

Elliott, Delbert S., Elliott, Amanda, Huizinga, David, Rankin, Bruce, Sampson, Robert J., and Wilson, William Julius. (1996). The Effects of Neighborhood Disadvantages on Adolescent Development. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. (33,4). 389-426.

Purpose:

- Examine how children growing up in underprivileged neighborhoods manage to complete a successful developmental life cycle while dealing with the social and economic adversity.

Literary Review: Focus on neighborhoods and how they affect people (Crane and Tienda, 1991). Ask the questions: How do neighborhoods affect people and what do the people in the neighborhood do to respond to what may go on in their neighborhoods? Do neighborhoods affect the way a person may behave? The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency reported, “scholars are increasingly recognizing that neighborhoods matter (Wilson, 1987).” Many researchers used the hierarchical linear modeling to estimate the contribution of neighborhood effects on people’s development in the neighborhoods.

Methods:

- Sample: Denver sample only involved one stratum with 33 block groups, 820 youth, and 662 families. The Chicago sample was only for African American households with at least one youth ages 11-16. The high-poverty sample included 163 African American households and 614 children. The low-poverty sample included 163 households and 273 children. Total 546 household and 887 children.
- Variables: Neighborhood characteristics: poverty (proportion of the households below poverty), family make-up (proportion of single-parent families), mobility (proportion of household families who moved within five years), and ethnic diversity (# of racial/ethnic groups with at least 10%).
- Procedure: Path analyses to examine the positive and negative effects on the neighborhood characteristics. Asked questions to parents and guardians of youth in the neighborhoods dealing with: social support, # of organizations/activities in neighborhood, general informal activity, # of neighborhood kids known by name, # of family members in neighborhood, proportion of friends in neighborhood, neighborhood bonding, social control, institutional control, mutual respect. Questions on issues asked to youth were: personal efficacy, educational expectations, and commitment to conventionality, involvement in conventional activity, prosocial friends, delinquent peers, and drug use.

Results/Conclusion:

- Age and sex had an affect on individual-level covariates on the issue of problem behavior at the Denver and Chicago site.
- In Denver and in Chicago the level neighborhood disadvantage had affects on the people in the neighborhood.
- “Although the neighborhood is the most distal context, and families and peer groups the most proximate context in analyses of neighborhood influences on individual development, we acknowledge the reciprocal nature of these relationships. Families and peer groups also influence neighborhood organization and culture, and individuals influence the nature of family, peer group, school, and neighborhood contexts.