense of communityresponsibilityand concern for the social network within a close area. When these communal relationships are faulty or nonexistent, that social network loses a sense of organization and social responsibility, which can potentially lead to negative or even criminal behavior spreading through that neighborhood.

Types of Social Disorganization: Types of social disorganization are as follow: 1. Individual disorganization 2. Family disorganization 3. Community disorganization Social disorganization is the theory that crime and dysfunctional behavior occur in societies for cultural, political and economic reasons. Established communities experience increases in crime when their way of life and the established order of how things are done changes. Generally, social disorganization is caused by lack of personal control, community control and public control.

Cultural Social Disorganization: •Cultural social disorganization emphasizes that disorganization occurs through thefailureof people to keep up with the times. When housing, means of transport and methods ofcommunicationrapidly change in a society, beliefs, attitudes and habits do not change as quickly. Authority figures resist change and find it difficult to integrate the new circumstances into their lives. This lag can result in social disorganization and increased crime rates. Political Social Disorganization: When a country or neighborhood has a large influx of new populations, such as immigrants, or are dealing with social upheavals or wars, political corruption can threaten the stability of a society. Political social

disorganization also occurs when a country becomes subordinate to another country. The subordinate country loses its ability to govern itself and develop its own institutions, leading to subsequent loss of societal values, which can result in more crime in the society. Crime rates are less prevalent in stable communities. Economic Social Disorganzation: •Social and natural crises can give rise to economic social disorganization.

Famines, floods, epidemics and other natural disasters can disrupt social balances. Disparity between desires and themoneyto attain thosegoalscan also affect the rise of crime. Illegitimate means will be used when legal ways to acquire them are not available. Unfair division of labor and physical deterioration of neighborhoods were also found to result in social disorganization. Some sociologist believe that the introduction of commerce and high levels of industrialization lead to higher crime rates. With the demise of traditional norms of behavior, new forms of behavior -- whether productive or not -- are likely to increase.

INDIVIDUAL: 1. Individual difficulties such as physical, social, mental handicaps which may or may not lead to social disorganization. 2. Certain handicaps as a result of which the individual becomes habituated to some social vice. This ultimately affects his life organization as well as others in the community bringing social disorganization in the society. 3. Biological and physical factors which without proper control through moderntechnologycreates problem of mass disorganization. 4. Decay in the existing institutions whether educational, religious, recreational, family, etc which ultimately affects the community. . Change in values and conflicts in role due to the rapid spread of technology, industrialization, urbanization and

mass communication creating problems of national disorganization. When a number of individuals suffer from a similar type of disorganization, a social problem is in existence. In other word, individual disorganization, social problem, and social disorganization are closely interrelated to each other. Here individual disorganization may arises because of various factors such as biological, environmental, loss of security crisis in life, there can be two possibilities: 1.

Individual disorganization may grow independent of social disorganization. For instance, if a person has illhealthor is unable to meet his social demands it may leads to his physical or nervous breakdown and upset his personal plans and life schemes. 2. Suppose an individual is a leader or occupies a strategic position in society, which is often the case, then any disorganization in him leads to social disorganization if not checked. Each such disorganized such individual affects other individuals and in so doing produces social disorganization.

According to Elliott and Merrill all type of personal maladjustment represent in one way or another, the inability of the individual to achieve a satisfactory life organization from the point of view of the social definition of his social patterns. 1. The behavior of the disorganized person deviates from the culturally approved norms. 2. His behavior arouses social disapproval which may vary from mild to marked (and evenviolenceone.) 3. The disorganized person may respond to social disapproval in two ways, i. e. positively or negatively. Individual and Society: Social disorganization in a simple society:

The social change, social disorganization and personal disorganization have their genesis in the variant behavior of the individuals. In simple societies,

however deviations in behavior is minimum. Therefore there is a little awareness of their existence by the group. New coordination is made both for the society and for the individual with a minimum ofstressand strain. Social disorganization in a complex society: The functioning of three important factors is commonly held responsible for spontaneous variations in behavior. They are - the specialized functioning inherent in complex society.

The family as a culture defining agency and cultural participation outside the particular social order. The result is the emergence of a wide variety of various response patterns out of which develops disorganization both in society and individual. Some innovations find ready acceptance because they are related to those aspect of culture which are found outside institutional pattern. Innovations in mores, ideas and beliefs often meet with social disapproval because they vary from the accepted pattern. In simple society people revamp the discordant elements to the degree that their variance is no longer apparent.

Innovations which meet with organized resistance tend to result in marked social disorganization. All positive response to social disapproval does not result in attempts to explain the variant behavior in terms of the welfare of the group. Social disorganization is the inevitable result until such time as the new behavior pattern loses group support or becomes incorporated into the social order. When however social disapproval of variations is met negatively by retreat into a world of fantasy there is no corresponding social disorganization except to the extent to which the individual becomes a threat to the safety of society and its members.

This point of view does not deny the causative role of social organization in the production of personal disorganization. All social change involves some social disorganization. It is important to think of social disorganization related to those aspects of social change which result in the disturbance and revamping of social institutions and of the patterns of interrelationship between them. In the same way the social responses of the individual are always in flux. But only when changes take place in the individual's pattern of adjustment to social situations which arouse social disapproval that one may speak of personal disorganization.

Personal disorganization represents the behavior of the individual which deviates from the social norms. It results in social disapproval which may express itself in a wide variety of degree. The individual may also react in different ways. Social reality presents an endless confusion of social disapproval from time to time. It may be mild or violent. Accordingly individuals respond either positively or negatively to social disapproval. The most visible aspect of personal disorganization in complex societies is that in which there is mild social disapproval to which the individual responds positively.

This kind of personal disorganization does not deeply disturb the social order. The second aspect of social disorganization is that in which there is violent social disapproval and yet the individual responds positively. In the third aspect in which the individual's response to social disapproval is subjective the person retreats into an individually defined inner world. His innovations lose their social character. He becomes enmeshed in the

development of mechanisms which further isolate him from the normal influences of group life.

This type of personal disorganization results in psychosis through which the individual tries to escape from the web of social relations and insuicide. Social disorganization consists of the co-ordination of individual responses as a result of the operation of consensus and control. Personal organization refers to the coordination and integration of the attitude systems within thepersonality. A change in the cultural context which destroys the functioning of coordination that constitutes the social order represents social disorganization.

Similarly any variant behavior which disturbs the integration of the attitude systems within the personality represents personal disorganization. Social disorganization is the inevitable result until such time as the new behavior pattern loses group support or becomes incorporated into the social order. When however social disapproval of variations is met negatively by retreat into a world of fantasy there is no corresponding social disorganization except to the extent to which the individual becomes a threat to the safety of society and its members. This point of view does not deny the causative ole of social organization in the production of personal disorganization. All social change involves some social disorganization. It is important to think of social disorganization related to those aspects of social change which result in the disturbance and revamping of social institutions and of the patterns of interrelationship between them. In the same way the social responses of the individual are always in flux. But only when changes take place in the

individual's pattern of adjustment to social situations which arouse social disapproval that one may speak of personal disorganization.

Depressionand Disorganization: There are many medical conditions that can contribute to a disorganized and chaotic life. The most common is depression. A depressed person is usually apathetic, lethargic, disinterested, and this can lead to disorganization. Mental Disorder: Other mental problems such as bipolar disorder, dementia, and schizophrenia are all included under the mental umbrella that can cause a chaotic life. Besides depression and mental disorders, grief and pain can also lead to mounds of clutter. Emotional Clutter and Disorganization:

Another reason why people suffer from disorganization is because their emotional and social lives are cluttered. The psychological feeling of being overwhelmed can lead to a disorganized life. In these casestime managementand acknowledging priorities are two possible cures for eliminating disorganization. ADD and Disorganization: Attention deficit disorder plays a huge factor in a person's ability to get organized. People who have problems with organization and planning should be checked for ADD disorder. Organization and planning are two of the biggest challenges for those suffering from attention deficit disorder.

Unfortunately, standard organizing practices normally don't work for those with ADD and specialized strategies must be developed so that a person can get their life in order. Misconceptions: Most people attempt to solve disorganization by purchasing products and tools, but the Institute of Living, located in Hartford, Conn. , says this may not work. According to the Institute of Living, disorganization is commonly not a house problem that can be

solved with buying bins, organizers, hangers and other household accessories, but rather a personal problem that can only be solved when the individual fundamentally changes his behavior.

Causes of Social Disorganization: According to MacIver and Page five main factors such as psychological, biological, physical, technological and culture bring about social change. When the changes brought about these factors in the social structure are so disturbing that the present institution and other means of social control are no longer able to control them by adjusting themselves to the new situations there arise social disorganization. Factors of social disorganization at a particular period are so interrelated that it is difficult to find which factor is predominant.

Elliott and Merrill observe that in order to understand the full implications of a study of social disorganization we must keep in mind the complex nature of all social phenomena. Out of man's fruitless search for unique causes has come recognition of the multiple factors which account for such characteristics of modern society as the decline in the acceptance of revealed religion the changing structure of the family, the increasing importance of the central government, and the lowering standards of morality. Others would rely on a reconstructuction of the fundamental economic institutions to bring about the changes.

Still another group insists that the basis of all human woe lies in the biological field. Each of these groups however ignore the selective nature of the interpretation while on the other hand any realistic social understanding must consider all the factors related to the particular manifestation of social disorganization which is under investigation. Elliott and Merrill has described

the four main causes for the disorganization- •The social processes under the three main heads-cultural, political and economic •Cultural lag Conflicting attitudes and values •Social crises Social disorganization is mainly due to cultural degeneration of values in various spheres such as art, science, philosophy, religion, law and politics. According to Karl Mannheim unplanned capitalism and policy of laissez faire are responsible for social disintegration in the present age which Bertrand Russell observes that " the lack of adjustment in institutions based on authority in the past is responsible for the present social disorganization. " G.

R Medan has listed a few factors responsible for disorganization. •Psychological factors:- The cause of social disorganization is to be found in the humanpsychologyitself. Psychological factors contribute to disorganization in two ways:- (a)Failure to maintain proper communication among fellow beings. (b)Failure to modify or change one's attitudes in tune with demands of time. •Cultural lag:- Cultural lag is the concept used by W. E. Ogburn refers to the imbalance in the rate and speed of change between the material cultural and non-material culture.

Objects of material culture such as mode of housing, means of transport and communication, types of dresses, patterns of ornaments, technical and mechanical devices, instruments change very quickly. But ideas, beliefs, attitudes, taste, philosophies, habits, ideologies, institutional structures and such other aspects of non-material culture change slowly and gradually. Hence a gap or a lag arises between the material and non-material culture. This lag referred to as cultural lag invites the process of disorganization to set in. •Physical or geographic factors:-

The adjustment of man and his culture to certain extraordinary physical or geographic conditions or situations may cause disorganization in society. This is especially true in the case of natural calamities such as storms, cyclones, hurricanes, famines, floods, epidemics etc which upset the social balance and bring in social disorganization. •Biological factors:- Population explosion or extreme scarcity of population the instances of racial intermixture, defective hereditary traits and such other biological factors may also cause disorganizing effects upon society. •Ecological factor:-

Social disorganization is related toenvironmentin terms of regions and neighborhoods. •Social problems leading to social disorganization:- Social problems and forces such as a revolution, social upheaval, a class struggle, a financial or economic crisis, a war between nations, mental illness, and political corruption threaten the welfare of the society. •Degeneration of values:- Social values are often regarded as the sustaining forces of society. They contribute to the strength and stability of social order. But due to rapid social change new values come up and some of the old values decline.

At the same time people are not in a position to reject the old completely and accept the new altogether. Hence conflict between the old and the new is the inevitable result of which leads to the social disorganization. •Disintegration and confusion of roles:- Members of society are expected to perform certain definite roles in accordance with their placements in society. Due to profound social changes these expectations also undergo change. Consequently people are confused with regard to their new roles. •Political subservience:- Political subordination of a country will result in social disorganization.

The subordinate country is not permitted to develop its economy and institutions independently and is made as a means to serve the interest of the dominant country. •Conflict of goals and means:- Conflict of goals and means for achieving them may also cause disorganization. Most of the individuals share the dominant goals of the society and act accordingly. But lacking the means for achieving the goals by legitimate means some may resort to illegitimate and illegal means resulting in vice, crime and other expression of social disorganization. •Decline of social control:-

The declining control of religion, morals, customs, traditions and other institutions on the behavior of men has also enhanced the process of disorganization. There is an increase in interpersonal conflicts, crimes, tensions, divorce, delinquency, mental derangement etc. According to Thomas and Znaniecki the very decrease of the influence of existing rule of behavior upon the individual members of the group itself indicates social disorganization. •Extreme divisions of labor:- According to Durkheim social disorganization is often brought about by extreme division of labour.

In normal course according to him division of labor leads to social solidarity may become disturbed. •Disruptive social change:- Society undergoes change mainly due to the operation of physical, biological, technological and cultural factors. Sudden and radical social changes may disrupt the stability and the organization of the society. The result is social disorganization. Prevention/Solution: According to the National Study Group on Chronic Disorganization, a person who finds herself continuously surrounded by mess and should seek help and work with a professional organizer who is knowledgeable about disorganization issues.

A person who is able to get organized can experience better mental and physical health. Organization places a person in a more productive environment that is conducive to enhancing his quality of life. Conclusion: Disorganization can cause havoc in a person's life. There are multiple reasons that a person can have a disorganized life. In some cases a disruptive life event is to blame for disorganization. Events like relocation, a new baby, or even a loss can all affect the organization of one's environment. Other times an emotional or mental disorder is contributing to the disorganization.

Disorganization can also be brought on by something as diminutive as a change in mindset. The studies reviewed above indicate that social disorganization is an important predictor of youth violence and crime, and that social disorganization has its impact on youth violence and crime by affecting a number of mediating processes that facilitate youth violence. The findings also indicate that researchers and practitioners need to consider the linkages between economic deprivation and social disorganization when attempting to explain the genesis of youth violence.

In attempting to attenuate youth violence, a number of policy implications are suggested by social disorganization theory. REFERENCES: http://www. sociologyguide. com/social-pathology/personal-disorganization. php http://books. google. com. pk/books? id= MXpiJWE7m5cC= PA32= PA32= INDIVIDUAL+DISORGANIZATION+in+india=   bl=   mLW-FbCxK5= BGnlleTBCwenAz4t_NtYJykxu5c=   en=   X=   bQJrUZbYLK6P7Ab874HgAw= 0CEMQ6AEwAw#v=   onepage=   INDIVIDUAL%20DISORGANIZATION%20in

%20india= false FAMILY DISORGANIZATION Many marriages don't live up to high expectations, of people and families, so they break down or are violent.

Some believe these are exceptional problems, but feminists believe it's because of male/female inequities. Family is the universal social institution, of all the institutions, it is most multifunctional, inspite of the fact that in some societies many of its previous functions have been partially taken over by other institutions. In many societies, including Pakistani society, the family is still the principal agency for social control and for educational, religious, protective, recreative and other institutional functions.

Family: Sampson (1986) indicates that social disorganization may have an effect on youth violence through its effects on family structures and stability. He suggested that traditional social disorganization variables may influence community crime rates when taking into account the effects of levels of family disruption. This may occur by (1)removing an important set of control structures over youths' behaviour, and (2)creating greater opportunities for criminal victimization (i. e. , through the lack of capable guardianship).

Essentially, Sampson (1986) recognized the relationship of social disorganization theory to control theory and routine activities/lifestyle theory. To test his assertions, Sampson (1986) used three measures of family structure. First, he included a measure of the per cent of residents in a neighbourhood who were ever married and who were either divorced or separated. The second measure of family structure was the per cent of female-headed families. Finally, he included a measure of the per cent of primary or single-headed households.

His analyses revealed that, independent of the traditional social disorganization variables, the family structure variables each had a direct significant effect on community crime rates. Thus, Sampson's work identified an important and additional source of social disorganization (implicit in the work of Shaw and McKay) that had been previously overlooked by empirical studies. McNulty and Bellair (2003) also investigated the importance of family processes within the social disorganization tradition.

This study integrates theory and research in criminology and urbansociologyto specify a contextual model of differences in adolescent violence between whites and five racial-ethnic groups. The model presented views these differences as a function of variation in community contexts, family socioeconomic well-being, and the social capital available to adolescents and families. Data from the NationalEducationLongitudinal Survey (1988 to 1992), which included information on 14, 358 adolescents across 2, 988 US locales, were matched with community-level data from the 1990 US census to test the resulting model.

The white-black disparity in adolescents' fighting is explained by higher levels of disadvantage in the communities in which black children often live. The disadvantage index accounted for the largest reduction in the black effect on fighting, reflecting the well-documented concentration of disadvantage in black communities. Importantly, and in agreement with the importance of family processes for social disorganization theory, the results indicate that the effect of concentrated disadvantage on fighting is mediated by more proximate processes that are linked to family well-being.

Tolan, Gorman-Smith and Henry (2003) employ data from a longitudinal study of 284 African-American and Latino adolescent boys and their caregivers, living in poor urban communities, to test a developmental-ecological model of violence. Six annual waves of data were applied to evaluate the relations between microsystem influences of parenting and peer deviance, macrosystem influences of community structural characteristics and neighbourhood social organization, and individual involvement in violence. Structural equation modelling analyses showed that community structural characteristics significantly predicted neighbourhood social processes.

Importantly, it was found that parenting practices partially mediated the relation between neighbourhood social processes and gang membership. Consistent with the above research that social disorganization may influence the level of youth violence through its effect on family processes, other researchers have found that family processes may be used to mitigate the deleterious effects of social disorganization. Burfeind (1984), for example, examined the role of the family, within a larger social context, as it relates to delinquency.

This study focused on 1, 588 non-black junior and seniorhigh school studentsin the US. Burfeind analyzed the interactive effects of five family dimensions in relation to four other causal variables commonly associated with delinquency involvement: community social disorganization, delinquent friends, attachment to peers, and delinquent definitions. Analysis revealed that family factors influenced delinquency in different ways. The level of an adolescent's attachment to the father was found to be independently related

to delinquent activity after controlling for all other effects (independent and interactive).

Paternal discipline had an interactive effect on delinquency, such that the type of paternal discipline influenced the effect that community social disorganization and the number of delinquent friends had on delinquency. Sampson (1992) has attempted to consolidate the empirical findings that relate social disorganization to family processes and then to delinquency and youth violence. In so doing, he has developed a community-level theory of social disorganization, which places primary emphasis on family management practices and child health and development.

He notes that the embeddedness of families and children in a community context is a central feature of the theory. Prenatal care, child abuseprevention, monitoring and supervision of youth, and other family management practices are intertwined with community networks of social organization. Social disorganization directly and indirectly influences the care of children and other family processes, and ultimately, rates of delinquency and crime FAMILY DISORGANISATION This describes breakdown, due to functional failure and role failure. Causes and effects of disorganization include: Death, disability or serious illness. •Births outside marriage. •Divorce, separation, desertion of living in an empty-shell marriage (partners live together but really all over). •Conflict, including abuse/neglect. •Disruption caused from outside by unemployment, war, imprisonment or persecution. CAUSES OF AN INCREASING DIVORCE RATE •Big increase since sixties. One in three in divorce. reasons include: CONSEQUENCES OF AN INCREASING DIVORCE RATE •More one parent families, cohabiting,

remarriage, step-parents, and reconstituted families, where both married before and both bring children to the new union. Increased welfare dependence. •Disadvantaged children, a subject of debate. •Decline in the importance of family IS THE FAMILY IN DECLINE? Arguments predicting decline: •It failed, oppressive (Leach), encourages violence (Dobash and Dobash), exploits women (Bernard). Supporters of thenuclear familycondemn decline of family values (e. g. Marslands attack on single mothers). •Arguments against decline (by functionalist supporters of the family). •Divorce is because of higher expectations, so people think more of marriage as an institution. Divorce is the failure of individual marriages, not families in general. •Remarriage suggests discontent with a person, not an institution. •Serial monogamy (multiple marriages over a lifetime) and reconstituted family are change in structure, not decline in the family itself. •Other Views • Marxist: Family changes as capitalism develops but continues to reproduce inequality. Feminist: Family changes but continues to exploit women. You need to be able to tell the difference between family and household, reality and ideal, etnhic and other forms of diversity. DEFINING FAMILIES AND HOUSEHOLDS No agreed definition. Common characteristics are: oliving together oeconomic cooperation oreproduction osocialization of children. •A household is a group who live together or share aspects of life eg. eating together. •Nuclear families, are parents and immature children. Murdock argues this this is universal. •Extended families, add kin. •Ideal family, approved model by society. Other types might be frowned upon. Feminists say ideal family been promoted to exploit women. •Attitudes and language change. Lone parent families used to be (disapprovingly) unmarried mothers and children.

DIFFERENT TYPES OF FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD •Includes many one person, childless couples, unmarried with or without children, remarried sometimes with third outside person. •Many live in more than one nuclear family throughout life. Most live in variety of family and household arrangements during their lifetimes. IDEOLOGY OF THE FAMILY Ideology is a set of beliefs that forward a particular group, or their interests. Marxists and feminists referred to the ideology of the family. Increasing the pressure to have a happy family. ETHNIC DIVERSITY

Studies often by outsiders confirming stereotypes. They do vary according to class, religion and individual factors though. Why are there distinctive patterns of family life? Economic influences - History of slavery may have encouraged female-led afro-Caribbean family. Unemployment may have encouraged persisting extended families. Cultural differences - more likely to persist if a group maintains a distinct language and religion. Discriminationand disadvantage -Racismencourages keeping distinct culture. Westwood and Bhachu (1988), say family is a main strength and resistance.