I. Announcements:
Bonus Credits — Talks this week!

Evelyn Patterson
University of Pennsylvania
Sociology Department Conference Room 2824
March 4, 2009
12pm

Evelyn Patterson, a native of Atlanta, GA, graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 2007 with a joint degree in Demography and Criminology. She has been a member of the Pennsylvania State University since then in the Department of Sociology as a postdoctoral fellow and research associate. Her diverse research background covers topics in fields such as bioinformatics, health evaluation, mathematical demography, correctional populations, and collateral consequences of incarceration. Her current research focuses on mortality in various correctional settings.
“The Sociology of Today & Tomorrow, the Self & the Institution”

I. Announcements:

Student Researcher — See Announcements.

Thursday (3-5) — Roger & Paolo

Tuesday (3-10) — Review and Evaluation

Thursday (3-12) — Final Exam

Questions?
I. What is Deviance?

II. Individual-Centered Explanations.

III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

IV. C.W. Mills.

V. Individuals, Institutions and Duality
I. What is Deviance?

A. Recall Berger & Berger:

An Institution: A social arrangement or pattern of action, way of behaving or way of knowing that is enduring, widely shared and persistent.

- Institutions objectify Reality
- Have Coercive Power
- Have Moral Authority
- Have Historicity
I. What is Deviance?

B. What happens when you act contrary to the dictates of an institution? Deviance.

C. What happens when you act contrary to the dictates of an institution that has legal standing? Crime.

D. Especially fruitful place to think about individual vs. institutional centered explanations because it is natural and easy to think about deviants (or criminals) as “Bad Individuals”.
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I. What is Deviance?

E. Clearly there are important issues to be addressed about serious criminals in society and we all hope and want our society and the institutions of social control to protect us.
II. Individual-Centered Explanations.

A. Puritan (Calvinism) and Predestination.
   Good People & Bad People.
   Punishment is God’s will for Man’s evil.

B. Horatio Alger:
   Some people work hard, get wealth.
   Others? Lazy and undeserving (thief)
II. Individual-Centered Explanations.
C. Biological Explanations.

1. Franz Gall (1758-1828): German physiologist.
   - First to Argue that character traits resided in the head (not the heart)
   - Developed “Cranioscopy” (Phrenology)
   - Could determine personality, mental & moral faculties by examining shape, contours and bumps on the head.
II. Individual-Centered Explanations.

C. Biological Explanations.

1. Franz Gall:

- Different Parts of the Brain Have Different Functions (Not just size that matters)
- Organ of Theft.
- Organ of Perseverance.
- Organ of Secretiveness.
- Organ of Murder.
II. Individual-Centered Explanations.

C. Biological Explanations.


   - Italian Criminologist

   - Argued that Criminality was inherited (genetically)

   - and it left specific physical markers (stigmata)
II. Individual-Centered Explanations.
C. Biological Explanations

2. *Criminal Man* (p.1876) criminals reflect earlier “Apish” past
   - Atavism (from atavus Great, Great Grandfather) revert to ancestors form (“evolutionary throw-back.”)
   - Animals are savage “Criminals” (lack capacity for moral thinking)
   - Traditional People as “savages.”
   - Children as “savages.”
   - Criminals as reversion to “beasts”
II. Individual-Centered Explanations.

C. Biological Explanations.

2. Criminal “Stigmata”
   • Thickness of Skull
   • Large Jaws
   • Long Arms
   • Precocious Wrinkles
   • Large Ears
II. Individual-Centered Explanations.

C. Biological Explanations.

2. Criminal “Stigmata”
   - Low Forehead
   - Prehensile feet (prostitutes)
   - Hairy
   - Tattooing (Insensitivity to Pain and Atavistic love of Adornment)
II. Individual-Centered Explanations.
C. Biological Explanations.

3. Hernstein & Murray:
   • Argued that IQ determined success.
   • Also argued that IQ determined criminality.
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

1. Emile Durkheim (1858-1917):
   French sociologist (considered one of most important in sociology).
   (M. Mauss was his nephew & student)
   • Thought Crime had a social function.
   • Provided a basis for social solidarity (as community organized itself against “the others”).
   • Served to mark off institutional boundaries. “Patrol Outer Edges of Group Space”
   • People are “good to think with”.
   • Even a society of saints would require criminality if it is to continue to operate as a society.
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

2. Michel Foucault:

• Modified Durkheim suggesting that punishment does mark boundaries & demonstrates Power.

• explains the rise of torture as system of control.
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

2. Michel Foucault:

- But documents the change from “Punishment” to “Discipline”.

- A movement from power as symbolic display to the rise of power as a system of control over the small details of movement of the body and ultimately the attentions of the mind and our ability to think or to be a self.
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

2. Michel Foucault:

- For Foucault — That which counts as deviant is produced through the rise of systems of Truth/Power.

- Professionally produced scientific systems of knowledge about us, our inner selves, our pathologies, our essential selves.
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

2. Michel Foucault:

- The Rise of the Prison System.

- Instead of torturing the body, modern criminology is concerned with the deprivation of liberty.

- Also, the foundations for modern systems of power as “surveillance” (as in the original Panopticon).
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

3. Labeling Theory:

- Deviance is caused by the deviant person being negatively labelled, internalizing the label, and acting according to the label.

- As time goes on, the "deviant" takes on traits that define what a real deviant is supposed to do and takes on the role of such a label by committing deviations that conform to the label.

- Overtime preoccupation by self & institutions with the deviant label lead the deviant individual to follow a self-fulfilling prophecy of conformity to the ascribed label.
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

3. Edwin Lemert:

— We all Deviate (drugs, DUI, traffic, IRS).

— What matters is being labeled as a "Deviant."

(a) **Primary Deviance** (initial rule-breaking).

(b) **Secondary Deviance** (rule-breaking results from being labeled as deviant).
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

4. American Prison System:

• Take a look at how imprisonment works in the U.S. and ask the question whether individual or institutional centered explanations are more helpful?

• Imprisonment is a huge institution in the U.S.

• As of 2007 1 out of every 131 Americans is in prison or jail (762/100,000).

• Highest Imprisonment rate in the world in 2007, Russia was next with 635/100,000.
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.


* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in the United States: 700
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Russia: 665
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Mexico: 150
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Canada: 105
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Denmark: 60
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Finland: 50
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Iceland: 30
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Norway: 60
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Sweden: 65
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in England and Wales: 125
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Ireland: 80
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Italy: 95
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in France: 80
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Germany: 95
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Portugal: 130
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Estonia: 330
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Latvia: 355
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Japan: 45
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in Saudi Arabia: 45
* Number of prisoners per 100,000 population in China: 110
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

4. American Prison System:

- Varies by Gender & Race (data from 2007):
  - 1 in 10 (10.4%) black males age 25-29 in prison
  - 1 in 28 (3.6%) Hispanic males age 25-29 in prison
  - 1 in 59 (1.7%) Hispanic males age 25-29 in prison
  - 69 females/100,000 in prison
  - 957 males/100,000 in prison
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

4. American Prison System:

- Varies by Gender & Race (data from 2007):

- black males 32% chance be in prison in their lifetime

- Hispanic males 17% chance be in prison in their lifetime

- white males 6% chance be in prison in their lifetime
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.
5. What’s Going on Here?

U.S. incarceration rates by race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Rate per 100,000 population, 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>2,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prison Policy Initiative
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III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

5. What’s Going on Here?

![Graph showing International Incarceration Comparison](image)
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

5. What’s Going on Here?:

- Increase in Individual Centered Thinking dates back to end of Counter-culture days.
- Change in thinking about deviance and control.
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

5. What’s Going on Here?:

- Drug Addiction—(Increasingly)
  A Marker of A Flawed Self

- Arrested Drug Charges sent to Prison:
  - 1980 19/1000
  - 1992 104/1000

% Prison Inmates Drug Charges
Fed.  Calif.
1980  22%  7%
1997  62%  27%
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.
5. What’s Going on Here?
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Incarcerated Americans
1920 - 2007


In 1971 President Richard Nixon declared a “War On Drugs”
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

5. What’s Going on Here?:

- Lower Income Person:
  - 1- More Likely to be Scrutinized.
  - 2- More Likely to be Arrested (if Susp.).
  - 3- More Likely Spend Jail Time pre-trial.
  - 4- More Likely Come to Trial.
  - 5- More Likely be found Guilty.
  - 6- More Likely receive harsh punishment.
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

5. What’s Going on Here?:

- 1990-No difference by race/class re: drug use.

- 1992 Study–Blacks:
  13% total pop.
  35% arrested drug possession.
  55% convicted " " " ".
  74% Serving Sentences " " " ".
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

5. What’s Going on Here?:

- Crack vs. Powder Cocaine:
  Amount Necy. 5 yr. Mandatory Sentence:

  - 5 grams crack (10 doses, $200)
  - 500 grams powder (5,000, $20,000)

- 83% convicted for Crack black.
- 95% convicted for Crack black+ Hispanic
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

5. What’s Going on Here?:

- 1990-No difference by race/class re: drug use.

- 1992 Study—Blacks:
  - 13% total pop.
  - 35% arrested drug possession.
  - 55% convicted " " " ".
  - 74% Serving Sentences " " " ".
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III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

5. What’s Going on Here?:

- Death Penalty (1990 = 2,356, 40% Black):
- Baldus' study of 2000 homicide cases in Georgia, 1973-1980:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>killer: Black</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>killer: White</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Institutional-Centered Explanations.

5. What’s Going on Here?:

- CA 16 new prisons ('85-95) ($10 b).
- CA Spent on ea. UC student (1991) $6,296
California’s Three Strikes Law Fact Sheet

- California’s Three Strikes initiative became law on March 7, 1994. As of September 2003, California had incarcerated 42,445 people under Three Strikes.

- The law was intended to put murderers, rapists and hardcore violent criminals in prison for 25 years to life, but 65 percent of those imprisoned have been sentenced for nonviolent offenses. More Californians are serving life sentences under Three Strikes for drug possession than for second degree murder, assault with a deadly weapon and rape, combined.

- California’s Three Strikes law is the harshest in the country. No other state allows someone to be convicted under Three Strikes for a nonviolent offense. Prior to California’s Three Strikes law, no one in the history of the nation had received a life sentence for shoplifting. Three hundred and fifty-four people are serving life sentences for petty theft of under $400. Robert Blasi received a 31-year sentence for stealing a pair of AA batteries. Nathan Thomas shoplifted three packs of T-shirts from J.C. Penny and was sentenced to 25 years. Brian Smith was sentenced to 25 years to life for abetting a petty theft when two women he was with shoplifted from a convenience store.

- California faces a $15 billion budget shortfall next year.

- California spends $5.7 billion a year on prisons. The cost of incarcerating a single inmate each year is $30,929. Inmates over the age of 55 cost the state $50,000 a year.

- Incarcerating nonviolent offenders under Three Strikes costs California nearly a billion dollars a year.

- Californians want the law changed and the budget balanced by cutting corrections spending.

- Sixty-five percent of Californians believe Three Strikes should focus on serious or violent felonies, not petty theft or drug possession.

- Californians are more willing to cut corrections spending to balance the state budget than any other state program.

It’s not fair. It sinks California deeper into debt. Californians want it changed.


A. Neither the life of an individual nor the institutions of a society can be understood without understanding both (p. 259).

B. Private Troubles vs. Public Issues: unemployment, war, marriage, the metropolis (p. 262).


C. Sociological Imagination—The capacity to shift from one perspective to the other, from the most impersonal and remote to the most intimate features of the self (p. 261).
V. Individuals, Institutions and Duality

• How to think about society?
Lecture Outline

Overall Goal:
Introduce the "Sociological Imagination" (C. W. Mills).
- Need to understand how individuals are constituted by institutions AND how institutions are constituted by individuals.
- See the relationship between "Private Troubles" and "Public Issues."

Main Task:
Teach you to understand what an "Institutional-Centered" approach involves.

Main Tactic:
Make a sharp contrast between Individual-Centered and Institutional-Centered explanations.