ARTICLES

Linking informal social control and restorative justice: moving social disorganization theory beyond community policing

Barbara D. Warner[a]*, Elizabeth Beck[b] and Mary L. Ohmer[b]

[a]Department of Criminal Justice, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, United States;
[b]School of Social Work, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia, United States

Much of what is at the heart of social disorganization theory's approach to neighborhood crime prevention has been ignored in favor of policies that are more closely associated with deterrence and rational choice theories. Specifically, ideas of informal social control and collective efficacy have often been translated into policies of community surveillance and the reporting of suspicious behaviors to the police. While these policies may make neighborhoods less attractive to offenders because they create higher certainty levels of recognition, and subsequently arrest, social disorganization theory, at its heart, suggests crime prevention policies of a very different nature: policies that are more closely associated with restorative justice, re-integrative shaming and peacemaking criminology. These associations are highlighted and provide a conceptual model for a community crime prevention program that is more consistent with the underlying nature of social disorganization theory.

Keywords: social disorganization theory; restorative justice; community crime prevention; informal social control; community programs

Introduction

The revitalization of Shaw and McKay's (1942/1969) social disorganization theory over the last three decades paralleled an increased enthusiasm for building police community partnerships (such as Neighborhood Watch and Community Oriented Policing) to prevent and control crime. A theoretical basis for building police community partnerships could be found in social disorganization theory and a ready made policy could be demonstrated to be consistent with the newly re-emerging theory. Such connections, however, have overshadowed the humanistic philosophy underlying social disorganization theory and thereby hindered the development of programs more consistent with the theory.

The Community Action Programs which originally developed out of social disorganization theory were not programs that focused on increasing residential reporting of crimes to the police. Indeed they encouraged the community to develop their own solutions to problems and were based primarily on providing social support. As Cullen (1994) has argued, much of the current research on informal social control may be confounded with the effects of social support. Specifically, Cullen suggests (p. 528), "we are missing something important when we reduce these theorists' perspectives to the sterile interplay of the concepts of disorganization, control, and

---

cultural values. The underlying humanity of [Shaw and McKay's] criminology and (I believe) their insights on the importance of social support are overlooked".

Examination of early documentation from McKay's Community Action Programs draws attention to the inconsistencies between the theory's authors' original ideas and current policies associated with the theory. The original ideas of Shaw and McKay appear to be much more consistent with current work in restorative justice, community justice and peacemaking criminology.

Social disorganization and current community crime prevention policies

The revitalization of social disorganization theory in the late twentieth century centered on the concept of informal social control. Informal social control, while central to Shaw and McKay's original version of the theory, had previously not been well operationalized or measured. Work by Greenberg, Rohe and Williams (1982), Kornhauser (1978), Bursik (1988) and Sampson and Groves (1989) began to further develop and operationalize this central theoretical concept, and placed it within a clear causal model.

Social disorganization theory argues that neighborhood structural factors, such as concentrated disadvantage and residential mobility, create a deficit of social capital that inhibits the creation of informal social control. Communities that are disadvantaged and have high levels of residential mobility provide a weaker context for the transmission of informal sanctions, or social control that is derived from the community itself (see e.g. Bursik & Grasmick, 1993; Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). While the forms of social capital needed to provide informal social control differ somewhat between the systemic and collective efficacy formulations of social disorganization theory (in particular, social ties or friendship networks are emphasized in the systemic model while social cohesion, trust and a willingness to intervene are emphasized in the collective efficacy model), both models emphasize the importance of informal social control (Bellair, 1997; Bursik & Grasmick, 1993; Sampson & Groves, 1989; Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997; Warner, 2003; Warner & Wilcox Rountree, 1997).

Within social disorganization theory, informal social control has been conceptualized predominantly in two ways – as informal surveillance (i.e. guardianship) and direct intervention.[1] Informal surveillance refers to "the casual but active observation of neighborhood streets that is engaged in by individuals during the course of daily activities. It includes recognizing and paying careful attention to strangers in the neighborhood and keeping an eye on neighbors' homes and property" (Greenberg et al., 1982, p. 9). Informal surveillance presumably increases the likelihood that formal authorities will be contacted in the event of deviant behavior and that residents will be able to identify wrong-doers once formal authorities are involved.

Direct intervention, on the other hand, involves residents themselves, addressing both strangers and residents in their neighborhood about inappropriate or suspicious behaviors. Greenberg et al. (1982, p. 10) suggest that direct informal social control "should be particularly effective in conveying an image of a cohesive and well regulated neighborhood" and should help to "establish social norms for the area".

The idea of social control as direct intervention is rooted in writings on social control in the early 1900s. At that time, social control was viewed as developing "the capacity of a social organization to regulate itself" (Janowitz, 1975, p. 84). Indeed, social control was often thought of as the opposite of coercive control. Many early

discussions of social control did not view social control as coercive. Rather, as Meier (1982, p. 40) points out, "social control and coercive control were seen as antithetical; social control was thought to consist of a set of legitimate moral principles that rendered coercive control unnecessary. As such, social control did not force compliance, but used persuasion by remnants of the primary group in the city." Janowitz (1975, p. 84) differentiates coercive control from social control in stating that coercive control "rests predominantly and essentially on force – the threat and use of force".

While results from research in the last 20 years have generally supported the idea that neighborhoods with perceived higher levels of informal social control have lower levels of crime (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997; Morenoff, Sampson, & Raudenbush, 2001; Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999), there has been little distinction between these different forms of informal social control – guardianship and direct intervention (for an exception, see Warner 2007). This lack of distinction has led to a myopic emphasis on community police partnerships that emphasize guardianship, and are more consistent with deterrence and rational choice theories.

Indeed, community responses that involve a heavy reliance on the police have been criticized for their potential to lead to an atrophying of a community's capacity to address their own problems (Bazemore, 2001; Christie, 1977; Clear & Karp, 1999). For example, Clear and Karp (1999, p. 38) suggest,

> when agents of the state become the key problem solvers, they might be filling a void in community; but just as in interpersonal relationships, so in community functioning, once a function is being performed by one party it becomes unnecessary for another to take it on … Parents expect police or schools to control their children; neighbors expect police to prevent late night noise from people on their street; and citizens expect the courts to resolve disputes … Informal control systems may atrophy like dormant muscles, and citizens may come to see the formal system as existing to mediate all conflicts.

In contrast to a reliance on formal authorities, current reform and critical movements in criminal justice – including restorative justice, peacemaking criminology, and anarchist criminology – focus on building communities that foster cooperative solutions to crime and justice problems, and a willingness between parties for negotiation. We suggest that there are connections between these perspectives and social disorganization theory, and that in constructing these connections, implications for policy are developed that are quite different from the current criminal justice policies that have evolved out of social disorganization theory.

Most of the current policies and programs that have been directed at developing informal social control have focused solely on community residents increasing their vigilance and being the "eyes and ears of the police". Indeed most textbooks that relate social disorganization theory to a policy relate it to policies such as Neighborhood Watch, Weed and Seed, Order Maintenance Policing or Community Policing (see for example, Adler, Mueller & Laufer, 2007; Schmalleger, 2009; Vito, Maahs & Holmes, 2007). While this type of guardianship is undoubtedly important, particularly with regard to violent crimes, it has been argued to be difficult to successfully implement in communities where there is little faith in the police (Rosenbaum, 1987) or little desire on the community's part for maintaining this type of social control (Grinc, 1994). Surveillance that relies ultimately on the police is also not practical for nuisance and other inappropriate behaviors that, while not illegal, may eventually lead to more serious confrontations among neighbors. Finally, as Christie (1977) and others (see, for example, Clear, Rose, Waring, & Scully, 2003; Lynch & Sabol, 2001)

have suggested, the use of the police or criminal justice system to address community problems may ultimately weaken the community. Christie (1977) has argued that, when communities turn their problems over to criminal justice agencies, they lose opportunities for community interaction, participation and norm clarification. Similarly, DeLeon-Granados (1999, p. 7) argues that, "Official crime prevention can swallow up informal community-based responses, can alienate segments of the population, and can chew up police resources by focusing on arrest instead of strategies that can potentially stabilize a community's social ecology".

The other side of social disorganization theory

While social control within the social disorganization perspective has focused on the control or prevention of deviant behavior, and hence is normative, and consistent with the use of the term by most sociologists since the 1950s, it has clearly not been focused solely, or even predominantly, on control brought about by formal authorities. Indeed, social disorganization theory views both divergent (or weakened conventional) value systems (Kornhauser, 1978; Shaw & McKay, 1942/1969; Warner, 2003) and weakened indigenous institutions, such as the family, community clubs, religious and school groups, as leading to decreased informal social control within those neighborhoods. Consequently, programs developed by Shaw, based on his and McKay's theory, focused on strengthening both normative values and weakened indigenous institutions, and not on increasing the use of formal social control.

Based on archival records of the first, and perhaps most successful, of the Chicago Area Projects (CAPs; i.e. the Russell Square Area Project) Schlossman and Sedlak (1983) provide a systematic study of Shaw's program in its early years. These records give great insight into the philosophy behind social disorganization theory and the types of programs the developers of the theory thought were needed. It is clear from these archives presented by Schlossman and Sedlak (1983) that the purpose of the various programs implemented in the CAP was to strengthen community norms through increased community interaction, thereby allowing residents to develop a sense of efficacy in creating solutions to community problems. As Schlossman and Sedlack (1983, p. 428) point out, Shaw viewed the CAPs as "a conceptual framework meant to encourage and facilitate indigenous social invention".

From the specifics of the program it can be seen that the focus was to create, among community members, a sense of shared values and an expectation for community members to uphold those values. The CAP in Russell Square was administered by the Russell Square Community Committee (RSCC), made up of local residents. According to Schlossman and Sedlak (1983, pp. 419–420) the RSCC's

> chief role and goal was to upbuild a new sense of potency among law-abiding residents to transform their neighborhood so it would no longer tolerate conditions that fostered juvenile crime … It sought not only to eliminate 'the attitudes of indifference,' but to create 'a single standard of behavior expectation among the adults and children'.

However, importantly, the means through which this was to be achieved was one of social support and tolerance. For example, one of the CAPs concerted efforts at delinquency prevention involved the use of "curbstone counseling". Quoting from the archives, Schlossman and Sedlak (1983, p. 429) describe curbstone counseling as:

Sometimes the most important thing to an individual is just to sit on a curbstone and talk to someone he can trust. It's hard to explain, but I guess the biggest thing we do is to make ourselves available for whatever help a youngster would expect of a close friend. And if we can't be that friend to him, we'll try to find someone who can … CAP [Chicago Area Project] staff and volunteers served as concerned, knowledgeable older brothers and close friends to children who were already in trouble with the law, or who were committing delinquent acts that would invariably lead them into legal difficulties. Curbstone counselors were, ideally, young adults from Russell Square with whom delinquent youth could identify relatively easily … Curbstone counselors advised boys on appropriate language and manners, tried to dissuade them from serious criminal behavior, suggested alternative courses of action that would prove equally stimulating and rewarding in the long run, stood by them when they got into trouble, and, above all, tried to be with them as much as possible. They served as both model and translator of conventional social values with which youth from the Bush had had little previous contact or awareness.

It is also noteworthy that the approach to delinquency was not one of turning problems over to the criminal justice system or other authorities. Indeed it was the opposite. As Schlossman and Sedlak (1983) point out, the RSCC tried to keep the police and other criminal justice agencies away from the delinquent youth.

By interceding with officials in schools, police stations, and juvenile courts, CAP staff and volunteers attempted both to humanize the operation of educational and social control institutions and to convince those institutions that the community (i.e. the Russell Square Community Committee) possessed the will and ability to rehabilitate juvenile delinquents without the need for official, punitive intervention. The Area Project was aggressively against institutional treatment and in favor of community treatment in cases of juvenile misconduct and crime. (Schlossman & Sedlak, 1983, p. 439).

In looking at the specifics of the CAP, it is clear that Shaw viewed delinquency prevention as a project for the community, and developed programs to enhance the community's ability to exercise informal social control. The CAP used activities such as recreational programs to "facilitate adult involvement in the day-to-day social activities of the youth and thereby, gradually, to build up a sense of neighborhood responsibility for monitoring youth conduct" (Schlossman & Sedlak, 1983, p. 403). Shaw used street workers and indigenous supervisors for youth activities who were tolerant, yet provided a role model for more conventional behavior. "The supervisors were not present to discipline the boys … since the Area Project workers believed that 'disciplinary problems are dispelled by the supervisors playing with rather than supervising the boys'" (Schlossman & Sedlak, 1983, pp. 416–417). "CAP workers tried to persuade local youth – in a low-keyed, tolerant, nonabusive manner – why it was both morally right and, ultimately, in their best interest to conform to the values and expectations of conventional society" (Schlossman & Sedlak, 1983, p. 428).

This humanistic philosophy at the heart of social disorganization theory has also been recognized by Cullen. Cullen (1994, p. 528) noted that, in re-reading the social disorganization literature for his Presidential Address to the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences in Chicago, "The underlying humanity of [the Chicago school] criminology and (I believe) their insights on the importance of social support are overlooked". Cullen (1994) argues that much of the writing of the early Chicago school underlined the neglect and lack of social support for youth, and that early policy prescriptions developed out of those writings therefore emphasized support, rather than punishment. Quoting from Lin (1986), Cullen (1994, p. 530) defines social support as "the perceived or actual instrumental and/or expressive provisions supplied by the community, social networks, and confiding partners".

For Shaw, the purpose of the CAP was to "build solidarity and unity of sentiments among the people by encouraging them and aiding them to work together toward common objectives" (Shaw & McKay, 1942/1969, p. 323). More recently, De-Leon Granados (1999) also argued for the need to strengthen community life rather than relying on the criminal justice system. He suggests that it is the common life more than the law that provides for resources that benefit us and for social sanctions that control us. "Because crime-control policies do not exploit exchange, communication, dialogue, feedback, and connections, those policies fail to establish shared public-behavior values" (De-Leon Granados, 1999, p. 153).

While community programs that have focused on police–community partnerships have become increasingly popular over the last 30 years, these programs do not reflect the heart of social disorganization theory. Social disorganization theory is built on the premise that neighbors can, and should, directly intervene in inappropriate neighborhood behavior, thereby clarifying and enforcing community norms, and strengthening the neighborhood against more serious criminal behavior. Moreover, they should do so in a manner that is ultimately supportive of all community members. Therefore, we argue that policies that are truly reflective of social disorganization theory would translate these ideas back to the community in terms of community based programs for crime prevention.

Developing social organization

Using social disorganization theory as the basis, but also drawing from restorative justice, peacemaking criminology and traditional community organizing strategies, we outline an educational and skill development program that we believe would be reflective of the underlying humanistic nature of social disorganization theory. Such a program could be taught to community residents by "master trainers" in indigenous community organizations. Based on the concepts of social disorganization theory and the early CAPs program discussed above, we identify three essential elements of such a program.

First, it is crucial for residents to have a sense of shared values/norms and be provided with mechanisms for strengthening these values. We discuss strategies to help residents identify and establish community norms that are supportive of prosocial behavior and mutual trust, which are crucial for the development of informal social control. Second, it is important for residents to expect widely held norms to be upheld and to learn how to directly intervene in a respectful and supportive manner when norms are not upheld. Borrowing from restorative justice and peacemaking criminology, we discuss why respectful, noncoercive intervention is fundamental to developing social cohesion and informal social control, and outline several strategies that could be used for incorporating these concepts into a community education program. Third, we believe that, in order for residents to intervene effectively in this manner, social networks that develop understanding of others and promote belongingness in the community must be developed. We outline several community organizing strategies that can be incorporated into community programs to build trusting and supportive relationships among residents.

Helping residents identify and establish community norms and values

For informal social control to have a positive effect on neighborhoods and their crime levels, there must be a substantial agreement regarding norms and values. The norms

and values supported by the neighborhood must encourage prosocial behavior, and be prevalent to the degree that residents can build mutual trust and be willing to intervene for the common good. Yet the development of norms that support both prosocial behavior and mutual trust may carry obstacles in low-income communities.

Questions regarding the type of norms found in low-income environments have often been raised. For example, norms that are widely held may not always be visible, and visible norms may not reflect widely held values. Wilson (1996) suggests that, although disadvantaged groups may hold middle class values, they may not be able to live them out in all instances, given the eroding nature of the pervasive problems associated with poverty (see also Warner, 2003). Similarly, Anderson (1999) has pointed out that children may take on the norms of "street behavior" even if they do not agree with them, "in order to get by". Thus, what is valued in a community may be difficult to observe directly. Therefore, it is important that participants are given the opportunity to explore these issues. Residents need to be able to identify norms and values within their community, and then explore the extent to which these norms and values are widely held. It is important that participants do not try to intervene in widely accepted behaviors, even when they themselves may feel those behaviors are inappropriate. Informal social control must be sensitive to the context in which residents live and must be geared toward behaviors that a substantial number of residents view as problematic.

The first step in exploring norms is to present a summary of the academic findings regarding norms and values and their role in building strong communities. In addition to hearing academic findings, residents need to internalize the significance of norms in their neighborhood. One way in which this internalization can occur is through using strategies found in popular education. In his explanation of popular education Reardon (2001, p. 1) explains "Social change begins with individuals reflecting on their values, their concern for a more equitable society, and their willingness to support others in the community". When engaging in popular education, the experiences of individuals are analyzed to explore larger phenomena (Horton et al., 1990). In the current context, program leaders would ask participants to respond to a series of questions about norms. These questions might include defining norms in the context of their own lives, as well as describing circumstances in which they have violated norms, and times when a harmful or uncomfortable consequence resulted from norm violation. From this "story telling", the trainer would work with the participants to understand the relevance of norms.

Next participants might be asked to talk with a wide spectrum of residents about what they believe the norms are within the neighborhood. This interaction would allow residents to begin to understand the neighborhood norms as others see them, and begin a process in which non-normative behavior is defined through communication and interaction among group members. As ethnomethodologists have pointed out (see, for example, Garfinkel, 1967), social order is created through social interactions in which individuals persuade others to share their understanding of what is taking place.

Facilitating residents' ability to intervene in a respectful and supportive manner

Once residents have a sense of shared norms/values, they must view themselves as having a responsibility for enforcing those norms/values and providing a safe neighborhood. As Clear and Karp (1999, p. 32) point out,

> [I]t is assumed that citizens in a democracy must actively work toward the welfare of the whole society and not just look out for themselves. Thus, citizens are morally obligated to fulfill whatever tasks are necessary to sustain a good society. Failures in public safety are at least partially the result of citizens' shared assumption that the responsibility for public safety belongs entirely to the criminal justice system.

While academics are aware of the importance of community residents providing informal social control, this information is often not translated back to their communities. Residents are often not educated about their responsibility for providing informal social control, the benefits to be potentially reaped from it or the form of informal social control in which they should engage.

Residents should be educated about the importance of informal social control and provided with the skills to intervene in inappropriate behavior that are nonthreatening and nonconflict-generating. Relying on work by Bazemore (2001), Braithwaite (1989), Braswell (1990), Pepinsky and Quinney (1991), Sullivan and Tift (2005) and others, we suggest that communities should foster values that encourage helping others and recognizing moral obligations to others, rather than isolating and stigmatizing others. Specifically, residents should be taught how to intervene in respectful, noncoercive ways when faced with inappropriate neighborhood behavior. This approach is based first on Braithwaite's (1989) theoretical work on re-integrative shaming. While shaming, or disapproval, is important for social control, shaming should not be disintegrative, i.e. stigmatizing, or isolating. Rather disapproval should be followed by reintegrative gestures. This approach to intervening is also found in peacemaking criminology and restorative justice. Respect, central to both peacemaking criminology and restorative justice, is key to this approach. As Howard Zehr (2002, p. 26) stated, "Respect for all, even those who are different from us, even those who seem to be our enemies. Respect reminds us of our interconnectedness but also of our differences. Respect insists that we balance concern for all parties".

We argue that modeling respect, educating community members about the importance of intervening, providing them with skills to develop noncoercive intervention and allowing them to practice these skills is an important strategy for developing effective community social organization. Because transgressions of norms undergird so many conflicts within communities, it is important that neighbors know how to intervene when simple norms are not supported. Participants should explore ways in which they can address transgressions in a respectful manner. In order to do such it is important that respectful interactions are modeled during the training session, and that participants learn skills such as reflective listening, re-framing, nonviolent communication and balancing negative statements with positive statements, to promote such interactions.

Without appropriate community resources, residents will probably not engage in formal restorative justice practices. However, it is important that they understand some of the goals and practices associated with restorative justice so that they integrate these ideas into their interactions with neighbors. Restorative justice seeks to repair harm, and in nonviolent cases, that often means that the offender takes responsibility for her/his actions and makes restitution, and in return s/he is reintegrated into the community (Braithwaite, 1989; Zehr, 2002). Braithwaite (1989) describes this process as reintergrative shaming. For reintegrative shaming to occur the victim/community member describes how the offender's actions made her/him feel. Specifically, the victim/community member identifies that a norm or value system has been transgressed, explores her/his concerns and feelings regarding the transgression, and

often tells her/his own story within the circle process (see Pranis, 2005, for a discussion of circles). Abrahamson and Moore (2002) suggest that at some point in the circle there is a moment of shared vulnerability, which creates the context for reintegration and in some cases forgiveness. While a formal process such as this will not be played out when neighbors speak with each other about loud music, parking, trash or the behavior of their pets or children, the tenets of storytelling, accountability and forgiveness can support an instructive interaction. Writing within the peacemaking paradigm, Cordella (1991, p. 30) reminds us that the goal of restoration, which can be a goal for nonviolent interaction, "is inclusion rather than exclusion, re-admittance rather than isolation, reinterpretation rather than adjudication".

Building social ties and social support

Contemporary research based on social disorganization theory has found mixed support for the role of social ties in producing effects on a general measure of informal social control. However, a general measure of informal social control includes the likelihood of residents contacting authorities as well as directly intervening (see for example, Sampson et al., 1997; Elliott et al., 1996; Warner & Wilcox Rountree 1997; see also Warner, 2007). Indeed, while it is likely that social ties are irrelevant to someone anonymously calling the police about inappropriate neighborhood behavior (see Carr, 2003), social relationships based on caring and mutuality may be more important for the type of direct intervention discussed here (Warner, 2007).

Both restorative justice and community justice models rely heavily on interpersonal interaction and the empathy with others that develops out of those interactions. For example, Clear and Karp (1999, p. 69) argue that, "strengthening social ties" is one of three community ideals that are critical in developing community justice. The purpose of such ties is to create a greater understanding of, and caring for, others in the neighborhood, especially others that are different, as well as to create a sense of belongingness to the community. Residents who feel they are part of the neighborhood will be more sensitive to informal social control efforts by neighbors and will also be more motivated to work for the improvement of the community by providing informal social control. Braithwaite (1989) also points out that sustained personal interaction among residents is crucial for the development of mutuality and trust. Likewise, as Sullivan and Tifft (2005, p. 391) note, "Restorative justice is indeed a process of 'talking things out,' of increasing an awareness of self and others". Therefore, it is in the sense of learning about others and their needs that we include the importance of social ties.

As Putnam (2000, pp. 288–289) has pointed out while discussing the importance of social capital, social ties provide us with an

> awareness of the many ways in which our fates are linked. People who have active and trusting connections to others – whether family members, friends, or fellow bowlers – develop or maintain character traits that are good for the rest of society. Joiners become more tolerant, less cynical, and more empathetic to the misfortunes of others. When people lack connections to others, they are unable to test the veracity of their own views, whether in the give-and-take of casual conversation or in more formal deliberation. Without such an opportunity, people are more likely to be swayed by their worst impulses.

Social ties can be among residents within the community as well as between community residents and outside organizations. Social ties among residents within the

community are central to building what Putnam (2000) refers to as bonding social capital. Bonding social capital encompasses the notion of dense social networks among small groups of people that bring them closer together. It accumulates in the daily lives of families and individuals living in communities through the course of informal interactions and includes social networks, trust, norms and values. It is these interactions and their resultant capital that support residents' willingness to directly intervene in inappropriate neighborhood behaviors.

Alternatively, social ties between neighborhood residents and both individuals and organizations outside of the neighborhood are central to Putman's (2000) notion of bridging social capital. Bridging social capital refers to more loosely connected networks of large numbers of individuals typically linked through indirect ties. Where bonding social capital is "inward looking", so that residents bond with each other, bridging social capital is "outward looking" (Putnam, 2000). It connects neighborhoods and people to others, across diverse social groups and/or localities. Bridging social capital includes connections to institutions and organizations that may facilitate access to needed resources for community initiated solutions to problems.

Traditional community organizing strategies for building social capital (Beck & Eichler, 2000; Chaskin, Brown, Venkatesh, & Vidal, 2001; Eichler, 2007; Gittell & Vidal, 1998; Ohmer & Beck, 2006; Ohmer & DeMasi, 2008; Rothman, 1995; Smock, 2004) are important tools that can support the development of social ties among neighbors. Traditional community organizing approaches to working with communities include strategies for supporting social ties through the development of bonding social capital by understanding what residents care about and building relationships among residents based on mutual interests, values, and concerns (Beck & Eichler, 2000; Chaskin et al., 2001; Eichler, 2007; Gittell & Vidal, 1998; Ohmer & DeMasi, 2008; Smock, 2004).

One of the primary community organizing methods for strengthening bonding social capital includes facilitating effective one-on-one relationship-building skills among residents. It is critical that a community program focused on developing informal social control include exercises that both provide skills and motivation for residents to find ways to meet and have discussions with other residents, particularly residents with whom no previous relationship has been established. This interaction allows residents to begin to meet and develop an understanding of their neighbors.

Additionally, a community education program should facilitate effective skills among participants, including the ability to actively listen, empathize and/or sympathize with people about the issues they care about, and show genuine respect (Ohmer & DeMasi, 2008). Role plays and field exercises should be used to build residents' skills in these areas. For example, these exercises could focus on how to approach other residents (e.g. at the grocery store, while taking a walk, etc.) and have a conversation about neighborhood strengths, weaknesses, norms and/or issues that concern them. Through these experiences and class discussions of these experiences, residents can develop both direct and vicarious experiences of success, and begin to form support for developing more extensive social networks.

It is also important that youth are considered as significant members of the neighborhood, and that they are included in the development of bonding social capital. Informal social control is most likely to be successful when positive relationships have already been established between adults and youth. Therefore, adult residents should be encouraged to have positive interactions with neighborhood youth. The

Panel on High-Risk Youth (1993, p. 213) stated that, "Perhaps the most serious risk facing adolescents in high risk settings is isolation from the nurturance, safety, and guidance that comes from sustained relationships with adults". Studies have shown that young people are often protected from harm when they have strong connections to their families, schools, and communities (Wilson, 2005). Several studies have shown that a combination of support and control has been found to reduce crime and delinquency (Sampson, Morenoff, & Earls, 1999; Wright & Cullen, 2001).

In order to support positive interactions, it is important that youth view adults as caring about them. Adults need to be able to see youth as resources and agents of change instead of problems to be addressed or prevented (Hughes & Curnan, 2005). Programs should build trusting relationships with youth based on what youth care about, and also engage youth in violence prevention programs (see Hughes & Curnan, 2005; and Eichler, 2007). Ideally, young people would be engaged in community education programs working alongside adults in building relationships with other residents, understanding and negotiating community norms and issues, and developing strategies for indirectly and directly intervening in problem neighborhood behaviors.

Strategies for developing bonding social capital (e.g. social ties, trust, norms) to facilitate residents' ability to directly intervene in problem neighborhood behaviors go beyond traditional community policing programs in several important ways. While developing acquaintanceships among neighbors has been an important aspect of some community policing programs, their purpose has been one of basically knowing who your neighbors are so that strangers can be identified. The purpose of developing social ties from a norm enforcement point of view, however, is different. In this case it is important not only to know who one's neighbors are, but also to develop positive interactions with them, including the neighborhood youth. These networks are important in that they provide an avenue to positively reinforce norms as well as developing a common understanding of what the community norms are. It is through a foundation of positive interactions that direct intervention can later be effectively used. That is, socializing residents are more likely to be effective when the "offender" knows that the "intervener" is someone who, at heart, cares about them. This is also supportive in shifting in orientation from identifying "offenders" to facilitating bonding social capital.

We also believe that community programs should go beyond traditional community policing programs by facilitating bridging social capital based on mutual interests of residents and external organizations, such as the police. Using a method of organizing called consensus organizing, dense, personal relationships are developed among residents and other community stakeholders and between residents and members of the power structure based on mutual self-interest (Gittell & Vidal, 1998). Bridges between low-income communities and the external power structure are intended to go beyond providing charitable contributions and other types of investment to include technical and political support for low-income communities. The goal of consensus organizing is to develop and knit together the interests of the "wealthy and the poor, the powerful and the powerless, the policy maker and the consumer" (Beck & Eichler, 2000, p. 93).

Consensus organizers build partnerships with external players and community residents by breaking down low expectations and negative stereotypes that external players may have of low-income neighborhoods, while at the same time breaking down the negative images that low-income residents may have of people in power

(Haskin & Lloyd, 1994). It is important for community programs to position leaders of the external power structure to make contributions to solve community problems that are in line with their self-interest and recognize the value that strong community development adds to their self-interest and the interests of the community. By tying the self-interest of external players to their values as civic leaders, and by linking them with similarly motivated community leaders, true working partnerships can develop to solve neighborhood problems.

The deeper and wider the partnership among residents and external players, the greater the capacity for community change. The development of social ties and capital among community residents and between the residents and external partners increases residents' confidence and ability to intervene in both direct and indirect ways in problem neighborhood behaviors. As part of a training program relationships among residents and external leaders would be built by including external players in the program, inviting them to meet with and educate residents about their programs, as well as listening to what residents care about. In addition, participants can be encouraged to conduct their own research and interview external resource players they feel are important to their community, but with whom they do not currently have relationships.

These experiences can then be drawn upon by the group to develop potential strategies for addressing community problems. Through planning, negotiating and developing their own strategies, relationships are strengthened among participants, and between participants and external players. We believe that the capacity of communities to successfully intervene in problem neighborhood behaviors increases when both bonding and bridging social capital are developed and strengthened. In a broad definition of restorative justice a number of theorists, including Sullivan and Tift (2005), and Beck, Britto and Andrews (2007), suggest that restorative justice includes the development of social capital in neighborhoods so that residents are provided with the support systems that they need to be constructive citizens.

Conclusion

While social disorganization theory has had a major impact on our understanding of the community context of crime and crime prevention, the types of community programs that have generally been implemented have not been entirely consistent with the ideas at the heart of the theory. A closer examination of the philosophical underpinnings of social disorganization theory provides policy implications that are more in line with current discussions of restorative justice and peacemaking criminology. Such policies would provide for programs to educate community residents about shared responsibility for creating safe neighborhoods and create education programs that (1) help residents identify and establish community norms that support prosocial behavior and mutual trust; (2) facilitate residents' abilities to intervene in inappropriate neighborhood behavior in a respectful, supportive manner using the principles of restorative justice; and (3) develop social capital among residents using community organizing strategies.

Finally, although such a program would be consistent with social disorganization theory as discussed here, the effectiveness of community programs based on these ideas would require careful evaluation, both in terms of process and outcome. Not until programs consistent with the underlying philosophy of social disorganization are developed can the theory be effectively evaluated.

Note

1. Greenberg et al. (1982) suggest that there are actually three ways, with the third being movement-governing rules.

References

Abrahamson, L., & Moore, D. (2002). The psychology of community conferencing. In J. Perry (Ed.), *Restorative justice: Repairing communities through restorative justice* (pp. 123–141). Lanham, MA: American Correctional Association.

Adler, F., Mueller, G.O.W., & Laufer, W.S. (2007). *Criminology* (6th edn). New York: McGraw Hill.

Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city.* New York: Norton.

Bazemore, G. (2001). Young people, trouble, and crime: Restorative justice as a normative theory of informal social control and social support. *Youth and Society, 33*, 199–226.

Beck, E.L., & Eichler, M. (2000). Consensus organizing: A practice model for community building. *Journal of Community Practice, 8*, 87–102.

Beck, E., Britto, S., & Andrews, A. (2007). *In the shadow of death: Restorative justice and death row families.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bellair, P.E. (1997). Social interaction and community crime: Examining the importance of neighbor networks. *Criminology, 35*, 677–703.

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braswell, M.C. (1990). Peacemaking: A missing link in criminology. *The Criminologist, 15* (May–June), 1–5.

Bursik, R.J., Jr (1988). Social disorganization and theories of crime and delinquency: Problems and prospects. *Criminology, 26*, 519–551.

Bursik, R.J., Jr, & Grasmick, H. (1993). *Neighborhoods and crime: The dimensions of effective community control.* New York: Lexington Books.

Carr, P.J. (2003). The new parochialism: The implications of the Beltway case for arguments concerning informal social control. *American Journal of Sociology, 108*, 1249–1291.

Chaskin, R.J., Brown, P., Venkatesh, S., & Vidal, A. (2001) *Building community capacity.* New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Christie, N. (1977). Conflicts as property. *The British Journal of Criminology, 17*, 1–15.

Clear, T.R., & Karp, D.R. (1999). *The community justice ideal.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Clear, T.R., Rose, D.R., Waring, E., & Scully, K. (2003). Coercive mobility and crime: A preliminary examination of concentrated incarceration and social disorganization. *Justice Quarterly, 20*, 33–63.

Cordella, J.P. (1991). Reconciliation and the mutualist model of a community. In H.E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 30–46). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Cullen, F.T. (1994). Social support as an organizing concept for criminology: Presidential Address to the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. *Justice Quarterly, 11*, 527–559.

DeLeon-Granados, W. (1999). *Travels through crime and place: Community building as crime control.* Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Eichler, M. (2007). *Consensus organizing: Building communities of mutual self-interest.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Elliott, D.S., Wilson, W.J., Huizinga, D., Sampson, R.J., Elliott, A., & Rankin, B. (1996). The effects of neighborhood disadvantage on adolescent development. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 33*, 389–426.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gittell, R., & Vidal, A. (1998). *Community organizing: Building social capital as a development strategy.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Greenberg, S.W., Rohe, W.M., & Williams, J.R. (1982). *Safe and secure neighborhoods: Physical characteristics and informal territorial control in high and low crime neighborhoods.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice.

Grinc, R.M. (1994). "Angels in marble": Problems in stimulating community involvement in community policing. *Crime & Delinquency, 40*, 437–468.

Haskin, K., & Lloyd, S. (1994). *The collaboration project: A conversation about consensus organizing.* Chicago, IL: The John D. and Catherine T. Mac Arthur Foundation.

Horton, M., Freire, P., Bell, B., Gaventa, J., & Peters, J.M. (1990). *We make the world by walking: Conversations on education and social change.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Hughes, D.M., & Curnan, S.P. (2005). Youth engagement makes a difference in addressing community violence. *Community Youth Development Journal, 4,* 7–10.

Janowitz, M. (1975). Sociological theory and social control. *The American Journal of Sociology, 81,* 82–108.

Kornhauser, R.R. (1978). *Social sources of delinquency: An appraisal of analytic models.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lin, N. (1986). Conceptualizing social support. In N. Lin, A. Dean, & W. Edsel (Eds.), *Social support, life events, and depression* (pp. 17–30). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Lynch, J.P., & Sabol, W.J. (2001). *Crime, coercion, and communities: The effects of arrest and incarceration policies on informal social control in neighborhoods* (Final report). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Meier, R.F. (1982). Perspectives on the concept of social control. In R.N. Turner & J.F. Short, Jr (Eds.), *Annual review of sociology* (pp. 35–65). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Morenoff, J.D., Sampson, R.J., & Raudenbush, S.W. (2001). Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of urban violence. *Criminology, 39,* 517–560.

Ohmer, M., & Beck, E. (2006). Citizen participation in neighborhood organizations in poor communities and its relationship to neighborhood and organizational collective efficacy. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 33,* 179–202.

Ohmer, M., & DeMasi, K. (2008). *Consensus organizing: A community development workbook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Panel on High Risk Youth (1993). *Losing generations: Adolescents in high-risk settings.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Pepinsky, H.E., & Quinney, R. (1991). *Criminology as peace-making.* Bloomigton, IN: Indiana University Press.

Pranis, K. (2005). *The little book of circle processes: A new/old approach to peacemaking.* Intercourse, PA: Good Books

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Reardon, P. (2001). *Paulo Freire and popular education.* About.com. Retrieved from http://adulted.about.com/cs/learningtheory/a/pop_education.htm

Rosenbaum, D.P. (1987). The theory and research behind neighborhood watch: Is it a sound fear and crime reduction strategy? *Crime & Delinquency 33,* 103–134.

Rothman, J., (1995). Approaches to community intervention. In J. Rothman, J. Erlich, & J. Tropman (Eds.), *Strategies of community intervention: Macro practice* (5th edn, pp. 27–64). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers.

Sampson, R.J., & Groves, W.B. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology, 94,* 774–802.

Sampson, R.J., & Raudenbush, S.W. (1999). Systematic social observation of public spaces: A new look at disorder in urban neighborhoods. *American Journal of Sociology 105,* 603–651.

Sampson, R.J., Morenoff, J.D., & Earls, F. (1999). Beyond social capital: Spatial dynamics of collective efficacy for children. *American Sociological Review, 64,* 633–660.

Sampson, R.J., Raudenbush, S.W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science, 277,* 918–924.

Schlossman, S., & Sedlak, M. (1983). The Chicago Area Project revisited. *Crime and Delinquency, 29,* 398–462.

Schmalleger, F. (2009). *Criminology today: An integrative introduction,* 5th edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Shaw, C.R., & McKay, H. (1942/1969). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Smock, K. (2004). *Democracy in action: Community organizing and urban change.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Sullivan, D., & Tift, L. (2004). What are the implications of restorative justice for society and our lives? In H. Zehr and B. Toews (Eds.), *Critical issues in restorative justice* (pp. 391–404). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Sullivan, D., & Tift, L. (2005). *Restorative justice: Healing the foundations of our everyday lives* (2nd edn). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Vito, G.F., Maahs, J.R, & Holmes, R.M. (2007). *Criminology: Theory, research and policy.* Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.

Warner, B.D. (2003). The role of attenuated culture in social disorganization theory. *Criminology, 41*, 73–97.

Warner, B.D. (2007). Directly intervene or call the authorities? A study of forms of neighborhood social control within a social disorganization framework. *Criminology, 45,* 99–129.

Warner, B.D., & Wilcox Rountree, P. (1997). Examining informal social ties in a community and crime model: Questioning the systemic nature of informal social control. *Social Problems, 44*, 520–536.

Wilson, W.J. (1996). *When work disappears : The world of the new urban poor.* New York: Vintage Books.

Wright, J.P., & Cullen, F.T. (2001). Parental efficacy and delinquent behavior: Do control and support matter? *Criminology, 39*, 677–705.

Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice.* Intercourse, PA.: Good Books.