Sociological analysis of social non-organization and its relation to social learning of crime among boy teenagers

Ghorbanali Saboktakin Rizi¹, Ali Nobari²

¹. Assistant Professor (of Sociology) of Kharazmi University
². M.Sc. of Social Work

ABSTRACT: According to the young structure of our country and regarding the fact that the youth are the most vulnerable class of society toward the social threats of sanity, this article is written to assess the role of social non-organization sociologically in learning social crime among Tarom teenagers. The method used in the current research is survey. Our 1095 participants are teenagers between 14-19 years old among whom 360 ones were chosen based on multi-stage cluster sampling method as the final samples. For the analysis and evaluation of data, SPSS software is used. The results showed that there is a meaningful connection between social non-organization variable and crime social learning and other variables such as the easiness of finding a partner, relations network, apt views toward crime and offence. The results of regression analysis showed that social non-organization has a meaningful effect on variables like the easiness of finding a partner, relations network, apt views toward crime and offence. To speak clearly, the relation between social non-organization and crime social learning happens through variables such as companionship with a criminal, the easiness of finding a partner, apt views and network of relations.
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INTRODUCTION AND DISCUSSION

Most teenagers find themselves under pressure due to the emotional injury from family separation and repetitive change of family structure and show reactions because of premature entrance into sexual desires and drug abuse. As they become mature their expectations rise and some of them can’t deal with social and academic requests. Teenagers are worried about their conditions in comparison to their counterparts. These defects can lead to alienation from society which is itself a source of crime.

The young structure of Iran and the appearance of social acceptance after world modern order in the progressing society of Iran culminated in the growth of teenagers’ criminal acts. Those teenagers who can’t lead their desires toward convergent behaviors may go through divergent behaviors due to the poor performance of social organs and chaotic structure of social order. If they are labelled aberrant by social control organs, they’ll be known as criminals.

As we consider crime among Iranian teenagers and its increasing trend in recent years, by referring to the behavioral statistics we can assess the topic meticulously.

Nevertheless, the official statistics of aberrant behaviors doesn’t give a correct norm of the number and the features of the criminals. On the other hand, according to the selective and registering nature of controlling organs of crime and aberrance and selective feature of criminals punishment, registration issues of crime and offence are not correct. But by presenting a relative amount of crime and aberrance, it shows the number of those who are labelled criminal and aberrant through social controlling organs.

In Iran, according to the existing reports from the year 1996 up to the present time, about 28000 kids and teenagers are sent to the Tehran institution of reformation and education. Their major crimes were rubbery, sexual offence, fray, drug smuggling and drug addiction. (The center of prisons education, 1996)

According to the above mentioned reports and statistics, we can say that in the current status of Iran society as a progressing country which has to deal with social, symbolic, distributive, normative and relative corruptions, and
due to the young structure of Iran population and the fact that age pyramid of the youth, as the most vulnerable class of society toward threatening factors of sanity, criminality can be considered as a serious obstacle on the way of the glory and development of society. Based on what was said, this article tries to find answers to the following questions:

First, what’s the effect of social non-organization on teenagers’ criminality?
Second, How can social learning affect teenagers’ criminality?
Third, can we consider social learning as an intermediary variable?

**Theoretical Frame**

The combination of cultural and social elements makes social organization and it is defined as the total formation of all elements which constitute social act in the shape of special forms and images. Social organization, for each community of social actors, include the most perfect analytical context in which social act takes place. As a matter of fact, social organization results from the integrity of social act in a specific community and all cultural and structural elements, all variables and all the factors that are effective in determining, organizing, leading and motivating act in each person, having a role in establishing social organization.

The most famous definition of social non-organization is presented by Thomas and Zenaniski in 1910. They say “social non-organization is the weakness of norms in observing the roles and behaviors of members of society.” Farbes believed that “social non-organization comes out of chaos in patterns and mechanisms of human relations.” He says social non-organization happens when different parts of patterns and relations mechanism lose their interrelatedness and fail their performance according to implicit goals. So the decrease in unity and organization of societies is the basic factor for social non-organization.

According to Farbes, the most fundamental feature of social non-organization which affects the number of great crimes and offences, appears when “normal mechanism of social control” fails. He believes social changes have an influence on modern societies and undermines neighborhood and family controls.

Eliot and Marble define social non-organization as ”A process through which the bonds of group members are broken.” According to them, social non-organization is the natural outcome of social change. Sutterland is one of those who defined social non-organization. He believed that in time of collision between norm and social organ, social non-organization appears.

According to Marton, social non-organization refers to the existence of a combination of problems in normative structure of society. It can also be defined as non-organizational base structure and roles in society. In this mechanism, social patterns of behavior disappear or, as the individual roles emerge, they won’t be controlled, analyzed or removed by social procedures. It can also be probable that social mechanism doesn’t show enough connectedness with the environment and the process of relation with society members doesn’t keep the minimal social integration.

Social non-organization, unlike aberrance, results from incorrect organization of social integration in a social mechanism with a logical connectedness and in this condition people are convergent with their roles but their behaviors don’t lead to the expected results. Social non-organization can be caused due to the following reasons:

- Insufficiency and disconnectedness in useful communicative channels among people
- Opposition and difference in the benefits of various groups in society
- Defect in socialization

The contrast among different roles of an individual in a society

Borsik and Web considered social non-organization as the weakness of local communities for the diagnosis of common values of their residents and resolving the common experienced issues. According to Sampson and Kruz, social non-organization is "The inability of social structure in realizing the common values of its residents and its continuation of effective control." Many researchers have applied this definition. Sampson and Kruz named four principles to diagnose social non-organization:

- Low economic status
- Frequent transference inside and outside the region
- Mingling of different local groups
- Corrupted families and ruins

According to Taylor and Kavington, social non-organization "proves the effects of social structure on crime and offence." This theory rationalize that rapid social changes, great migrations, industrialization and urbanization end in the weakness of social norms which is the reason for the high number of crimes.

In American Heritage Dictionary, learning is defined : "acquiring knowledge, understanding or mastering by experience." but most theorist don’t approve this definition because it has ambiguous terms such as understanding, knowledge and mastering.
Campbell defines learning as “A relatively permanent change in potential behavior (behavioral potency) which is enriched by practice. Most theorists consider learning as the means of behavior. For them, learning is a process which happens as a result of certain experiences and before the mood changes. Actually, learning is an intermediary variable.

Herganhan and Olson have defined learning in the book “Learning Theories” which is neutral in the definition of learning in comparison to Campbell’s definition regarding enrichment. “Learning is making a relatively permanent change in behavior or potential behavior which comes from experience and can’t be attributed to the temporary states of body like what results from illness, tiredness or taking medicine.

Each society believes several behavioral patterns to be wrong and this kind of behavior is usually considered as aberrant. Aberrance is a sort of behavior which is destructive and is condemned or fined. Some of these aberrant behaviors are known as crime, influenced by the provided communicative states from minor aberrant culture and lead to learning and crime justification.

Albert Bandura as a famous theorist in this field infers that “All ideas and phenomena acquired by personal experiences can be reached indirectly through observing others’ behaviors and their subsequent results. According to him observational learning happens anytime and when this ability grows and becomes perfect, no one can prevent others from learning through this process. Nevertheless, observational learning doesn’t need either clear responding or enrichment. According to Levin, a psychological reality is the only thing that affects behavior like hunger, a memory of the past, being in a certain physical place, the presence of others or having a certain amount of money. All these psychological realities form one’s life and a change in each of them impresses one’s whole life. So the causes of behavior change repetitively. They are very dynamic. Human being lives in a consistently changing field and change in each of them influences others. Learning theory also seeks to find one’s influence on the environment and its consequences on the individual.

According to Skinner, behavior is formed and kept by its consequences. So each behavior is the result of past and present events of one’s life. Probabilities of being awarded or punished are what determined either a particular type of behavior has increased or decreased. The theory of social non-organization as one the main theoretical overviews regarding crime, came to light in mid 80s.

In the early stages, this theory was established outside urban studies of Chicago by Shaw and Mckey which focused on the ecological distribution of crime. They assumed that vast and crowded urban areas will make superficial relations which increase interpersonal opposition and necessitates official control and observation. The results of social non-organization led poverty and active settling of population around cities and will cause weakness in social control that escalates minor aberrant cultures and the growth of violent situations.

Anomy’s theory predicts that in situations where people are less moral act stubbornly and tend to exploit others (normless environments), social trust will decrease and violence will increase. According to this theory we can say that in normless situations, social norms lose their imposing authority and can’t enforce required moral management, as a result, people can’t control their manners of behavior. Accordingly, the theoretical frame of this article is formed from a combination of above mentioned theories.

In this model, we can envisage a model theoretically in which social non-organization, crime social learning and criminal behavior are placed in a casual practical relation.

**Empirical Background**

In a research by Shahbazi (2010) under the title “Assessment of Social Factors effect (family, parents, school, circle of friends) on criminal acts of Tabriz teenagers and understanding influential behavioral features”, it was inferred that circle of friends has the greatest effect on criminal acts of Tabriz teenagers, in comparison to family, school and parents factors.

Parents and spending time with friends were also so influential on the criminality of Tabriz teenagers. There was a survey, performed on 140 boys from Tehran institution of reformation and education and 15 girls from Evin prison who were under 18 and were arrested in 1371 to test the effect of internal and external factors of family on the criminal acts of teenagers. There were interviews with 90 boys and all the girls. The results show that three factors are influential on the intensity of crimes: beliefs and views, teenagers’ attachment to family and close communications with criminals. The more attached to family, the less crimes will be committed. Religious beliefs hinder criminal acts and close communications with criminals lead teenagers to commit offences.

The other study by Borhani (2010) is based on social non-organization theory and ecology and tries to assess the residence of sampled teenagers in Tehran institution of reformation and education. The results show that most teenagers and kids live in chaotic, apt-for-crime neighborhoods and non-standard houses and have friends who are inclined to committing crime. Social learning and social structure model are performed by Lee in 1998 on users of addictive drugs. The data is gathered from a survey on 1725 students from 11 to 17 in 1976 and Lee assessed the
data. This model applies structural equations for the analysis of data in comparison to the theoretical pattern of social structure and social learning of Acres.

The results show that structural factors have indirect effect on criminal behavior (like taking Marijuana and drugs) through learning process. Actually, learning variables moderate the effects of social structure (Lee, 1998). There was another research by Lee and others (2004) with the data gathered from suburban, dealing with the question whether the social structure variables are moderated by social learning or not. Different social status is performed in social structure and family structure but a different social organization goes with the size of society, and social learning variables go with friends companionship, distinguishing enricher and accordant and opposite definitions to criminal behavior are measured and the results denote that social learning variables can moderate the effects of social structure.

According to the mentioned cases in the theoretical frame and based on empirical background, we can present the assumptions of current research as mentioned below:

There is a relation between social non-organization and criminal social learning.

There is a relation between social non-organization and the easiness of finding a partner.

There is a relation between social non-organization and the network of people’s relations.

There is a relation between social non-organization and apt views toward crime.

**METHOD**

The method used in this research is survey by the use of questionnaire. Statistical community includes high school boy students of Tarom (1095 participants).

360 individuals are chosen ultimately based on Kokeran formula and cluster sampling method. To measure social non-organization, these questions were asked:

- How many violent crimes happen in your neighborhood?
- How often can you see addicted people in your neighborhood?
- How often you see policemen in your neighborhood?

To measure the validity of questions (the easiness of finding a partner, relations’ network, apt views toward crimes and criminals companionship), nominal and elemental validity were applied. The final evaluation of measuring tools for structures in the frame of Likert used questions internal coordination technique (Kronbaj Alpha) for which the resulted factor is above 0/7 for all structures and is acceptable. In the current study 3 key definitions in Acres model have been used to measure social learning variable:

- Distinguishing fellowship with questions such as enforcing friends, struggle in the street, hurting others
- Distinguishing enricher with questions such as anger, hatred toward life, alienation and isolation
- Individual’s definitions of his action in rank testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social non-organization</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime social learning</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations network</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apt view</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companionship with criminal</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easiness of finding a partner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Results of the Research**

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of dependent variable (crime social learning) and independent and intermediary ones among sampled individuals. According to this table, the average social non-organization is 61/30 (minimum=28, maximum=128), the average friends companionship is 28/32 (min=5, max=45), the average apt views toward crime is 28/79 (min=11, max=28), the average relations network is 45/05 (min=22, max=64), the average of easiness in finding a partner is 3/64 (min=1, max=5). The amount of social non-organization variable is considered to be higher than moderate, social learning variable as moderate, friends companionship as moderate, apt views toward crime as moderate, relations network as moderate and the easiness of finding a partner as higher than moderate. (Table 2)
Easiness of finding a partner and social learning go together by implying a reverse meaningful relation (the decrease in relations network leads to the increase in social learning). Relations network variable goes with social learning by implying a direct meaningful relation. (Apt view toward crime social learning). Apt view toward crime variable goes with social learning by implying a reverse meaningful relation (the decrease in relations network leads to the increase in social learning will simultaneously lead to the escalation of companionship with criminal friends). Apt view toward crime variable goes with social learning by 0.25 implying a direct meaningful relation. (An increase in social learning will simultaneously lead to the escalation of companionship with criminal friends). Apt view toward crime variable goes with social learning by 0.25 implying a direct meaningful relation. (An increase in social learning leads to the escalation of apt views toward crime). Relations network variable goes with social learning by 0.28 implying a reverse meaningful relation (the decrease in relations network leads to the increase in social learning) and finally the easiness of finding a partner and social learning go together by 0.32 implying a direct meaningful relation. (Both variables increase together)

**Inferential Findings of Research**

In this part, the relation between studied variables is considered two by two, based on research assumptions. So we use Pearson coordination factor to put the regarded variables in a relation and to be able to consider the direction of relations and the meaningfulness of existing difference among them. The statistical relation of dependent variable means social learning of the crime and independent variable means social non-organization. In addition to coordination factor, meaningful level and the probability of mistakes in the relations between the variables are shown. The maximum acceptable statistical mistake is 0.05 (95%). (Table 3)

Based on the obtained data from Table 3, social learning variable with social non-organization is 19% which implies a direct and meaningful relation (an increase in social non-organization will lead to the escalation of crime social learning up to 19%). The statistical relation between intermediary variables and dependent ones is shown clearly and meaningfully in the table.

**Table 2. Descriptive statistics of research variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easiness of finding a partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations network</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1/29</td>
<td>61/3</td>
<td>Social non-organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apt views toward crime</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1/38</td>
<td>64/54</td>
<td>Crime social learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends companionship</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td>Friends companionship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social learning</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5/88</td>
<td>28/79</td>
<td>Apt view toward crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1/39</td>
<td>45/05</td>
<td>Relations network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/46</td>
<td>3/64</td>
<td>Easiness of finding a partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>15/81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. Coordination factors of social non-organization and intermediary and dependent variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easiness of finding a partner</th>
<th>Relations network</th>
<th>Apt views toward crime</th>
<th>Friends companionship</th>
<th>Social learning</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Social non-organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. Coordination factors of social non-organization and intermediary and dependent variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easiness of finding a partner</th>
<th>Relations network</th>
<th>Apt views toward crime</th>
<th>Friends companionship</th>
<th>Social learning</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data on table 4, social learning variable with friends companionship is 0.23, implying a direct meaningful relation. (An increase in social learning will simultaneously lead to the escalation of companionship with criminal friends). Apt view toward crime variable goes with social learning by 0.25 implying direct meaningful relation. (An increase in social learning leads to the escalation of apt views toward crime). Relations network variable goes with social learning by 0.28 implying a reverse meaningful relation (the decrease in relations network leads to the increase in social learning) and finally the easiness of finding a partner and social learning go together by 0.32 implying a direct meaningful relation. (Both variables increase together)

**Regression Variable**

We use step by step regression model to determine the variables, qualified to be present in the model and to eliminate less effective variables in model. This model showed that in the first stage, the variable with the highest parting coordination with dependent variable (distinguishing companionship) will enter the model. The relation between independent variables (interaction with adult criminals, finding a partner, apt views and relations network) and dependent ones of the research (social learning of the crime among teenagers) has been obtained through analysis table and unilateral variance according to a meaningful level (0.00).

The first, second and third stages are linear and show that total independent variables are capable of clarifying the changes of crime social learning variable and approving the model. The independence of mistakes, according to Watson camera, is one of the required drafts for regression analysis which has been ratified. Non-linear drafts from independent variables, based on certain amount of tolerance parameter (near 1) and variance inflation parameter (less than 2) have been approved in the first and second stages. Coordination factor (r) in the first stage between variables is 0.62, in the second stage 0.65 and in the third stage 0.66 which shows there is a strong relationship between independent and dependent variables. The moderated factor in the first stage (R2) is 0.38, in the second stage 0.43 and in the third stage is 0.44 which shows that remnant variables in regression model including interaction with adult criminals, apt views and finding a partner, could clarify 44% of changes of dependent variable, concerning crime social learning. Only relations network variable is put aside from regression model (Table 5).
In the above equation, if other independent variables are kept the same, as friends criminality increases just one unit, individual’s social learning will increase 0/55 and so on. According to this equation, we can say that companionship of friends, having apt views and finding a partner have a meaningful effect on people’s criminality, which means it escalates crime social learning and aberrance.

**CONCLUSION**

This article was written to assess the role of social non-organization in crime social learning of Tarom boy high schools. Based on the results, the average crime social learning among sampled teenagers is high. The innovation of this research was the expression of crime intermediary social learning variable because in the assessment of pertinent texts about social non-organization, the role of social learning was either ignored or included inside social non-organization variable. The existing gap is made due to the fact that social non-organization as an external variable doesn’t have a direct effect on teenagers’ criminality but its main effect is on aberrant behaviors which is achieved by social learning. Social learning means establishing, keeping and moderating the individuals’ behavior in the society where he lives. So the assumption is that the individual lives in an unorganized society and has the potential ability to learn crime and offence.

Sociology can tell us what circumstances can increase or decrease the probability of crime commitment. But it doesn’t determine who commits the crime or what should be done with criminals. What is innovative and important about this article is that it filled the gap and highlighted the importance of social learning variable as intermediary variable in committing criminal behaviors.

According to the analytical and descriptive results, these suggestions are made:

- Enrichment of relations and mutual trust between family members by parents in a way that parents should spend a lot of time considering family issues and communicating with each other and their children.
- Highlighting communication and discussion inside families due to the fact that in today society, the absence of father from family and from neighborhood communities caused parents not to be present in local organizations such as parents and trainers association and etc.
- Attention to the organization and integrity of society in keeping the social sanity of teenagers.
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