

Theory shaw and mckay's (1942) model has been

[Countries](#), [Canada](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Theory Social Disorganization theory is an important criminological theory developed by Shaw and McKay (1942) from the Chicago school of thought.

In their studies, Shaw and McKay used maps to analyze various locations and juveniles that resided in those particular mapped areas. What Shaw and McKay had come across was that criminal activity was not evenly distributed. However, they found that crime had been in concentrated areas. These concentrated criminal occurrences remained that way despite changes in individuals that lived there. Social Disorganization assumes that depending on the area a person lives in, could potentially influence whether he/she gets involved with criminal behavior. Shaw and McKay's theory shows that there is a link between crime rates and ecological characteristics to a neighborhood (Gaines and Miller, 2011).

Ecological characteristics in this case can be poverty, residential mobility, family disruption, and racial heterogeneity (Gaines and Miller, 2011).

These ecological characteristics can weaken a community, causing a lack of informal social control (Shaw & McKay, 1942). Empirical Evidence Social Disorganization theory, since Shaw and McKay's (1942) model has been further studied. Sampson and Groves (1989) used a sample of 238 people in Great Britain.

Their findings were similar to Shaw and McKay's (1942) in that social disorganization can be tied to criminality. The re-evaluation of Shaw and McKay's (1942) findings showed that variations of communities, as well as, various characteristics, can determine how socially disorganized an area is. More specifically, Sampson and Groves (1989) found that characteristics such

as; low socioeconomic status, mobility, family disruption, and heterogeneity in communities is what led to criminal occurrences. However, Sampson and Groves (1989) were not the only researchers who used Shaw and McKay's (1942) model. Many others have studied the relationship between neighborhood conditions and criminal activity (Austin, Furr, & Spine, 2004; Bursik & Grasmick, 1993; Bursik & Webb, 1982; Pratt & Cullen, 2005; Sampson, 1985). In fact, residential mobility is one characteristic that is shown to affect crime in a neighborhood (Bogges, 2010; Bursik & Webb, 1982; Porter & Vogel, 2014; Smith, 1989).

A study that was conducted by Bursik and Webb (1982) also looked at Shaw and McKay's work. Bursik and Webb (1982) did an analysis over a 30-daytime frame (three ten year intervals). What Bursik and Webb found was it didn't matter who moved in and out of the neighborhood, communities with high levels of residential instability had high levels of delinquency. Along with Bursik and Webb, Porter and Vogel (2014) had done another study on residential mobility. Porter and Vogel (2014) used a sample from two different sources of data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. Their conclusion was also very similar to Bursik and Webb (1982) in the sense that they found residential mobility showed a strong correlation to delinquency. More specifically, Porter and Vogel (2014) found delinquency was 1.

5 times higher than those who were non-mobile adolescents. Porter and Vogel (2014) however, wanted to look further into delinquency and neighborhood characteristics. For example, they looked at characteristics

such as; concentrated disadvantages, any exposure to violence, heterogeneity, and unemployment. After further analysis they found that those who have pre-existing risk factors are considered to be at a bigger disadvantage than those without. Another factor impacting criminal behavior is concentrated disadvantage (Browning & Erickson, 2009; Krivo & Peterson, 1996; Wang & Arnold, 2008). Browning and Erickson (2009) also tested to see if they could find disadvantages in a neighborhood to individual levels of disadvantage in relation to violent victimization. Browning and Erickson (2009) looked at a sample of students from Toronto, Canada. As an example of individual level of disadvantage, Browning and Erickson (2009) found that relationship between alcohol and being victimized varied depending on neighborhood.

However, neighborhood disadvantage, as a whole, was critical when explaining the amount of violent victimization. Similar to Browning and Erickson (2009), Wang and Arnold (2008) also looked at concentrated disadvantages. They hypothesized that concentrated disadvantages, such as, income inequality and poverty, adds a level of stress. Wang and Arnold (2008) looked at urban areas in Chicago. These urban areas showed a lot of concentrated disadvantage with also a high violent crime rate.

More specifically, they found high homicide rates in community areas, as well as, neighborhood clusters (Wang and Arnold, 2008).