

Sociologists On Campus

A division of the University of North Dakota branch of Alpha Kappa Delta

The Undergraduate Report

The online-journal of Sociologists On Campus at the
University of North Dakota

Volume 2 Number 1
Fall 2007
Edited by Gabe Kilzer

Introduction to the Journal

To the reader,

Welcome to the online-journal of Sociologists On Campus, a publication dedicated to showing the work of undergraduate students at the University of North Dakota. Within these pages you will find articles written by students who were, for the most part, merely completing an assignment for class. It is very important that this fact is known as it is the goal of this journal to show that exceptional work can come from students not actively seeking publication and are happy with an A in the class they are enrolled in. This is done to ensure that proper respect is paid to those who put in the extra effort to truly compose a paper rather than just doing what is required and nothing more. Who knows, maybe this will uncover the next great theorist or at least, show an exceptional example of what sociology is about. Educating, understanding, interpreting, and evaluating; the articles within this journal aim at these goals in order to promote the field of sociology to all.

The main focus of this journal is to show the work of undergraduate students at the University of North Dakota in an “as is” state of completion. “As is” means that these articles are written purely by undergraduates with no “professional” editing or revision and are published as such. This is done to ensure the author’s true style of writing without causing them the hassle of re-writing articles for this specific journal. Many of these papers are submitted from students writing a paper for class and it is for this reason that we do not wish to place further burden on the author. After all, it is the ideas proposed that are important and not whether they properly used a semi-colon. They have already been graded once.

With all of that said, it is an honor and a privilege to invite you to read on and enjoy. Thank you to the authors for your submissions and the sociology department at the University of North Dakota for making this possible.

Sincerely,

Gabe Kilzer
Editor

President of Alpha Kappa Delta, University of North Dakota Chapter

The Story of Sociologists On Campus:

The story of Sociologists On Campus (SOC) goes back to the Fall semester of 2004 in a little town called Grand Forks, North Dakota. It was there, at the University of North Dakota, where Ryan Thompson, Alex Parkhouse, and Gabe Kilzer dreamed of an undergraduate-run organization that would someday run campus like a shady underground mob. Eventually, after some fierce debate and rock-paper-scissors, this group evolved into the more campus friendly version that we now know as the SOC.

Today, the SOC is continuing the legacy set forth by the founding members as a branch of Alpha Kappa Delta – the international sociology honor society. It is open to all undergraduate students of any year and major looking to further their understanding of the social world in a relaxing environment outside the classroom.

Members will:

- Help organize events to take place both on and off campus in order to connect the University with the surrounding community.
- Be given opportunities for academic and professional development in the field of sociology.
- Further their general interest and understanding of what sociology is.

For more information contact any of the current board members below.

Gabe Kilzer

President Alpha Kappa Delta, University of North Dakota Chapter
“sort of SOC/AKD Liaison”

Dr. Daphne Pedersen Stevens

Assistant Professor of Sociology at UND/SOC Advisor
Ph.D. Utah State University

Index of Articles:

<u>Page Number:</u>	<u>Title:</u>	<u>Author:</u>
6 -16	A Collection of Social Thought	Tyler Vadnie
17 - 33	Social Theory and Illegal Immigration	Ryan Duletski
34 - 49	A Sociological Explanation of Attitudes Toward the Criminal Justice System	Bethany Langton
50 - 64	Elder Abuse: Perspectives from Sociology	Rachel O'Neal
65 - 84	Searching for Evidence of an Emerging Transnational Capitalist Class: A Pilot Study	Michael P. Braget
85	Closing notes	

About This Edition:

I must say that already we are off to a great start with the SOC Journal. After publishing the first edition last fall we received another handful of articles for this year's edition (and more). Not only is that a good faith showing from the students in letting us reproduce their work for anyone to see, it also shows a vote of confidence from the department for letting us do this again. As light-heartedly as I may seem to take this it is with the most sincere sense of gratitude that these individuals are assisting in something that could be of great use to students, the department, and the university. But as Dr. Abdallah Badahdah would say, "enough of this," lets get to this edition of *The Undergraduate Report*.

This edition tries to show the evolution of ideas along with range of papers that we are seeking to publish in this journal (decide for yourself which is the manifest function if you will). We begin with a collection of one-page articles written for Introduction to Sociology. In these papers the author is asked to relate various social theories to a series of questions presented over the course of the semester. What the author accomplished, and what we are trying to show, is that critical thinking does not have to equal high page numbers. Reading through these segments gives insight into the beginning of social thought. With that said, the papers which follow are to be seen as the next step that students should look to take with the ideas stemming from knowledge gained in an "intro" course.

Following the one-page articles, we immediately dive back into theory to focus on the issues of illegal immigration, conflicting attitudes toward the criminal justice system, and elder abuse. Each of the papers in the "theory section" outlines the details of the theory they are discussing, be it from Karl Marx to Emile Durkheim to Zygmunt Bauman, along with the author's personal interpretation. The authors of these papers are essentially talking themselves through theory by making inferences based on "intro" ideas. These ideas then lead to research questions.

The last paper is an excellent example of the research that can be done at the undergraduate level. The first SOC Journal research paper illustrates the benefits of taking advantage of your education. This paper, just as the others, began in class but has since turned into a serious project with the potential to spring into the emerging field of research on Transnational Corporate Classes. This is essentially the capstone paper to the sequence of sections provided in this edition because it shows the transition from ideas and theories to data tables and discussion.

Whew, I am a bit worn from writing this section. Here's to hoping the "snapshots of learning" theme goes over well.

Sincerely,

Gabe Kilzer
Editor

A Collection of Social Thought

Tyler Vadnie
University of North Dakota

Every great theory began its career as nothing more than a collection of ideas and interpretations. Although it is sometimes forgotten, the theorists that generally sit atop the ivory towers for their scientific achievements were once the ones struggling to arrange the same ideas students are faced with today in a basic “intro” course. In this section, Tyler Vadnie begins to discuss some of the more prominent theories within sociology today ranging from Merton’s functions to DuBois’s double consciousness. One could argue that not all of these interpretations are “correct” based on current academic understandings; but notice the attempts made by Vadnie to seek connections outside the course material and you get a glimpse of the author seeking to work through the concepts presented rather than simply type a term’s definition and move on.

It is important to note that one-page (single-spaced) was expected to be the maximum for the papers turned in as well. Therefore, the discussion of some concepts was restricted in page length. The questions posed to the student are in *bold italics* before each section which followed by the corresponding section. With permission from the author, and to avoid printing too much “article specific material,” some papers are not re-produced in their entirety.

In your own words, describe and explain the three perspectives of sociology (i.e. explain their main arguments, differences, etc.). Which of the three perspectives do you identify with the most? Explain.

...The third of the three perspectives is the Conflict Perspective. This perspective examines societies that have withstood the test of time. It examines its creation, transformation, and lasting effects on a population. Conflict perspective discredits the other two perspectives and states that societies are essentially large arenas where different groups struggle for dominance over the other ideas. Also, the Conflict perspective says that the struggle for dominance is the reactants for maintaining institutions. It also states that modern institutions represent dominating, minority elite and are discouraging the larger more submissive group. Conflict theorists believe that an ideology's purpose is to protect the particular interest of a certain class. Lastly, the Conflict theorists believe that drastic social change is the result of a confederacy of groups pushing forward their collective interests, even at the toll of other's interests.

I believe that I identify most with the Conflict Perspective. I too believe that the values of society of today are a result from a theological battle in which what we believe today has become accepted. For example, premarital sexual relations, while it was once considered a great sacrilege to enter sexual relations with someone who was not your spouse, today it is an accepted practice. The idea that it was not wrong proved dominant over the argument that it was sacrilege. I also believe that institutions represent dominant elite that impose their ideas on those of less fortune. Government is a good example in that a rich predominantly white group decides what is best for a nation consisting of countless minorities with incomes a fraction of theirs. The major social changes of society are a result of many dissenting groups forming an alliance against a common foe. National voting rights are a prime example of diverse groups banding together to fight for a common interest: voting. Various minority groups and some feminist groups banded together in

an attempt to change the Constitution so that it would allow them to vote. Examples like that are why I feel I identify most with the Conflict Perspective, I identify with it because of how I view the changes of society in the past.

What are some of the manifest and latent functions of taking this course, Introduction to Sociology?

...sociologists do not look for the obvious reasons a society does something, but rather search for the unconscious compulsion to do so. A manifest function is defined as the intended beneficial consequences of a particular action, whereas a latent function is the unintended beneficial consequences of a particular action. The sociologist searches for reasons why a society does something beyond the obvious. For example a sociologist looks at some one who buys expensive name brand clothing. The person buys the clothing not only to help adapt to the climate, which is a manifest function, but also for the mark of social status, which in turn is a latent function. Non-name brand clothes are just as efficient or more so at keeping someone warm, but yet people buy expensive name brand clothes for the latent functions: it demonstrates that they are economically able to buy the more expensive clothes, and it is a level of social status, distancing themselves from less desirable people who are in a lower social circle. The sociologist looks for the latent functions in such a purchase, the latent functions of that action. The sociologist notes that the person buys the more expensive clothes not out of necessity, but rather because they can buy the more expensive clothes even if they are not as efficient as non-name brand clothes.

In taking a course for this there are many benefits, both manifest and latent. Some of the manifest functions of taking this course are that students are getting general credits. Another manifest function is that sociology is an easy class compared to college composition; one doesn't have to write a 10 page paper every week. If you are sociology major a manifest function is that

you fill up prerequisites for more advanced sociology classes when this one is finished. One could also be curious why societies act as they do and in taking a sociology class one could come closer to finding that answer out for themselves. There are also several latent functions in taking this course; one is the fact that you get to meet many people and sit and stare at the hot girl across the lecture hall during class. Another latent function is that as you learn more and more about sociology, one could discover that this career field seems more interesting than the major they are currently pursuing. It is also in the group sessions that you get to know your fellow students better and could start a relationship with a fellow student that you met during class. An obvious latent function is the fact that you get to spend times with friends and you have to be sober. While it is fun to party with friends, it's also nice to spend time with people while their sober, cause a drunk is a drunk after all. If one viewed this class as just a general class credit filler, there would be more latent functions than manifest functions because ones only taking this class for easy credit. If one was sociology major, there could be more manifest functions than latent functions, as SOC 110 is a gateway class for more specialized sociology courses. It also is a prerequisite for many of the classes so one would be required to take it eventually. Also sociology major would be inherently more interested in the subject matter than one who is just taking the class for an easy 'A'. There are many manifest and latent functions in taking this course. Whether there are more manifest functions or latent functions all depends on ones own point of view.

What do you already know about social inequality and what has changed, or been added to, that knowledge? Thinking about your major/minor, what do you feel is are some of the essential tools required to become educated in that field and what would be different without them (e.g. could you become a pilot without access to an airplane, could you become a computer technician without a computer, etc...)?

The No Child Left Behind Act is the first thing to come to my mind when I think of changed from when this article (Jonathan Kozol's *Savage Inequalities*) was first published. Established in 2001, the act calls for better qualified teachers, new school curriculums, and funding to keep American schools competitive in the world market. This has helped many schools in getting better teachers and technology so their students would not fall behind in average education. If it was implemented correctly this act would help lower class students change their achieved status; by providing them with teachers who were highly educated they would better perform in their studies in order to get scholarships and attend college; something that would be more difficult was there not certified teachers in their school. However well the NCLB Act were implemented it would not change the kids' ascribed status. They would still have to deal with the stereotypes of being from a low social class; also they would have to find the motivation to excel in school when at home they get bombarded by images of failure. Crime then becomes a quick way to make money, and with money he would see that it brought power. So instead of concentrating on his studies, he would put his wit into organized crime looking for a quick fix, as opposed to a road that was fraught with difficulties leading out of the lower class.

(Lower class schools) can thus be the exact opposite of the higher class schools where the teachers are already graduates of higher education, and the NCLB Act would not affect their curriculum as much as it would the lower class schools. The funding would be distributed to schools that were in most need of conforming to the Act. The kids in the (upper class school) have the best chances to excel in life because of their ascribed status. They probably had stable

families, with a stable income, and parents who had good social networks (sadly, it is often a case of who you know rather than what you know) to provide their kids a 'one-up' over the competition. Overall social inequalities have changed, but it is not a drastic enough one to end social inequalities in children's schooling.

Concentrating on my Pre-medical focus, it would be impossible to become proficient in my trade without access to chemical labs, cadavers, or teaching materials. Teachers with experience in medicine would also be a requirement. Without proper training materials I would kill people because I would not know what I was doing. The difference between a kidney and a liver would make no sense to me, as it would be the first time I actually saw one. While it would be entertaining to watch a surgeon who did not know the difference between a kidney and the liver, to be at the receiving end of that surgery would be terrifying. Cadavers give me a chance to practice my surgical technique without worrying whether or not the patient will die if I err. Having a teacher with experience in the field that I am studying would be important because they could give me the benefit of their years of experience and I would not have to make the same errors they did. Having the proper textbooks would be important too, because even if I had an excellent teacher, I would have no previous knowledge to question them about. Without proper materials it would be impossible to obtain the knowledge needed to enter med school.

What do you think are some of the commonly held misconceptions about people with mental illness? What are these assumptions inaccurate?

There are many misconceptions that influence our thoughts on the mentally ill. One example of a mental misconception is that the severely diagnosed mental patient is often prone to violence. This is not true as the patient may just be afraid and confused. Fits of violence may be caused by the environment and staff just as much as it is attributed to the characteristics of the

diagnosis. Another misconception about mental illness is the role that parenting played in the development of the illness. Most mental diagnosis is the result of fluctuations in brain chemistry. Parents play a major influence in our lives, but bad parenting itself is not the cause of a mental illness; it may increase the susceptibility for some mental disorders, but in itself the person must be susceptible for such an illness through genetic factors and inheritance. Media has made negative stereotypes for the mentally ill. The mentally ill are often depicted as violent, awkward, and homicidal. Many mental patients admit themselves for psychiatric observation and want help in treating their shortcomings. Having a mental illness means that you are weak and lack willpower is a misconception held by many about the mentally ill. Depression can be caused by a deficiency in some brain chemicals, which would show that the person is not “weak-willed” the fault can be found in the missing brain chemicals, which may help alleviate stress. There are many misconceptions that concern mental patients. The assumptions are often inaccurate and are influenced by mass media’s depiction of the mentally ill.

Paraphrase the following line from Emile Durkheim’s The Normality of Crime: “For murderers to disappear, the horror of bloodshed must become greater in those social strata from which murderers are recruited; but, first it must become greater throughout the entire society.”

The line from the article means that bloodshed must become so common in society that it is no longer considered a deviant behavior. Murders are murders because the taking of another’s life is not accepted in our present society. For murders to disappear, the taking of another’s life must become commonplace, the act of murder would no longer be considered undesirable therefore there would be no more murders because everyone would be doing it. Punishment serves to curb or inhibit socially unacceptable behavior; murder being an example. Jealousy, anger, and betrayal are common causes for murder. Coveting another’s possessions can lead to

murder when one does not want to put the effort and time into acquiring possessions themselves and thinks that murder would be the fastest way to get those items. People murder in anger over many things, an insult or gross breach of etiquette can cause some people to murder others. Why people murder in anger is important: did they do it out of passion, or did they wait and let cold logic form a plan to punish those responsible? The judicial system also takes that into account when such people are presented in court. Crimes of passion are dealt fewer penalties than “cold blooded” murder. Murder over betrayal can also be seen as a crime of passion or cold blood depending on the circumstances of death. A man walks into his bedroom hoping to surprise his wife, only to find her embracing another man. Does the husband kill the adulterer and his wife in blind rage and betrayal or does he wait and see them suffer as he feels as if he could never be the same again? Does he allow himself to be controlled by his emotions and become a murderer, or does he do the more socially acceptable course and have a divorce? Murder can be caused by many things but for murders to disappear, the act of taking another’s life must become acceptable so that the perpetrators are no longer defined by committing a criminal, or even deviant, act.

Explain what DuBois means by “the veil” and “double consciousness.” Knowing that DuBois wrote this article in 1903, how do you think he would respond to the statement, “Humans show such remarkable diversity that there are no pure races.”

The veil that Du Bois talks about is his race, his skin color, and how that separates him from those around him. When he speaks of his double consciousness he is talking about being African, and knowing that he is African and how that brings with it certain prejudices in the eyes of white society. In the article Du Bois relates his first memory of being different from those around him. When he tried to exchange a card with a new student she refused his card

immediately without any thought. That was when he became aware of his veil, and could be when he had the birth of his second consciousness. After he became aware of his veil he says he did not attempt to 'tear down that veil, to creep through,' but he had for himself his own respect and attempted to show his superiority over the white children in academics and physical prowess, relishing each time he was able to do so. Du Bois goes on to say that Africans have had to try to balance two contradictory ideas after emancipation. The idea that he must try to shatter the predisposition of Blacks by Whites, that they are more than just 'drawers of water' but have only the support of a poverty stricken race, for Black doctors tempted toward quackery and demagoguery. Du Bois talks about the early years of the emancipation, when Africans were often persecuted because of their veil, their race, and how the malicious attacks by the Klu Klux Klan made clear the double consciousness in Africans. They saw themselves through the eyes of the KKK, white supremacists that view all other races as abominations. Du Bois also speaks of the shadow that follows Africans, the shadow of prejudice, assumptions by one group of people about another. He had to deal with assumptions about his lack of mental ability, or his strength. He was asked, "what need of education, since we must always cook and serve" (57), Du Bois and others took such assumptions as motivation, motivation to better themselves and show Whites why Africans need education, to show their true potential. How the double consciousness served to motivate his people to better themselves and become an integral part of American society. Both the veil and the double consciousness are still present in America today, not just with Africans but other races as well, Middle Easterners, and Asians. Middle Easterners have are aware that Americans view them as terrorists and are afraid that they have a bomb strapped to their chest. Asians have to deal with the stigma of being super intelligent, having unreasonable expectations placed upon them for no justifiable reason.

People are affected by race because it is the easiest way to tell people apart. Skin color is an ascribed status that we have no control over. Also, people of a different appearance often have a different culture than whites. The fact that one's culture may have ceremonies or beliefs that are different from whites are another reason that race affects us. For instance, traditional African dance and dress is radically different from that of white society. Because people do understand that culture and generally compare that culture to their own, acts considered normal in one culture may be considered deviant in another. Not understanding is one reason some crimes are committed against those are different. I think Du Bois would respond to what was written by saying that only way race has meaning is with the emotions that are ascribed to it. Any negative emotions tied to a race make it unacceptable, like the word "nigger." Taken by itself it is just a word, but add to it the negative meanings that have been attributed to it over the years, make it offensive to those of African descent. Today, "nigger" is used in popular culture and the negative annotations that were attributed to the word are changing, and the word is used in a less offensive way. However, there are many who still cling to those negative annotations and refuse to let the word's derogatory history fade away. Du Bois would see that the trappings of race to be decreased, affirmative action allows Africans to remain competitive in the workforce, and the equal opportunity acts allow possible instances of discrimination to be disputed legally. He would still have his veil and his double consciousness but the only limitations they have on him would be the limitations he himself feels.

References

Henslin, James M. 2007. *Sociology: A Down-to-Earth Approach – Core Concepts, 2nd ed.*

Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Howard, Eve L. 2007. *Classic Readings in Sociology.* Thomson-Wadsworth.

Social Theory and Illegal Immigration

Ryan Duletski
University of North Dakota

Presented at Great Plains Sociological Association Conference
October 2006
Grand Forks, North Dakota

This article is a good example of the research in its early stages by providing an excellent discussion of ideas that can lead to future research questions. Illegal immigration is a topic that everyone is familiar with. An individual or group of individuals emigrates from one country to another without abiding the laws upheld by the country they are choosing to seek refuge in. In this paper Ryan Duletski seeks to provide answers as to why illegal immigration persists and the potential problems that arise from it. Using very familiar theorists, Karl Marx and Ralph Dahrendorf, Duletski analyzes what happens when the draw of capitalist materialism is legitimized by the inaction of those holding authority. Duletski argues that those with authority must work to end illegal immigration in order to assist in the battle against exploitive capitalist practices.

Illegal immigration is a social issue that is present in the United States and is increasingly being brought into the political spotlight. Immigration can be viewed as the moving from one country to another in search of better opportunities for one's self and/or family. Illegal immigration in this sense is immigration through illegitimate means. Such illegitimate means consist of smuggling people on boats or in cars to cross borders. This can also be achieved by running or walking across the nation's borders at either Canada or most notably Mexico. Illegal immigration is an issue that affects all of us on both a public level and also on an individual level. This paper will explore the reasons behind illegal immigration by applying both Classical and Modern theories in a hope to better understand why people come into this country illegally.

Since illegal immigration is both a personal trouble and a public issue, it will be helpful to break it apart and explain why it pertains to both of these situations. Illegal immigration as a personal trouble can best be explained by how it affects individuals directly and indirectly. Individuals in the United States are affected directly in a number of ways. First off, illegal immigrants travel and disperse all over the United States. Such wide dispersal leads to more contact with individual citizens. This contact can lead to citizen problems if the immigrants are reported or dangerous. Secondly, illegal immigration directly affects the lives of illegal immigrants and members of their families. Many individuals travel illegally to the United States because they have family members who have obtained legal means of entering the country. These family members tell of the opportunities they have and encourage others to join them. Such illegal disclosure often puts the family's legal stay in jeopardy. Also, coming to the U.S. illegally often limits the individual's chance of ever obtaining legal entry. Lastly, individual law enforcement officers are affected because they must deal with illegal immigrants and the problems they may bring.

On an indirect level, individuals are being affected through the increase of law enforcement to prevent illegal immigration. With more and more people coming to the U.S. illegally, the Government must respond and increase manpower. This results in more taxes and strain for the individual. The only alternatives for these personal troubles are if immigrants start coming in legally through the use of green cards and visas. Only then will personal troubles and hardships due to illegal immigration stop.

While illegal immigration affects individuals, the application of the sociological imagination allows us to realize that it is also a public issue that spans across levels of society. People need to realize that they are not the first and only ones to experience the effects of illegal immigration. It affects everyone from local communities all the way up to a global impact. It affects small communities because they have to deal with illegal immigrants living and working in their neighborhoods. It then moves up to the regional and national level because it is affecting many communities. Regions and the nation as a whole must find a solution to control illegal immigration to maintain order and discipline. A good example of this is how the southwest United States is impacted by illegal immigration from the Mexican border. Everyone in the region is rallying together in hopes of preventing terror threats and an overrun of illegal immigrants. Lastly, this issue is on an international and global level because it crosses directly over the relationships between the U.S. and other countries. Ties with other countries can be strained if efforts are not made to reduce the influx of illegal immigration into the United States. A good example of this is how the United States is contemplating the building of a fence on the Mexican border to reduce drug trafficking and illegal immigration. Such a proposal has raised great offense in the minds and hearts of Mexican leadership.

The social structure is set up around this issue through the economy and politics. On one hand, certain businesses use illegal immigrants for cheap labor and thrive off of profit increases. This is countered politically through the active resistance of American citizens who don't feel that illegal immigrants should just be able to come into the country as they see fit. This issue also plays a role in the recent increase of terror threats. If illegal immigrants can easily penetrate our borders, how can the terrorists be stopped?

The social structures surrounding illegal immigration coincide with other parts of our society in the sense that they are all related in the desire to maintain order and preserve our freedoms.

In regards to history over time, illegal immigration has not changed a whole lot. Ever since the colonies were first formed, people were illegally coming into this land. Over time the regulations have gotten stricter and the means of entering more elaborate. Culturally, people in the United States hold great pride towards the integrity of the country. Most Americans make an honest living and contribute towards the present and future of their country. It is because of this that most Americans are not pleased with illegal immigration. While most feel that immigration in itself is great, they don't agree with illegally obtaining such freedoms that we are granted. In general, this feeling is not problematic. Such feelings only bind the nation stronger together against possible looming threats. People's thinking and behaviors can be contributed to recent 9/11 attacks. Americans feel that people who come here unwanted are only here to hurt them. Any change in behavior is not likely anytime soon. The American public is very consistent with its views towards illegal immigration and the people that partake in it.

Illegal immigration is a social issue that affects everyone in the United States on both a personal and public level. To help better understand this issue, one must explore deeper into it. A deeper exploration of this social issue can be done by applying the ideas of a classical theorist and see how a classical theory can better explain a modern social issue. The classical theorist that best identifies with illegal immigration is Karl Marx. Marx is a conflict theorist whose focus lies in capitalism and on the idea of historical materialism, human potential, and the epochs of society. This paper will address Marx and his theory, how it pertains to modern society, and how it explains illegal immigration in some detail.

Since Marx is a 19th century theorist it may seem complex as to how his theories pertain to a modern issue such as illegal immigration. In order to better understand this relationship, one must first fully understand all of the ideas behind Marx's theories and how they are applied. Marx's theory of capitalism contains many different aspects. The first aspect to be looked at is that of historical materialism. Historical materialism is the idea that all things in a society have a relation to material goods. Essentially, this means that no matter what one looks at in a society, it all comes down to having material possessions. Within historical materialism there is a material base and a superstructure. Through the material base, there are forces of production and relations of production. Forces of production are basically the essentials needed to produce material goods. These are commonly referred to as raw materials, human labor, and technology. Relations of production describe how things within this are intertwined and related. The superstructure of historical materialism is described as the ideology that surrounds materialism. This basically means that there is more beyond the surface and that materialism goes deep within our society. The overall view of historical materialism is that material goods have always played a role in society and most likely will continue to function in the same way. Through historical

materialism, illegal immigration can be better understood. The concepts of America and American life span all countries all over the world. Most countries are very familiar with how wealthy Americans are and the amount of possessions that Americans own (i.e. cars, houses, boats, property, clothes, and jewelry). Television and the media, along with foreign leaders have displayed America as the one place where dreams come true and material possessions are achieved. Since citizens of most other countries do not have it as well off as the United States, many are envious and would certainly like to partake in the ‘American Dream.’ It is because of this that illegal aliens are willing to do anything to obtain the same lifestyle that we Americans enjoy and take for granted. If legitimate means are not possible, illegal means are the only way that such material success can be obtained. The second aspect of this relation takes part when the illegal aliens make entry into the United States. The forces of production require labor and if possible cheap labor. When illegal immigrants make entry into the United States, their options are limited and they end up working physical labor jobs for little money. This benefits the capitalist who owns the production because they can make a higher profit by using such cheap labor. Overall, illegal immigration is a direct result of the high value placed on material goods in America and how this ideology has expanded to poorer and more desperate cultures who strive to mirror our society and obtain the same possessions.

The second aspect of Marx’s theory of capitalism is that of human potential. Marx believed that human beings are capable of achieving higher capacities than just simply maintaining and surviving. He felt that human beings could achieve their highest level of thoughts, consciousness, and actions if given the right opportunities. Marx felt that this could be achieved through a society in which everyone is on an equal “playing field.” Marx felt that it was necessary for societies to advance towards communism in order to achieve full human

potential and to steer away from materialism. He explained that there are four epochs or stages that societies generally travel through. These stages are primitive societies, Asiatic/Ancient/Feudal societies, capitalist societies, and socialist societies. The first of these, the primitive societies are exactly what they sound like. They rely on foraging the land for survival, have no class structures, and have achieved low human potential. These societies do not strive for anything other than the basic necessities. Without these met, they cannot even begin to comprehend greater ideas. The next society Marx described is Asiatic/Ancient/Feudal societies. These types of societies rely heavily on maintaining power relations. Groups are distinguished separately but not sophisticated enough to allow stable human potential. A good example of one of these types of societies is how feudal lords used to operate their lands in the days of old and can even be used to explain how some modern countries are run today.

The relation to illegal immigration here lies in the fact that illegal immigrants are poor and are not given the same opportunities in their native countries. These individuals view America as the only place that they can really achieve something and perhaps strive for more than just sheer survival. Some also feel that if they can make enough money in America, they can afford to improve their own lives and that of their relatives back in their own countries. According to Marx, this is merely a movement towards achieving higher human potential instead of just sustaining one's existence.

The third epoch of society that Marx described is that of Capitalism. Our modern society is now in a state of capitalism. Capitalist societies such as ours rely heavily on a material base in which forces of production are necessary. Relations of production are also very distinct. Under the relations of production as described by Marx, there are two types of classes; the proletariat and the capitalists (bourgeoisie). The proletariats are essentially the workers in a society. These

individuals are paid wages and are used for their labor value. The proletariat work for the bourgeoisie, who control the power of production. The bourgeoisie establish what the proletariat will work for in terms of wages and strive to achieve surplus value. This surplus value is essentially profit that the bourgeoisie receive in order to consume more material products. Illegal immigrants are in essence perfect for this because they will quite frankly work for very little compensation, therefore increasing the amount of surplus value.

According to Marx, there are three major problems with capitalism. These problems are exploitation, alienation, and false consciousness. Exploitation can be described as the exploiting of workers by the bourgeoisie. This is done by having workers work long hours in order to achieve higher surplus value for the capitalists. Alienation explains the loss of connections that workers experience between their activities and fellow workers. In other societies, the workers aren't pushed as hard to produce such high results. This high demand for profits turns workers into sort of robots that just do their part in the work and receive their wages. Lastly, false consciousness is when "both the proletariat and the capitalists have an inaccurate sense of themselves, their relationship to one another, and the way in which capitalism operates" (Ritzer, 2003). In general, this means that the workers don't really feel that they are being exploited for cheap labor and that the bourgeoisie don't really feel that they are going overboard in their desire for profits. Illegal immigrants help to fuel all three of these problems. Illegal immigrants are easily exploited as very cheap and non-complainant labor. They are also very alienated from their work in instances where they do not share a common language. Lastly, aliens experience the feeling of false consciousness by not knowing that they are being exploited and allowing the bourgeoisie to feel comfortable in having such cheap labor at their disposal. Also, the illegal immigrants who come to America to work don't realize that their illegal presence will not really

fully allow them the opportunities that the 'American Dream' projects. Overall, capitalism is furthered along by illegal immigration.

The final epoch of society is that of socialism. Socialism differs from that of capitalism in that there is no need to own; therefore reducing the need for materialism. There are also easing class divisions. This helps to eliminate the problems commonly associated with class divisions that capitalism is all too familiar with. Marx felt that socialism was approaching the point of communism in which full human potential can be achieved. So long as illegal immigrants are willing to come to America to work for low wages, we will maintain our present state of capitalism. This in turn will keep the people of the United States that much farther away from Marx's view of human potential.

Of the four epochs described, our modern American society is in a state of capitalism. In our society today, there is blatant evidence that there are class divisions. Within these class divisions, one can easily distinguish between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Through these class structures, the poor are exploited and the rich become richer. American ideals marvel in the idea of free enterprise and the chance to become extremely rich. The rise of computers, the internet, and mega-stores (i.e. Wal-Mart), have made the dream of becoming rich seemingly possible for anyone. This chance is known by all of those worldwide. People immigrate into the United States every day hoping for a chance to partake in some of the wealth and success that we are so noted for. However, Marx warns us of the problems with such pursuits and the haste with which they are obtained. Illegal immigration is a direct result of this necessity to have material goods. Too much emphasis on materials on a worldwide scale without opportunity to achieve such things will only result in what we as Americans now deal with as illegal immigration.

Illegal immigration affects all Americans on a personal and public level. In an attempt to

better understand the issue, we have explored it through the capitalist theory of Karl Marx. Marx allowed us to better understand the issue from a classical perspective. Now, in order to get an even better grasp on the issue, we must relate illegal immigration to a contemporary sociological theory. The contemporary theorist that best identifies with illegal immigration is Ralf Dahrendorf. The theory that Dahrendorf presents is the conflict theory of authority and of groups. While Dahrendorf relates some of his ideas back to Marx and other conflict theorists, his ideas are powerful and help to explain the social issue of illegal immigration.

Just as with Marx, in order to understand how Dahrendorf's theory relates to illegal immigration, one must fully understand the ideas that he presents. Dahrendorf's theory is composed of two parts. The first aspect to be looked at is the idea of authority. Authority is defined as power tied to a social position. It is important to remember that it is a position that holds authority, not the individual person. This essentially means that without their particular position, the person in authority would hold no authority at all. It is through this power that many issues and problems can and do arise. Before the issues and problems of authority can be addressed, the components of authority must be fully understood.

The components of authority include super/sub-ordination, expectation of control, legitimacy in position, spheres of control, and sanctions. The first of these is super/sub-ordination. The idea behind super-ordination and subordination is that people within the realm of authority are in either super-ordinate or subordinate positions. In this context people in super-ordinate positions hold power and control over the people in the subordinate positions which essentially forms a hierarchy of authority. The next component to be discussed is the expectation of control. Expectation of control basically asserts that people in super-ordinate positions are expected to control those in subordinate positions. Subordinate people are dominated by these

expectations rather than the personal characteristics of the individual holding the position. After expectation of control comes legitimacy in position. Legitimacy in position essentially states that those in positions of authority have been granted this power and legitimacy by others in society. This authority is granted by those around them and therefore makes it legitimate. This also ties in with the spheres of control, which are specified in society. Spheres of control are certain areas, recognized by all, in which control and authority take place. The spheres of control are where people in super-ordinate positions can dominate over those in the subordinate positions. The last component of authority to be discussed is that of sanctions. Sanctions are what can be brought down on those who do not comply with authority. Sanctions are possible because the authority that defines them is legitimate.

Once the general components of authority have been defined, it is easy to piece together how illegal immigration ties in with it. With the concept of super/sub-ordination, illegal immigration is defined as illegal by those in position of power. Government and law enforcement officials dictate what is acceptable in regards to immigration. People with such power say that it is wrong for people to come to this country illegally. In regards to law enforcement, police officers and border patrol agents hold power over illegal immigrants and those who assist them. Regardless of the type of person each individual agent is, their position holds power over people and they are able to deport illegal immigrants who try to cross into our nation's borders. They can also arrest and detain certain individuals who may try to assist illegal aliens. The main point in this relationship is that those who break the law are subjected to the enforcers' rules and regulations.

With the expectation of control, the people in positions of authority such as border patrol agents are expected to maintain order and keep our borders free from illegal aliens. They have

been granted this authority by the society of the United States. They are essentially upholding the beliefs of an entire nation (or at least the majority of the voting population). If these agents and politicians did not express their authority over illegal aliens then the American public would be outraged and they would basically lose their jobs and their positions of authority. It is along with this expectation of control that people in authority are granted legitimacy by others to do what they do. As stated earlier, they represent the agenda of an entire nation. Through this representation, they are allowed to enforce decided rules and regulations on all of those who violate them. Since it is legitimate, the power that these individuals hold cannot be questioned by those that it is enforced on. This means that those who try to illegally enter this country and those who assist these sorts of people, cannot legally complain about those with power attempting to shut down their activities. As long as their legitimacy remains, those with authority can exercise their power to the fullest extent.

From here it is easy to see the spheres of control that are formed around illegal immigration. There are essentially two different groups in power; the lawmakers (i.e. politicians) and the law enforcers (i.e. border patrol agents). The lawmakers control what is allowed on a national level. They right the laws that state how one may gain access to this country and what happens when one tries to gain illegal access. They control the political realm and have authority more in the form of paper and documents than in actual physical control. The law enforcers on the other hand form a sphere of direct control over those who attempt to or are already involved with illegal immigration. They are the ones who go around and physically enforce the laws that the lawmakers have established through their own authority. Law enforcers exercise authority by arresting individuals and enforcing the last component of authority; sanctions. In the realm of illegal immigration, sanctions are essentially what happen when one is

found to be in violation of the laws and regulations of this country. Sanctions can vary from a fine or temporary shutdown, as is the case with large firms found to be in violation of immigration practices. They can also be on the end of arrest and deportation, as is the case with most individual persons who are found to be participating in illegal immigration practices. The sanctions imposed most often affect the illegal aliens themselves in that their efforts are hindered by being arrested and eventually deported back to their original country. Overall, the components of authority relate directly to illegal immigration and how individuals respond and are responded to with authority that is present around it.

While the components of authority help to explain how illegal immigration is addressed, there is also the aspect of imperatively coordinated associations that must be viewed. Imperatively coordinated associations are “associations of people controlled by a hierarchy of authority positions.” (Ritzer 98) This definition addresses how people in subordinate positions in one setting may be in super-ordinate positions in the next setting. This relates to illegal immigration in that people who are doing well in the United States legally and essentially maintain some authority over foreigners are willing to turn around and assist those who wish to obtain illegal residency. This is most common in family members who are legal but are trying to retrieve their relatives from their native lands. The entire system shows how individuals can swap positions and make transfers along the hierarchy of authority that is present.

The last issue that Dahrendorf addresses in his theory of authority is how there are distinct groups and how conflict arises from the authority. The three categories of groups that he presents are quasi, interest, and conflict groups. Quasi groups are like the American public in that they all have the same role interests. Their interests are to keep their country safe and to maintain order within the immigration that occurs. Interest groups share common interests but

also have structure, goals, and personnel. Interest groups in regard to illegal immigration can be viewed as people who believe in illegal immigration and help participate in it and people who view illegal immigration as wrong and work to prevent and stop it. It is through interest groups that conflict groups emerge. When two or more interest groups disagree, they can engage in conflict and form this third type of group. With the two opposing sides of illegal immigration, it is easy to see how conflict comes about. The two different groups are on opposing ends of the authority spectrum. Those who are against it have the authority to prevent it and those who are for it must deal with the sanctions that are imposed upon them for attempting actions currently deemed illegal by those holding authority. Because the authority to control illegal immigration is made legitimate by society, those who are subordinate are on the losing battle of the conflict.

Through the application of authority, it is easy to see why illegal immigration is in the state that it is in. Power is legitimated to certain individuals to make laws and to individuals to uphold these laws. Sanctions are imposed on those who do not comply with those in authority positions. Attempting to enter a country in which they do not belong, illegal aliens are faced with powerful opposition. America values its laws and its' established systems of self-protection. When illegal aliens try to undercut this, our society responds. It is through the backing of its citizens that our country has positions of authority with which to deal with such issues. As long as Americans remain in relative consensus on their views towards illegal immigration, there will always be positions of authority to maintain the desired goal of diminishing it.

By analyzing theorists such as Marx and Dahrendorf, one can see why illegal immigration is the way it is and why it is occurring in the first place. The only real question that remains is; where is illegal immigration headed? Marx discussed conflict that arises out of

capitalism and Dahrendorf explains how authority contributes. Both of these theories help to guide where the future of illegal immigration is going.

The three time ranges to look at are immediate, long term, and distant future. First off, on an immediate scale (the next 5 years), illegal immigration will remain to stay “out of control”. That is, highly unregulated and relatively easy. Right now there are not enough individuals to guard and protect our nation’s borders. Within the next 5 years, the U.S. government should be able to crack down on illegal entry. In the long term (5 to 10 years), I feel that illegal immigration will be greatly reduced. By the time the government fortifies its borders with personnel, entry into this country will be greatly reduced. As far as the distant future (beyond 10 years) is concerned, I foresee great changes in the ways of illegal immigration. With time the U.S. will slowly but surely close off its borders and force everyone coming in and out to go through rigorous checkpoints. The future will also bring us better technology with which to counter alien attempts at entry. These predictions can be fortified by Dahrendorf in the sense that those with authority will enhance the rules and the physical control. Those given authority will speak for the whole of the United States and greatly reduce the amount of illegal immigration that is occurring.

All the changes that are due in light of illegal immigration will most likely occur through a gradual reversal of the current trend. Currently, illegal aliens are making relatively easy passage into the United States. I feel that it will take a few years (5-10) for the government to catch up and really be able to do something about it. An example of this is how it takes a year to be hired as a border patrol agent. Stacking of border personnel is something that will take time and cannot be rushed into. It is because of this that the situation will continue as is for a little while longer.

While one can see where this social issue is headed, we can also see what must be done to get it there. Controlling and ultimately preventing illegal immigration must be done on a societal and public level. Individuals must join together if something is to be accomplished. While Marx would say that we need to eliminate capitalism altogether, I feel that we just need to give other countries the same opportunities that we have. This means that perhaps we should open up more opportunities for work passes and legal immigration. Also, we all personally could help to contribute financially to assistance programs to help poorer countries. The goal of this would be to help other countries help themselves. If foreign situations are not that bad then they perhaps will not strive to come to the U.S. While this idea is high and mighty, it will not prevent all illegal entry. This is where authority and Dahrendorf step in. I feel that people in authority need to step up and make policies to better control illegal immigration. This would mean stricter laws/penalties with more border patrol agents to enforce the laws. With tighter borders and better opportunities for neighboring countries, I feel that the U.S. will have much less illegal immigration to worry about.

With a nation such as the U.S., it is easy to see why people would do literally anything to obtain entry. We are the richest and most powerful country in the world. Through recent terrorist strikes, we must maintain our present state through tighter security. I personally am applying for a position with customs/border patrol. I hope to one day do my part in preventing illegal aliens and other terrorist threats from entering our country. While I am not extremely conservative, I feel that there are better means of entering into the United States. Everyone deserves a chance to live the American Dream. After all, we are all immigrants of some sort.

References

Ritzer, George. 2003. *Contemporary Sociological Theory and Its Classical Roots: The Basics*.
NY: McGraw-Hill.

A Sociological Explanation of Attitudes Toward the Criminal Justice System

Bethany Langton
University of North Dakota

Presented at Great Plains Sociological Association Conference
October 2006
Grand Forks, North Dakota
Honorable Mention – Student Paper Competition

If you are looking for an example of how to use sociology as a tool for understanding, you have found it with this paper. Following the tradition of the first edition of this journal, the following paper by Bethany Langton is a great example of using a sociological lens to discuss issues that affect a wide variety of individuals. Putting Darhendorf's ideas on authority against Durkheim's ideas of collective conscience, Langton gives a very clear description of why the criminal justice system is a "paradox of progress." By providing a clear description and discussion which explains this paradox and its origins, Langton seeks to pinpoint the core problems hindering the criminal justice system and the resulting lack of trust that individuals hold towards this institution.

Societal views and beliefs become more complex and cynical as they are caught in a cycle of change and more liberal ideas are introduced. This untrustworthy aura that surrounds many new organizations today has not excluded many of the older institutions that are in desperate need of societal support. The criminal justice system in America today is a paradox of progress. While the fairness and effectiveness of criminal justice have improved, public trust and confidence have not. This paper will pinpoint the core of the problem regarding lack of trust in the criminal justice system within various sections.

First, a general history of the issue will be given in an attempt to determine within what societal level the issue falls upon. This history will be explained and sociologically connected with a following discussion of the sociological imagination. Next, the social reasons for society's lack of confidence in the criminal justice system will be explained through both classical and modern theory, focusing mainly on the theory of functionalism. The lack of confidence found throughout society will then be addressed through this theory focusing on the main concepts of the theory, including; social systems, interdependence, and shared values. Finally, this paper will represent social factors, such as race and status, and show how they play a role in the formation of individual opinion through social systems, concepts, and structures.

Origins of the “Paradox of Progress”

Historically, the lack of faith in the criminal justice system can be dated back to when English Common Law was still used as the basis for policing and punishment. During this time, the law was written parallel to values that were similar among most people. The shared values represented, for the most part, were religious beliefs which made the description of each law very distinct. While crime was parallel to sin, many individuals feared the criminal justice system. As society has changed over the decades, many citizens have turned their fear of the

criminal justice system into anger as more and more individuals lose trust in the system each year. The last few years have shown no change as citizens have continuously decreased their trust in the criminal justice system. Recent Gallup polls have consistently found that Americans have less confidence in the criminal justice system than in other institutions, such as banking, the medical system, public schools, television news, and organized labor (Sherman 2002). Because of the system's importance to the functioning of the government, it is important for individual opinions to be changed. The question is, will the change start with the individual, or is this issue manifested on a larger level?

The criminal justice system and the opinions society has regarding it affect each individual living in the country as each person has the right to feel confident about his or her justice system. Whether one is being processed through the criminal justice system or has a member that is professionally involved, the system touches all on some level. To feel safe and secure in our environment is a right that should be protected by the government. When individuals feel they are not protected, biases can turn into violent social problems that may have been prevented. However important each individual opinion is to ones self, the issue is relevant on a much larger scale, as it is society that suffers the greater loss due to lack of trust in the criminal justice system. The relevance lies within the structure of social systems that form these individual opinions that one takes in as their own on a day to day basis.

This lack of trust is, therefore, a national issue, that is consistent with a breakdown of function and a disappearance of shared values among society. The government, the people: the whites and blacks, the criminal justice system, the media, and the elite are all social systems that affect the opinions of each individual, whether consciously or subconsciously through shaping the economy and the cultures of the people. The biased opinions that an individual may hold are

not necessarily their “own” opinions, but are given to them by the culture in which they grew up. Culture, in this regard, represents one’s race, status, religion, value system and general way of life. By becoming in touch with ones own sociological imagination, which includes understanding ones history, experiences, values, and culture, each individual will become more aware of why they hold the opinion that they do regarding the criminal justice system.

There are alternatives to the negative views that individuals have toward the criminal justice system. They could support the system, not care either way, or try and do things to correct the system, at least in their own environment. However, it is hard for individuals to correct something, or make an informed decision on the subject when they are not aware of the “bigger picture.” What is more important for individuals to understand is why they feel the way they do. Society needs to recognize the forces that come into play and that ultimately affect the decisions that they make about the criminal justice system. Through recognition of the social structures, processes, social systems, and cultures involved, they will better understand their own opinions and how they are formed. The process of uncovering their sociological imagination will open up the minds of American citizens and help them realize that the opinions they have are not necessarily their “own” but are those shared by their culture’s set of values.

Theoretical Application

Before opinions about the criminal justice system of today had even begun to develop, an explanation of its progression and other likewise social phenomenon had already been proposed. To begin to understand the negative views individuals have towards the criminal justice system, we must first journey into the ideas of a French sociologist named Emile Durkheim, who focused an important part of his study on the collective conscience and the basic concepts supporting it.

Durkheim proposed the idea of the collective conscience, which exists among individuals within a given society. It refers to the entire existence of beliefs and sentiments, or feelings that are common to the average member of the society (Ritzer 2003). The collective conscience is directed toward the non-material culture of society, focusing on shared ideas among individuals versus monetary goods. It varies from society to society and is the product of diverse causes, with each individual slightly affecting that of the whole.

However, this collective conscience which Durkheim proposed is suggested to grow increasingly weaker as civilizations become more complex and industrialize themselves. The mechanical societies, which were small and held a deeply regarded collective conscience, will soon turn to what Durkheim called organic societies, which is the type we see in mainstream America today. Within this new and developed society, Durkheim proposed that the collective conscience that was once strong will diminish, and individuals will have less concern for sentiments related to collective things, such as values associated with family, or the institution of religion. In turn, they will have a greater concern for feelings of respect toward the lives of people and the freedom of individuals. The focus on humanity will greatly increase. Individuals will feel a greater compassion for others as they are less concerned with the older instituted values that the collective conscience once promoted if moral education is instilled in them.

Within the concepts just explained, is a double-edged sword. The weakening of the collective conscience will draw certain social systems and groups to come out of their shell and develop new, and sometimes, contradictory beliefs about what is acceptable or unacceptable within their society. Because these systems are made up of relationships between people, the more the people within the system bond, the less likely they are to be accepting of those from another system. The farther these individual's views and opinions travel from each other, the

stronger the bond within that group becomes. It is important to mention that these groups, whether separate in opinion or similar are still forced to interact with each other in society. The difference between groups and the disappearance of the strong collective conscience have left industrialized societies to judge acts differently. Consequently, one person may have a quite distorted view of what is wrong or right in another's eyes.

While this collective conscience is weakening, the counter-effect of an ever growing response to the importance of humanity is becoming stronger among individuals. This negative relationship between the collective conscious and the promotion of humanity will, according to Durkheim, exist in all organic societies.

Within these societies, a form of punishment unlike that used in a society with a strong collective conscience will also exist. As we have already discussed, Durkheim predicted that primitive societies would make way for what he called organic societies that would hold slightly different forms, or lack thereof, of collective feelings. The punishment within these societies would also change radically. Instead of being a strict and severe form of punishment as illustrated in the mechanical or primitive societies, a less severe type of punishment would be used in organic societies. Durkheim referred to this form of punishment as restitutive law (Ritzer 2003). This law does not hash out harsh punishments, but rather determines that people need to comply with the law. Like the term implies, people would be expected to pay restitution for their actions to those harmed.

How do these ideas and concepts proposed by Durkheim have any relevance with the ever growing negative attitudes toward the criminal justice system today? Let us discuss these concepts with regard to the present nature of the criminal justice system by exploring the attitudes on a societal level.

The collective conscience is nothing if not referring to human feelings on a societal level. Let us assume that Durkheim is correct, that there has been a decline in the collective conscience that was once known in American society. In colonial times, there was a strong collective conscience about what should be done about crime; deter and incapacitate. There were prisons being built and public punishments being executed in order to turn people away from crime out of fear of punishment. As America grew, and communities grew into cities with large numbers of people, the collective conscience weakened tremendously. Today, it is almost non-existent within the criminal justice system, as new groups emerge with different propositions as to how crime should be handled.

The differences in opinions tend to be parallel with the differences in ethnicity. Perhaps the immigration that has occurred over the years into American culture has affected the collective conscience once present. The once agreed upon ideas of what should be done about crime, which have a direct effect on individual's attitudes toward the criminal justice system have broken on racial borders. For example, Americans have expressed a clear preference for prevention as the best strategy overall. However, some strongly suggest a different outcome. African Americans place a greater emphasis on the rehabilitation of offenders, in fact, African Americans place rehabilitation of offenders as their top priority. Hispanics, on the other hand, are the greatest supporters of prevention and strict punishment (Hart 2002).

Perhaps race/ethnicity is not the only factor diminishing the collective conscience once known. Education seems to be displaying a likewise effect. College graduates are twice as likely to choose the progressive approaches over the punitive approaches whereas those with a high school degree or less are divided in their preference between prevention and rehabilitation (Hart 2002).

While the criminal justice system tries to please each preference, and equally, each social group, it slowly divides attention among the different propositions for enforcement. Soon, each group is unsatisfied, some more than others, but not one super-exceeding above the rest. In this way, the weakening of the collective conscience is directly related with the negative views that society has toward the criminal justice system.

The diminishing effect of the collective conscience as societies develop is definitely related to public opinion; however, there is a counter-effect taking place that has an equal part in the phenomenon. The development of stronger feelings toward humanity, as Durkheim predicted, has definitely become more apparent among social systems in our society. There has been a shift in the public opinion and people are now re-considering whether prison is the right solution for some offenders. The idea of incapacitation is not as popular as it used to be and is becoming frowned upon by more and more members of society. The “get-tough on crime” views that once existed are losing ground as society is becoming frustrated with mandatory sentencing and death sentences. People are beginning to consider the feelings of others and are humanizing the system. Instead of regarding spiritual religion as important there has been an introduction of what has been called the “religion of humanity.”

As Durkheim predicts, with the weakening of the collective conscience and the strengthening of the sentiments toward humanity, a new form of punishment would prevail known as restitutive punishment. This form of punishment is present in today’s system. Paying restitution to the victims of crime is an important aspect of the criminal justice system, especially, within the judicial boundaries. However, many believe that the victims’ payback comes far and few between. Individuals care more about the lives of others, in turn; they are far more worried about crimes that have victims, versus victimless crimes such as prostitution, or

arguably, drug use. Because of America's focus on drug policies, Americans have become ever pessimistic toward the amount of time and money being spent on drug-related, "victimless" crimes.

The conclusive aura that surrounds these concepts presented by Durkheim almost seems an inevitable process, however, the backbone of the problem lies within the division of the social groups, the weakening of the collective conscience, and ultimately the strengthening of the sentiments concerning humanity that, if present, will likely not allow a positive view toward the criminal justice system to exist. In effect, the ever diminishing collective conscience will be the final judge of the system's fate.

Through Durkheim and his ideas concerning functionalism and the collective conscious, the ever increasing negative attitudes toward the criminal justice system can be explained by a weakening of the collective conscious which in turn promotes social systems and structures which develop their own unique ideas. These ideas collide with each other and consequently form opposing views of how the criminal justice system should function, leaving the system to disappoint certain groups at different times. However, this is just the beginning of the explanation. Let us explore these conflicting groups in an attempt to further explain the phenomenon of negative attitudes toward the criminal justice system with a focus on the formation of positions within these groups, and an explanation as to what these characteristics have in relation to this phenomenon.

The following discussion will examine these conflicting groups in depth, focusing on a key theorist in the conflict perspective, Ralf Dahrendorf. First, an outline of some of Dahrendorf's key ideas will be discussed including: (1) authority, the formation of interest groups, and the relationship of conflict to change followed by a (2) detailed correlation of

Dahrendorf's ideas and their relevance to the formation and continuance of negative attitudes toward the criminal justice system.

Conflict theory can be looked at as a clear reaction to the breakdown of functionalism or in this case, the breakdown of the collective conscience. Dahrendorf theorized that systematic social conflicts are caused by the differential distribution of authority among citizens (Ritzer 2003). Dahrendorf recognized that different positions within society held different amounts of authority. This authority did not reside within the individual however, it resided within the position that the individual held. With authority came either a position of subordination or superordination, or sometimes both. Dahrendorf describes authority as not being generalized, but as people holding specific "spheres of control" within society. The individual with the authority in one place or institution does not necessarily hold the same authority in another set of circumstances. In turn, one who is in a subordinate position in one set of circumstances may hold a superordinate position in another which is parallel with Dahrendorf's idea of imperatively coordinated associations. Authority is not constant in this way, however, the authority one receives from their position within their sphere of control is and because it is legitimate, sanctions may be imposed upon those who do not follow the orders of the superordinate (Ritzer 2003).

Dahrendorf went on to describe the authority within each association as dichotomous, which means that only two conflict groups can be formed. Those who are in opposite positions, such as superordinate and subordinate, are in conflict with one another. These opposing groups hold separate interests (Ritzer 2003). The interests held are not exactly those of the individual to begin with, but are determined by the individual's position. In fact, the individual does not even have to be conscious of these interests. If they hold the position, the interests will be present.

Dahrendorf labeled these unconscious concerns that come with a position, latent interests. The superordinate group, which is the dominant position, seeks to keep things the way they are and maintain the organization's values, while the subordinate group seeks change (Ritzer 2003).

The subordinate group seeks this change through phases. It starts as what Dahrendorf calls a quasi group, or individuals who have positions that have similar interests. The quasi group is the recruitment ground for further formation of the interest group. The interest group is actually recognized sociologically as a real group. They have common interests and also have a goal or outcome in mind. These groups have the ability to start conflict. The third group after complete formation is the conflict group. These groups stand up to their title and actually engage in conflict while portraying the characteristics of the previous groups (Ritzer 2003).

In Dahrendorf's theory, he recognized that conflicts may actually maintain the traditional values of the organization and ironically not cause the change that the conflict group was seeking. However, he also hypothesized that conflict can lead to change and development into new ideas and traditions. The amount of change that occurs depends on the intensity of the conflict and the path that the conflict takes. For example, if the conflict is severe and intense, the change may be much defined. Both the relationship between conflict and change and conflict and no change are important in reference to this phenomenon.

At this point in the discussion, it is appropriate to begin correlating Dahrendorf's key ideas with the phenomenon representing ever increasing negative attitudes toward the criminal justice system. To start this endeavor, let us begin to understand who has the authority within this phenomenon and what it means to have it. The criminal justice system has always been a mechanism of conflict within itself, however, there is a bigger conflict arising in this situation, that is, the conflict between the people and the system. This conflict is fueling American

citizens' opinions toward the criminal justice system and the authority it embarks. Within this phenomenon, the criminal justice system represents the superordinate position. With recognition that there are subordinate positions within this system, let us focus on the larger scale picture in reference to the American people. To break it down, the system holds the authority. The authority was given to the individuals within the system, by the system. Each aspect of the system represents a sphere of control; corrections, judicial, law enforcement, etc. Each sphere of control holds separate yet distinctly written sanctions. The corrections department has prison regulations which direct the prisoner's behavior within their controlled environment. The judicial system likewise has sanctions that prohibit certain conduct within its boundaries. Finally, there is the sphere of control within the law enforcement agencies, which are subject to the most public scrutiny because of their daily representation of the entire system. The law enforcement agencies hold the majority, next to the prisons, of hostility from the public's perceptions (Sherman 2002).

Although Dahrendorf specified that authority was not a general phenomenon, within the views of society toward the criminal justice system, it has been transformed into one. If an individual has a biased attitude toward one aspect of the system and has fallen into a bias toward that particular sphere of control, it tends to carry over to the authority within the other aspects of the system. Through time, these biased feelings will spread toward others with whom the individual is connected, leaving society with entire groups having conflicting feelings toward the criminal justice system and its exertion of authority.

These groups do not just appear however, they have a very certain process of formation which had been explained through the eyes of Dahrendorf earlier in the discussion. At the very first level, the quasi group is formed. This would represent individuals who have accepted and

maintained biases toward the criminal justice system on some level. At this time, they recognize others who are also holding biases toward the criminal justice system. This is where the process begins and people are, as Dahrendorf stated, “recruited” (Ritzer 2003). Within time, these people will fully recognize each others biases and search for a common goal. A structure is built within the group and common interests are found, representing the second stage, the interest group. The third stage, the conflict group, represents those groups that advocate for change in the criminal justice system today. In present society, these groups are defined by race, education, and status. These three things have been directly correlated with specific and defining changes being sought within the criminal justice system (Hart 2002). They are conflict groups because they are engaging in conflict and ultimately, engaging in the promotion of change.

However hard these conflict groups fight for change which would further support their own interests, the superordinate position or the criminal justice system officials, are advocating their own interests. Laws are being processed and followed in accordance with the interest of those in authority. Because of these circumstances, it is my prediction that the more intense and violent the conflict becomes the result will be one of two things; quick structural and political change associated with criminal justice policies and procedures or the superordinate authority will prevail, leaving the subordinate conflict group on a plateau of unchanging impossibilities.

In conclusion, the authority exerted within Dahrendorf’s theory may actually, in itself be, the endearing factor that holds superordinate positions, like those of criminal justice officials, within their reign. Consequently, it is deeming those in subordinate positions powerless and unable to change a system that they believe is foreshadowing their lives.

Discussion

The opinions and attitudes that have formed toward the criminal justice system through the eyes of Durkheim and Dahrendorf can conclude an aura of different things. However, with acknowledgement of the history surrounding this issue it is safe to say that future power struggles, as Dahrendorf readily predicted, will remain apparent for years to come. Until all groups that are affected by the criminal justice system can agree on a single cooperative solution that the government feels is not unfavorable in their own respect, there will be endless struggles between all groups within society, and an even larger struggle between these groups and the government.

The change that has occurred within the criminal justice system over the decades has been a gradual battle with a goal of agreement between all of society's conflicting groups. Because of this consistent source of change, I propose that the change will remain consistently steady in the future. There may be some radical attempts at a quick change, but as Dahrendorf concluded, radical attempts will either end in very abrupt social change or an increasing amount of government control over the criminal justice system as they attempt to tighten their authority and ultimately satisfy their own objectives. Therefore, these attempts, as many have in the past, will in my opinion likely fail or persist to make minor changes within a phenomenon that requires major change.

If change is to be seen by society, it will become apparent in the distant future, as changes within a system that is controlled by the government is anything but speedy. Within increments of twenty to thirty years, there will be available more observable changes within the system. The small changes in this amount of time will have a domino effect in producing a

significant change. On their own, they are not pronounced, but together, the change is likely to have an effect on both the system and the individuals who wish to change it.

The focus then shall be to promote these small changes within different aspects of the system to help build the significant, larger, evolution of the system. Individually, there is much that can be done to promote change within the criminal justice system. Each case that is pending is a building block within the legislations and sentences that are imposed among those involved in the criminal justice system. Each person that becomes engaged within the system, whether in occupation or confrontation is inevitably affecting the overall application of the system and can promote change within the collective conscience. Through these encounters, individuals can change the system and promote new legislation that will produce positive outcomes within their situations.

When looking at this on an individual level, it seems rather weak. However, revolutionary change within this system is dependent on individuals. Individual cases and encounters are what bring these groups and systems to grow cohesive and cause significant change. The strengthening of the collective conscious among individuals of society is the key factor in producing change within the criminal justice system. If groups come together and formulate cooperative ideas that promote genuine equality for each individual in all aspects of the system, it will end the conflict between the social systems and within society and the only conflict left will be with that of the system itself.

In conclusion, Dahrendorf and Durkheim's ideas concerning sociological theory may have held the key to determining the solution to the phenomenon of negative attitudes toward the criminal justice system. Sociology, in essence, becomes a key to another social science.

References

- Hart, Peter D. 2002. "Changing Public Attitudes Toward the Criminal Justice System." *The Open Society Institute* 02/05.
- Ritzer, George. 2003. *Contemporary Sociological Theory and its Classical Roots: The Basics*. McGraw Hill; New York, NY.
- Sherman, Lawrence W. 2002. "Trust and Confidence in Criminal Justice." *Criminal Justice Annual Editions* 04/05.

Elder Abuse: Perspectives from Sociology

Rachel O'Neal
University of North Dakota

Presented at Great Plains Sociological Association Conference
October 2006
Grand Forks, North Dakota
1st Place Winner – Student Paper Competition

Leave it to theorists Max Weber and Zygmunt Bauman to surround our thoughts with iron cages and moral dilemmas; but leave it to Rachel O'Neal to take these concepts and apply them to another issue of utmost importance to our society: elder abuse. Similar to previous articles, O'Neal seeks to provide insight into why elder abuse continues to be a problem by applying discussing a wide range of topics from Weber's types of rationality to Bauman's views on a post-modern world. In society today, O'Neal would argue, elder abuse as a social problem "flies under the radar" because of a lack of strict formal regulations that deal with this issue. As a society that places (or at least says to place) high value on our elderly population this problem must become a public issue in order to combat the personal traumas that are the result of elder abuse.

If most cultures socialize their young to respect their elders, then why is it that elder abuse has become such a widespread problem in the United States? Utilizing the sociological imagination, one can see that this problem is not only a personal trouble for the elderly whom are affected, but that elder abuse is also a public issue. In a time when people are living longer than ever, many families lack the time, space, or financial resources to personally care for their elderly relatives in their own homes and therefore must trust the care of their loved ones to nursing homes or assisted living facilities. As a result of this, the epidemic of elder abuse has the ability to cause serious issues in the greater society.

The issue of elder abuse can be understood and interpreted in many different ways. Later in this paper we will approach this issue from the perspective of classical theorist Max Weber and his theories regarding rationality and ideal-type bureaucracy, as well as from the perspective of Zygmunt Bauman and his work on agencies, and the dilemmas of ethics and morality in a post-modern world.

Definitions of elder abuse vary, but the term can be understood to include the physical harm, neglect, and/or exploitation of an elderly person. There are no nationally compiled statistics on the issue and state reporting policies are not uniform, making it difficult to obtain a true assessment of the prevalence of elder abuse. Aside from the varying state reporting policies, the fact that there is no exact universal definition of the term creates even more complications for any researchers trying to attain statistics. According to the National Center on Elder Abuse (NCEA) , it is estimated that for every one reported case of elder neglect, abuse, exploitation, or self-neglect, there are 5 more incidents that go unreported (2005). Also according to the NCEA, based on information from the best available estimates, between 1 and 2 million Americans age

65 and over have been abused or neglected by someone they were dependent on for their care or protection (2005).

Even without concrete national statistics, elder abuse is still an apparent problem. Imagine the frail old woman who cowers in her bed every time she hears a caregiver coming towards her because she's been handled too roughly in the past and has the bruises to show for it. Or imagine the nursing home resident down the hall who hasn't even seen a caregiver for hours and is being forced to lay hungry in a soiled bed while he develops bedsores because he is not mobile and no one has come around to help him change positions. Imagine the elderly man who has no family that visits him, which means there is no one else to notice his bruises or sores, and yet he is too afraid of retribution from the abusive staff member to file an abuse report himself. This is no way for anyone to live, especially not those too weak or disabled to protect themselves or take the appropriate action in reporting incidents.

Even the elderly who are able to live in a personal home with their children or other friends/family instead of an assisted living facility or nursing home are not safe from abuse or neglect. Caregivers in these situations are often not professionally trained and may inadvertently neglect the needs of their dependent. For many Americans these days, life is busy, fast-paced and stressful; without an appropriate stress relief method available, many caregivers may be apt to lose patience at times and lash out at the elderly person in their care. Elder abuse is not only a personal trouble for the elderly themselves, but also for the people who either serve as caregivers for their loved ones or who worry about the safety of their loved one residing in an assisted living facility.

On the macro-level, elder abuse can be seen as a public issue. It is a national problem that will probably, at one time or another, in some way affects most of the population if it is not

adequately addressed. The majority of the population may not personally be abused or neglected when they reach old age; but the problem has the potential to touch everyone who cares about an elderly person that becomes the victim of abuse or who feels guilt over not being able to take their aging family member into their own home to care for them and has to put their elderly loved one into an assisted living facility and fears for their safety.

Elder abuse will likely affect the institution of family most. In a time when people are living longer than ever, many families lack the time, space, or financial resources to personally care for their elderly relatives in their own homes and therefore must trust the care of their loved ones to nursing homes or assisted living facilities. If the rates of elder abuse continue to rise and state or national governments do not appropriately make more stringent laws or create stricter licensing procedures, while better enforcing existing laws for care facilities and caregivers, younger generations may feel more and more pressure to care for their elder family members in their own homes to assuage the fear of abuse or neglect. This could create further financial strain for families that are already struggling to make ends meet in the current economy.

In looking at the issue of elder abuse, one potential reason for abuse is frequently suggested to be the shortage of workers. Due to this shortage, employees are working long hours in understaffed facilities and are falling under a great deal of stress in those working conditions. Although there is no excuse for abusing someone dependent on you for their care, this is a very plausible reason for the high rates of neglect and abuse. This is an issue that needs to be addressed on the institutional level. Better pay and perhaps offering free certification programs for prospective nursing assistants would entice more employees to seek jobs in the assisted living field which could alleviate the problem of understaffing. By offering free training programs, it may also be possible to simultaneously help reduce unemployment numbers by giving some

people valuable skills and certifications that would in turn create desirable employees for an industry that has many job openings.

Now that we have an understanding of what elder abuse is and the possible implications of not resolving this issue, we will turn our attention to the work of classical theorist Max Weber, particularly his concepts of rationality. Weber addressed four types of rationality- practical, theoretical, substantive, and formal. Practical rationality is used in cases where the rationalizing person chooses to act in their own best self-interest, allowing the person to get through a given situation in the way that is the most quick and efficient. Theoretical rationality is based on abstract concepts and the ability to think beyond the immediate action to wonder what the greater implications of any particular action may be. Substantive rationality is based on larger values that are outside the individual, including religion and morals. Formal rationality is imposed from outside the individual in the form of rules, regulations, and laws.

Weber also addressed the concept of bureaucracy and the key components of an ideal-type bureaucracy. Some of these components are efficiency, predictability, calculability, and control. Efficiency is the ability to accomplish tasks in the quickest, most convenient way. Predictability is the ability to know what to expect at all times, this allows efficiency to excel because the hope is that there will be no unexpected occurrences to disrupt the system of efficiency. Calculability is a focus on quantity rather than quality. Control is simply the power that the people in charge of the bureaucracy exert over the system and the people under them. The entire bureaucratic system is constructed so that it stays under control at all times, again lending itself to predictability for whoever is overseeing the system.

Assisted living facilities are largely bureaucratic institutions, including a hierarchy of power, specialized offices/positions, and to some degree trained incapacity. Often those at the

top of the bureaucratic hierarchy have very little day to day contact with the residents that their program serves. There are certain people designated for certain tasks within the facility. There are people designated as cooks and dietary aides to prepare and serve the meals, people designated as custodians to keep the facility clean and sanitary, people designated as nurses for the overall day to day medical care of the residents, people designated as activities coordinators and assistants to provide and oversee activities and entertainment for the residents, and people designated as nurses aides to assist with the medical care of residents.

While some of the people occupying certain positions may technically be able to perform tasks assigned to another position, they often will not because that is not their job. Also, for the most part, the tasks that could be accomplished are those that are below their position in the hierarchy. For instance, a nurse is most likely capable of cleaning or delivering meals but she won't voluntarily take over that job while neglecting her own obligations because her tasks are more important for the safety and health of the residents. There is a trained incapacity regarding the ability of any position to perform the tasks of a position higher than theirs on the hierarchy. For some of these, formal rationality restricts the allowance of performing tasks even if the person is capable. For example, due to regulations and licensing laws, a person who is not licensed or certified to perform a task such as dispensing medications is not able to. Even a doctor, who is most likely authorized and capable of performing any task imaginable regarding the care of residents and upkeep of the facility, is most likely incapable of performing any of the business related aspects of running the facility that are delegated to the president or other office higher than the position of doctor in the hierarchy.

This trained incapacity and specialization could help to explain some instances of neglect in a facility. It could be that an elderly resident makes some complaint of pain to the dietary aide

when a meal is served, but the aide is not allowed to dispense pain medication to the resident. Even if the aide does alert a nurse or other applicable person of the resident's condition, that second person may not relay the information to someone in the appropriate position in the chain of command to prescribe pain medication for the resident. With so many bureaucratic offices to work through, each involving people presumably very busy with their own assigned tasks, to achieve a desired result, there are many chances for accidental neglect to occur if the message never makes it to the appropriate office for action to be taken.

Even if all is running smoothly with respect to the bureaucracy of a nursing home, assisted living facility, or even in home care, the elderly person quite possibly disrupts the elements of a bureaucracy that make it run well. Occurrences that were not predicted are able to occur at any time or place, but the likelihood of an unexpected occurrence increases when dealing people who are more likely to have some impairments or restrictions to their abilities. An elderly person's unexpected fall, soiling of their bed or refusal to participate in any activity could upset a routine or scheduled process of a caregiver. This disruption of the routine or intended tasks of the caregiver could likely result in frustration that in some cases could cause the caregiver to harm the elderly person as retribution.

Along with the likelihood of an elderly person's acts interfering with predictability of daily routines, the same instances that will affect predictability will also impede efficiency. In an assisted living setting, activities of daily living are played out in a manner that doesn't alter much from day to day- meals are served roughly around the same times, entertainment activities are scheduled at regular times, and medicines are administered within the same time frames every day. This regimented system allows the bureaucracy to run smoothly and for everything that needs to be accomplished to be accomplished in an efficient manner. People who work in those

settings have to have some degree of flexibility to accommodate anything unexpected that may occur, but on a particular day when multiple things go awry, frustration would be an understandable response. Unfortunately not everyone has appropriate mechanisms to use to diffuse their frustration, and that emotion opens a window of opportunity for abuse.

The theoretical “fit” of Weber’s ideas to elder abuse is far from perfect. Many aspects of Weber’s theory do not apply at all. Certain aspects can just be stretched a bit to encompass possible causes of the conditions under which elder abuse occurs. Now that we’ve seen how Weber’s work can help us to understand the issue of elder abuse, we will move our focus to another theorist.

There are undoubtedly a number of possible causes and explanations for the growing issue of elder abuse and neglect in America. One contemporary sociological theorist whose work can be applied to the issue of elder abuse is Zygmunt Bauman. According to George Ritzer (2003), Bauman can be viewed as either a modern or a post-modern theorist depending on which aspect of his works one chooses to focus on. Bauman produced a sociological theory of post-modernity that focused on agencies in a post-modern world and also addressed a code of ethics and morality in a post-modern world.

Bauman offered a view of the agencies that are emerging in a post-modern world. His sociological theory of post-modernity states that in a post-modern world, there is no central goal-setting organization. Instead of one central organization, there are many smaller agencies that each focus on a single purpose. The agencies act independently of each other and all resist any form of centralized control (Ritzer 2003). Another aspect of his theory points out that every agency would act differently if the other agencies it interacts with operated differently as well. In other words, one agency changing their method of operation would have a domino effect in

causing all other agencies to alter their operational methods in some way as well. Another applicable aspect of Bauman's sociological theory of post-modernity is the concept that accessibility to resources is different for each agent. The main factor that determines which resources are available to an agent is the agent's personal assets, most particularly knowledge (Ritzer 2003). Greater knowledge equals greater access to resources.

The other component of Bauman's theory that can be used to explain the issue of elder abuse is his work on morality in a post-modern world. Bauman's theory asserts that there is no moral or ethical code that is shared among members of a post-modern society. Instead, he feels that morality has become privatized and each individual is responsible for creating their own personal moral code. Based on this lack of universal moral code, Bauman's theory states that we are stuck with lives that will be full of irresolvable moral dilemmas (Ritzer 2003).

With elder abuse, one of the major problems is a lack of a clear definition of what exactly constitutes abuse and a lack of nationally standardized regulations for assisted living facilities and nursing homes. In regard to Bauman's theories about agencies and their interactions, it is clear to see that if the regulatory agencies of elder care were to change the way they operated in a manner that would create stricter rules and harsher penalties for infractions, the nursing homes and assisted living facilities would have to change their practices as well. They would have to work to ensure that conditions within their facilities meet the new stricter rules of the regulatory agencies in order to maintain their licenses to operate.

Another impact that changing the way the regulatory agencies operate could have is to attract more attention to the issue of elder abuse. If a clear nationally accepted definition for elder abuse and neglect was created, there would be less variation from state to state in the classification of whether a particular incident constitutes abuse or not. With a clear definition of

abuse and neglect, the states could compile more accurate statistics of elder abuse. Compiling these statistics would be more relevant if it was ensured that each state was operating with the same definition. Currently there are no nationally compiled statistics, if national statistics were to come to light; more attention could be brought to this issue. If more people are aware, there may be an increase in people campaigning for leaders to look into this issue and try to fix it. People who are ignorant to the problem will never work towards correcting it, and the first step to solving any problem is to recognize that there is a problem. If this issue continues to not receive much national publicity, it will continue to occur.

Another applicable piece of Bauman's sociological theory of post-modernity is the concept of access to resources being based on knowledge. Most likely, most of the people who have a direct-care role in nursing homes or assisted living facilities, such as certified nursing assistants(CNAs) or care aides, do not have college degrees. This is not to imply that they are not intelligent people, but it is presumable that if they had a college degree, they would be holding a higher position. These people play a very important role in the care of the elderly in facilities and most likely are the ones, who have more contact day to day with the residents than any other employee, yet our society does not grant them much prestige nor are they given very many other perks such as high pay or leisure. With limited knowledge (education), the CNAs and aides have access to fewer resources than the nurses and doctors, both within their job duties in the facility and in regard to their ability to obtain other jobs. Feeling stuck in an occupational position or feeling limited in their ability to take action within their current job are both conditions that will likely lead to frustration.

The condition of frustration leads to the question of how a person will release the frustration. Bauman's work on post-modern morality becomes applicable in this situation.

There are likely established codes of conduct for employees that specify what is and is not allowed to be done regarding residents. Also, it is assumed that everyone learns “right from wrong” as children, but under Bauman’s theory “right” and “wrong” can be entirely different things for different people. But if no one is around to see or hear an incidence of abuse, the only thing that stops a person from committing that abuse is morals. In cases of elderly who are being cared for by family members or others in their own homes or the home of the caregiver, morals play an even larger role because there are no governmental rules and regulations overseeing the care of that person. The only thing governing the behavior of a caregiver in this situation is their personal moral code.

With no universal morality, everyone makes their own definitions, which can lead to a multitude of problems. One institution that previously helped to build a universal moral code was religion. According to classical theorist Max Weber and his theory of rationality, society is losing sight of substantive rationality, the type that deals with religious beliefs. This loss of substantive reality led to the breakdown of a universal moral code. Now that there is no major source of guidance for forming a moral code for society at large, everyone’s personal moral code is based on their own various beliefs and values.

With no clear cut definition of what constitutes abuse and with everyone operating with a different moral code, there’s a real potential for trouble. Just as some may view spanking a child as abuse and some may view it as a valid method of punishment for wrongdoing, some may view slapping the hand of an elderly person who is fussing with IV lines and other equipment that they may be hooked up to as an acceptable way to make them stop and others would label that abuse. Perhaps caregivers rarely intentionally abuse a resident. Instead, a more likely scenario is that by their own moral standards, they see nothing wrong with what they’ve done.

Not only are the employees operating by their personal moral codes in their interaction with the elderly, but the administrators who oversee the employees are all operating by their own moral codes as well. In cases where a judgment call is necessary if there are no definite rules in the code of conduct regarding a certain incident, an action that is seen as deserving of stern punishment to one administrator may not even be seen as wrong by another. The consequential inconsistency will only further confuse the employees as to what is acceptable and non-acceptable. If no one is enforcing a unified standard of moral behavior, the employees have no guidance in determining what their moral standards should be regarding their job duties.

Some parts of Bauman's theories are not particularly useful in analyzing the issue of elder abuse, for example, his work regarding politics in a postmodern world. One aspect of this issue that Bauman's theory is not completely compatible with is the idea that smaller agencies resist being controlled by one large centralized agency. Whether or not the smaller agencies are resistant, centralized agencies do exist. These agencies are usually at the state government level; they oversee and, to some degree, control the activities of the smaller agencies. Bauman's theories do not offer any insight into why a person who possesses a strong personal moral code may still abuse or neglect an elderly person in their care. One of the major questions at the root of this issue that needs to be answered so that action can be taken to reduce the high incidence of elder abuse and neglect is the question of "what causes a person to abuse or neglect an elderly person in their care?" Overall, Bauman's theory does seem relevant to the issue of elder abuse and his theory involving the lack of a universal moral code seems to provide a potential answer to the question.

Earlier we looked to the theories of Max Weber to help us understand the issue of elder abuse. Now that we have also used the perspective of Zygmunt Bauman to look at this issue, we

will see that not only do the concepts of the previously discussed theorists offer insight into why the issue is occurring presently, their theories can also offer insight into what the future may hold for this issue. In the likely gradual reversal of the current trend that will occur with this issue, both Weber and Bauman's concepts once again will play a role.

Weber's prediction for the future is that society will become stuck in an iron cage of irrationality. At present, society is operating in this iron cage and aspects of rationality are possibly at fault for some occurrences of elder abuse or neglect. For Weber, society will never escape from the iron cage. While society may never escape from the iron cage, I do predict a change in the rationalities that impact elder abuse. Formal rationality, in particular the laws and regulations that are applicable to assisted living facility procedures, will eventually be altered in a way that will help resolve this issue.

For Bauman, members of a postmodern society are doomed to a life of moral dilemmas due to the lack of a universal moral code. The problem of moral dilemmas will continue to exist. However, as a policy change occurs that implements more external or legal sanctions for committing an act of abuse or neglect of an elderly person, the moral issues will no longer be as central in the area of assisted living. As government agencies or employers begin to implement more clear guidelines of what is and is not acceptable and also implement better systems for monitoring the behavior of employees, the caregivers will be more likely to adhere to the new, stricter guidelines regardless of their own personal moral code.

The changes that will help to resolve the issue of elder abuse and neglect are not likely to occur in the near future. In the immediate future, some minor changes may occur at individual facilities in light of publicized cases of abuse, but no large scale public policy change is likely to

occur. This issue is still low on the social radar, but a slight increase in public awareness may occur in the immediate future.

In the long term future, the aging population may put a strain on the resources of assisted living facilities. If nothing is done to correct the understaffing issue of these facilities, the issue of elder abuse may actually get worse before it gets better. Although unfortunate for the victims, an increase in incidences may serve to increase awareness which will be the impetus for the public to become the social force that pushes for reform of national standards for assisted living facilities in the distant future. One of the current troubles is a lack of awareness due to there not being any nationally compiled statistics of elder abuse. As more and more people enter understaffed facilities, if the cases of abuse do increase, other members of society will be likely to have a personal tie to a victim of abuse and personal awareness will be raised. Individual by individual, the overall public awareness will increase. The public awareness will lead to pressure on lawmakers for stricter laws, better inspection procedures, stricter regulations, and better enforcement of those regulations, including sanctions for failing to abide by the new standards.

It cannot be realistically expected that this issue will ever be eradicated. Policy changes need to be made at both the level of the individual facilities and on a state and national level. If a new public policy is enacted that prevents even a few cases or ensures that appropriate punishments are given to those who violate the elderly, which will in turn deter others from committing such violations, then an improvement will have occurred.

References

National Center on Elder Abuse. 2005. "Fact Sheet: Elder Abuse Prevalence and Incidence."

Washington, DC: National Center on Elder Abuse, Retrieved February 1, 2006

(<http://www.elderabusecenter.org/pdf/research/apsreport030703.pdf>).

Ritzer, George. 2003. *Contemporary Sociological Theory and Its Classical Roots: The Basics*.

Boston: McGraw Hill.

Searching for Evidence of an Emerging Transnational Capitalist Class: A Pilot Study

Michael P. Braget
University of North Dakota

For this article the author, Michael P. Braget, has provided the abstract to this paper (below) as it is being constructed in conjunction with Dr. Clifford Staples here at the University of North Dakota. This is the first paper produced by Braget as an undergraduate at UND. Since then, the research on Transnational Corporate Classes has continued with further papers being presented at the April 2007 Midwest Sociological Society/North Central Sociological Association conference in Chicago, IL. This paper is on the cutting-edge of TCC studies and shows that high quality research at the undergraduate level is not unattainable. We've provided some excellent examples of theoretical papers, but this is the first true research paper we've seen thus far in the S.O.C. Journal. We look forward to future articles of this nature, but I must say the bar has been set pretty high by Braget with this pilot study.

Abstract

The study of globalization is not entirely new to anyone in the academic world. However many different aspects of the phenomena need to be look at to fully understand the cause and effects of globalizing world economy. Recent debate between scholars in the sociological field surrounding globalization has been focused once again on elitism – much as Mills looked at national elitism in the United States. Even more narrow of an approach is looking at what is growing to be called the transnational capitalist class. This paper focuses on the TCC (Transnational Capitalist Class). Specifically addressing what constitutes the TCC, I have come to agree with work done by Robinson and Staples that the word “class” should be identified with a Marxist definition; specifically a capitalist class must own or control the means of production. This pilot study, empirical in nature, focuses on finding evidence of a TCC by conducting internet searches of transnational and national directors of the largest companies of the world focusing on the nature of other business and nonprofit organizations these individuals are involved in. The sample size is small and the purpose is to test the methodology and feasibility of doing a much larger undertaking. That being said the findings seem to point to the hypothesis that a TCC is emerging based on the fact that transnational directors seem to be involved in more transnational organizations than national directors while, conversely, national directors seemed more focused on national interests.

In the recent academic field of globalization, the political, cultural and economical effects and consequences have been explored. From a political standpoint academics have focused on the subject of power, or those countries or nation-states that have more ability to sway decision policy making than do others. From an economic standpoint the focus is entirely on the policies and organizations that have direct effect on the economies of the globe. This could include a study of the WTO or IMF, trade agreements such as NAFTA, or the concept of neoliberalism. A cultural standpoint on globalization can be exemplified by English becoming the international language and the worldwide popularity of American movie and music stars.

However, the exact processes and aspects of globalization are never agreed upon. As Robert Schaeffer points out in the introduction to his book “Understanding Globalization”:

“Of course, social analysts have different theories or expectations about globalization. Some theorize that globalization is a positive development for most people around the world, while other argue that it has adverse consequences for many. Some analysts argue that globalization is a ‘new’ development, while others maintain that it is not new but ‘old’, or at least familiar. Some analysts argue that globalization is inevitable or unstoppable, while others insist that it is not.” (1)

To further the confusion, the word “globalization” is not always used to mean the same thing when used by different individuals.

It is my belief that the ambiguity that comes along with globalization is due to the relatively new status of the subject as well as the lack of hard evidence that can be used to support arguments for or against the differing opinions and definitions. The purpose of this paper is to begin to search for that evidence.

Up until recently, much of the focus of globalization has been given to nation-state relations. In this paper I attempt to systemically explore and study the individuals involved in what William Robinson calls the “fourth epoch of capitalism – globalization” (Robinson; 5).

Specifically, looking at the character of the organizations that large corporate directors are involved in to see if national directors (ex. U.S. Citizen sitting on board of a U.S. company) are involved in more national organizations while transnational directors (ex. Swiss citizen sitting on the board of a Dutch company) are involved in more transnational or global organizations. I go beyond interlocking directorates and look more toward business associations and non-profit organizations in hopes to find evidence of an emerging TCC (Transnational Capitalist Class).

Yet, such a topic begs to ask; why should anyone care? The answer to this is not particularly straight forward or uniform. For those aspiring to succeed in global capitalist endeavors, the information can be used as a guide, while for those seeking an alternative system to world economics (such as the World Social Forum) it provides evidence for an argument of the rise of a global elite – or parts of which can be referred to as the Transnational Capitalist Class. However, it is important to remember that whatever aspect or opinion that one takes on globalization, it affects everyone. The decisions made by the individuals at the top (those subject to this paper) will affect the lives of those living in the poorest of nations. Scott Sernau points out that “the richest one-fifth of the world’s people consume 86% of all the world’s goods and services, while the poorest one-fifth consume just 1.3%” (36). Global inequality is an ever growing problem and arguments are made that globalization is attributing to it (Seattle WTO protests) while others say that globalization, and more specifically global capitalism, will be the cure to global inequality. The bottom line, however, is understanding. As pointed out by Robinson (a strong critic of global capitalism), “...global capitalism is hegemonic... [and] any challenge to this hegemony must be predicated on a solid understanding of the system in which we live” (*preface; xv*).

The following essay is based primarily on the work of William Robinson, whose book; “A Theory of Global Capitalism” outlines a Marxian critique of global capitalism, as well as the work done by Clifford Staples who has written a number of papers concerning board globalization and global elites. These will be outlined in the next section below. As such my own view has become primarily that of Marx in respect to the nature of production and class – extended for global application. It is also important to note that this study is conducted as a pilot. The sample size is relatively small, and the purpose was more to test the method of data collection than to actually develop any solid conclusion based on the evidence.

Previous Research on TCC Class Formation and Elitism

There has been a considerable amount of previous work that holds direct and indirect relevance to the current topic. However, because my own study of the topic has been thus far somewhat limited and brief I cannot lay out all that is relevant. The work of Leslie Sklair and for the most part, that of C. W. Mills has not been directly explored in a sufficient manner to make concrete arguments with.

Previous research and presentations by Clifford Staples, however, have given excellent summaries and applications of the above authors. In a paper recently presented to the Pacific Sociological Association Meetings, Staples discusses “the potential for extending C.W. Mills’ ‘The Power Elite’ to the global level” (Staples, 2006(b)). Staples makes a strong argument for the usefulness of taking the work of Mills, that is based on power analyses at the national level, and extending it to the global level. Thus, any work done in the name of globalization – at least in terms of power – is really an extension of Mills.

Perhaps one of the most important topics in this paper is the definition of the TCC. Because it would prove contradictory to first search for evidence of a TCC without defining who

exactly comprises it. Sklair, Robinson and Mills are all brought to the forefront of this discussion because each offers a definition of what comprises the TCC. Mills, while not directly speaking of a TCC (Globalization not exactly a hot topic in the 1950s), discusses the nature of “ruling class” which he considers a “badly loaded phrase” (Mills, 1956). Mills’ argument is that because the term “class” deals with economic classification while the term “rule” is centered more in the political arena, the two should never be placed with the same context. Stating that “‘ruling class’ ...contains the theory that an economic class rules politically” (ibid). The danger in theorizing in this matter is that not only does it blur together lines of bordering groups with considerable sovereignty but also excludes groups and individuals who exist outside the bounds of class or rule but who also exhibit considerable influence in the arena of power waging.

This ambiguity seems to be – based on the discussion given by Staples – the problem area of Leslie Sklair’s definition of the TCC. In the opening pages of his book, Sklair states that “The transnational capitalist class can be analytically divided into four main fractions:

- 1) Transnational Corporation executives and their local affiliates (the corporate fraction)
- 2) Globalizing bureaucrats and politicians (the state fraction);
- 3) Globalizing professionals (the technical fraction);
- 4) Merchants and media (the consumerist fraction)” (Sklair, 2001).

The problem in lumping together all these factions is the confusion in what constitutes “class”. Staples suggests that what Sklair has really done is defined a global elite rather than a transnational capitalist class stating: “To add to the confusion, however, Sklair used the term ‘class’ when I think what he really means is ‘elite’” (Staples, 2006(b)). However, I do not believe that Sklair’s work is not without substance as globalization in general and subsequent TCC formation can and will tend to blur the distinction of corporate, state, technical and consumerist fractions as the world becomes ever more integrated and consequently smaller, in terms of a more homogenous global society.

How then do we go about defining what constitutes the TCC? Here it becomes most useful to refer to the work of Robinson and Staples who in effect seem to derive their work from that of Karl Marx, especially when defining terms such as class and production. Robinson is very open in his deliberations with Sklair and discusses them at length in his book. The thesis of the argument stems from this very question of what defines the TCC and in a footnote on page 36 Robinson states: “I believe that capitalist class is a propertied class – the owners of capital – and that the TCC is the capitalist group that owns or controls transnational capital” (2004). Much as Marx defined the capitalist class as those individuals who owned the means of production, Robinson says that those who own capital or (as in the case for the topic of this paper) those who are in a position to at least control capital. This is the definition that will be used for the purposes of this paper. The individuals who are subject for analysis are directors of either national or transnational character but all can be categorized as members of the capitalist class based on the notion that they all control if not own capital.

Much of the inspiration for the current subject stems from the work of Robinson, primarily using “A Theory of Global Capitalism” as guide to understanding the complex nature of TCC formation, the nature of TNC’s (Transnational Corporations) and other world organizations such as the IMF, WB, etc. and also explaining the possible outcomes of a global economy based on neoliberal policies if left unchecked and unregulated. Robinson provides the groundwork necessary to put a study such as this into context while simultaneously admitting that “The structure of transnational corporate ownership and control, including transnational corporate cross-affiliation, is an area ripe for research” (ibid).

As indicated above, Staples provides a relevant backdrop to the sociological study of globalization and capitalism by tying together previous work such as Mills into a more current

arena of scholastic work. However, his work does not stop there. Branching also from the Marxist school and that of Robinson, Staples has done research in the field of global capitalism. In a paper just recently published he followed-up on a study done in 1999 by Gillies and Dickinson. The purpose of the original study was to examine the “transnationality” of the top 80 corporations of the world. As stated in the abstract of Staples’ paper: “In their study [Gillies and Dickinson] reported that in 1993 29/80 or 36.3% of these companies had at least one non-national board member. I examined these same companies in late 2005 and found, in contrast, that 60/80 or 75% of these companies had at least one non-national board member” (Staples 2006(a)). This study proved that board globalization has occurred rather substantially in the recent decade and that this could provide the basis for the rise of a TCC. However the process thus far has not proved to be all that integrated as “Only a few of the corporations studied had more than 50 percent non-national directors and a majority – 54.3 percent had fewer than 26 percent non-national directors” (ibid). Staples goes on to mention that the rise of more transnational boards is not the outcome of a need but rather a consequence of cross-border merges and acquisitions.

My current undertaking ties most closely to this work of Staples. Because cross-border M&A’s have occurred at such a rapid pace over that last decade, boards have become more transnational in nature. However, due to the nature of this study, that of individuals rather than larger entities there is not a lot of empirical or quantitative work that has been done in respect to global class formation. The very nature and infancy of such an undertaking proves to be exciting and will allow me to further this research in the future as an undergraduate and hopefully as a graduate student as well.

Some further texts that are known to me but not directly tied to the current research are two books “Political Sociology” by George Kourvetaris and “Understanding Globalization” by

Robert K. Schaeffer. The former of these two provides some important background to the nature of power and politics. It is presented more at a micro-level of analysis; however the nature of the current study, that of individuals, it is important to keep in mind when considering those involved in the TCC. The later is excellent analysis of the infrastructure of the global economy. I found the book to be essential in understanding the history that led the global economy as it now stands. Because without a basic understanding of the restructuring programs, free-trade agreements, neoliberal policy making and the plethora of consequences that can result from such things, it becomes very difficult to put into perspective why TCC formation is important at all. One final text worth mentioning is Scott Sernau's "Worlds Apart", which is a direct testament to the inequalities that exist in the world that may or may not be the result of a global capitalist economy.

Data and Methods

As mentioned above, this research paper branches from a much larger compilation of data previously obtained by Staples. In his work on board globalization, Dr. Staples has compiled a list of a large number of directors from the largest corporations in the world. In this list the directors are coded using a number system representing countries (ex. 1=Switzerland, 2=United States). Figure 1 shows an example of how a typical director was placed within a row using the program SPSS. The "citizen" column refers to the citizenship of the director, then each company is displayed followed by "home economy" column which is coded the same as the citizenship column. In this example John Doe is from the United States and sits on the board of a U.S. company. The next column, "non nation" is coded using either a "1" or a "0" where a 1 would indicate that the director sat on the board of company whose home economy was not that of his/her own. I refer to these directors as non national directors where as the ones coded with a

0 are national directors in that they sit on boards of companies based in the home country of the director. In this example Doe is a then a national director. All of this information was previously compiled by Staples and put together on a large scale using SPSS.

From this large population of directors, I drew a small sample for the purposes of this pilot study. Twenty-five directors coded as national and another 25 coded as non nationals were chosen at random. Having both national and what can really be considered transnational directors then served as the background for the comparative study.

In addition to the columns already mentioned, using SPSS I added 6 more columns headed as “nboard”, “tboard”, “nbusasoc”, “tbusasoc”, “nnonprof” and “tnonprof” standing for national board, transnational board, national business association, transnational business association, national non-profit and transnational nonprofit respectively. These were then coded using either a 0 or a 1, where a code of 1 would indicate that that person served on at least one of the column groups.

Once all this information was set up in SPSS, I used primarily the Google search engine and searched for any and everything I could find for each one of the directors. Typical searches would start out at the company websites where most corporations would at least list the names of their directors under the “corporate governance” link. Some companies proved more difficult than others and some offered lengthy bios on all of their directors that listed other boards sat on as well as other groups in which the director was involved. If the company website offered no valuable information or not enough I would then search the name alone or match the name with keywords such as “nonprofit” or “business group” or “business association”.

In the first phase of the internet searches I copied and pasted everything I could find on each director highlighting the names of other groups and companies involved. Once something

(or in some cases nothing) was found on each one of the 50 directors I was able to go back and search the names of the other such groups a particular director was involved with. This was done for two reasons. One, to find out where the group – either another board, nonprofit group or business association – was located so that I could code whether it was national or transnational in respect to the citizenship of the director. Two, I needed to find proof that the specific director was actually involved with the group. Once all this information was compiled it was coded into the SPSS sample using the 0 and 1 system to basically indicate a “no” or a “yes” involvement.

This process did not come without considerable problems however. The first problem I ran into was finding anything at all on some of the directors. Some companies were much more open about the lifestyles of the directors than others and the same can be said about the directors themselves. When a search proved to exhaustive and fruitless I would move on to the next director in hopes of coming back, yet in some cases nothing of any value could be found and the for the sake of the study was eliminated from the sample all together. Another snag that I ran into was the language barrier. Because all the directors were chosen at random, the companies in which they were involved were just as diverse. In some cases a search of the company or the name would bring me to the website, but the website was in a language other than English. For some of these instances Yahoo and Google provided translation of the pages, however for some, specifically two directors sitting on Japanese companies, it was all but useless to gather information. Translation was sometimes available but would prove to output something that only minutely resembled English. As such, a few directors were eliminated from sample. If research of this methodology is to be used in the future, this language barrier will have to be overcome. The solution will most likely be costly software used by the global business

community whose advertisements I ran into often when trying to translate web pages. Simply put, free translation services will most likely not cut it. One final thing to note here is that I consistently noticed that English is becoming the international business language as many websites offered multiple language versions, yet English was always listed as a choice.

One final problem, although not considerable, was due to the nature of the business community. I had to eliminate two other directors because they had been either removed from the position or had stepped down. This really illustrates the ever changing face of corporations as all of the information gathered within the sample was no older than November 2005.

Once all the information was gathered and the problem issues taken care of the sample size was reduced to 40 from the original 50. This was because it was necessary to eliminate an even number of national directors and transnational ones. As it turned out the even number was not forced as 5 directors from each category were eliminated out of necessity.

When all the loose ends were tied it was then possible to construct cross tabulation tables – again using the SPSS program. These are represented in figures 2-7. For example, in figure 2 the cross tabulation represents the percentages of national boards that national and transnational directors serves. The first row represents the national directors. As expected all of them serve on a national board (20). The next row represents the transnational directors and the percentages of them that do not serve at least 1 national board in addition to the their transnational board (45%) as well as the percent that do serve on a national board in addition to their transnational board membership (55%). The bottom row of the cross tabulation table then represents the entire population and the percentages of all 40 directors that serve on a national board. The following figures are set up in the exact same way only with the other 5 variables that I added to the original data set.

These cross-tabulations serve as the comparative needed to come to any sort of hypothesis. It once again worth mentioning that this is only a pilot study and although the information that I was able to obtain seems to be pretty reliable, the point of this study is to find a systematic way to search for concrete empirical evidence for an emerging TCC. Thus, the information presented in the findings below, based on these cross-tabulations cannot be taken completely at face value. The methodology must become more refined and the sample size must be considerably larger than the one used here before any concrete conclusion can be drawn. In other words, the information is reliable but not systematic while the sample size is much too small for any succinct reasoning and theorizing to take place.

Findings

While keeping the nature of the pilot study mind, the cross-tabulations point out some very interesting statistics in which almost all point to a rise in the transnational character of foreign directors. Figure 2 shows that the transnational groups of directors are also involved in business in their home countries with 55% serving on at least one national board. This could point to the fact that Robinson and Staples point out, that a transnational group of directors most likely stems from national bourgeoisie. However, with 45% sitting on transnational boards alone may indicate that a TCC really has no home economy as so candidly put by Adam Smith which Robinson quotes, ““A merchant, it has been said very properly, is not necessarily a citizen of a particular country”” (Robinson, 2004).

Figure 3 points to another possible hypothesis. With only 30% of the national group of directors serving on at least 1 transnational board seems to hint that national directors seem to be involved in primarily national corporations.

Figure 4 and 5 deal with the business associations. Some examples of what constitutes a business organization could be the World Economic Forum, The Geneva Association or some other body that does constitute a company but rather a forum for discussion for members of many different corporations where the topics usually include ways to improve business. Figure 4 speaks pretty loudly about the nature of transnational and national directors with 20% of national directors involved with national business associations while only 5% of transnational directors do. Figure 5 shows the flipside of that with only 10% of national directors involved in transnational business associations while almost half, 45% of transnational directors are involved in at least one business association that is transnational in character. With almost a 5 to 1 ratio both ways it again possible to hypothesize that national directors seem to serve more national interests while transnational directors serve transnational interests.

Figure 6 and figure 7 deal with non-profit organizations. Finding information about individuals involved with non-profit organizations proved to be the most difficult aspect of the internet searches. More often than not directors and companies were not shy to display the other companies involved with or the interlocking directorates but very reluctant to mention any non-profit affiliations. This did not prove to be detrimental to sample because it was hard to find information on both national and non-national directors. However, the general trend still holds, although maybe not as strongly as the above inferences. From figure 6 it can be said that national directors are more involved in national non-profit groups but not by much with 15% of them serving while 10% of the transnational also serve national interests. This could indicate that while business has gone transnational, altruistic behavior may still be linked to national and patriotic identities. Again this can not be made explicitly clear, especially when considering that

15% national directors also serve transnational non-profits while 30% transnational directors are involved in at least one transnational non-profit organization as seen in figure 7.

All said, the cross-tabulations seem to point to the hypothesis that I hoped to prove from the beginning, that transnational directors are increasingly becoming identified with other global entities rather than serving groups based in their countries of origin. It is also possible to say that national directors like to keep it that way, serving corporations and groups that identify themselves as national.

Discussion and Conclusion

The findings discussed above numerically achieve the hypothesis and purpose outlined at the beginning of this project. A rising TCC seems to be occurring as transnational directors or individuals are coming to identify themselves as such through their connections with other global associations. However, the greatest barrier in using this methodology is that when it comes down to it, one has to consider the reliability of the internet as a solid information source. While doing this research I've ran into many anti-corporate websites that demonize every aspect of the corporate world. Some seem to be more legitimate in their cause while others seem to strive for pure anarchy. However, sometimes the only information available for some of the directors in the sample was through such sites. That information would have to be reasonably checked before inferences could be drawn from it. The issue of language will also have to be addressed before continuing research in this manner. With many websites and especially bios of these individuals presented in languages other than English it becomes difficult and sometimes impossible to gain any information.

I also ran into many instances in which directors also sat on the board of education for many universities and upper level academic institutions. I did not include these in any of the

categories listed because they did not seem to fit. However, a look at the educational end of globalization could prove to be an insightful endeavor. Also one could explore the transnationality of banks and credit unions as these were left out and also that of cultural transnationality as a few directors sat on organizational boards of music festivals or groups such as the New York Philharmonic.

In closing it is important to note that while this study defined a transnational director in relation to his/her citizenship, future studies may need to come to more concrete definitions of what constitutes a transnational corporation. That is should it be done objectively using some sort of measurement of transnationality or should it be continued as a subject characteristic in relation to an individual's citizenship. For example, just because an individual sits on the board of a company or institution headquartered in the respective home economy may not mean that that individual is a national director if the company is very transnational in its' business arrangements. All said and done, much more work needs to be done to clear the muddy water that surrounds an empirical study of the TCC and the social effects and consequences of a global capitalist economy.

Figures

Name	Citizen	Company	Home economy	Non nation
Doe, John	2	McDonalds	2	0

Fig. 1

NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1 * # National Boards Served Crosstabulation

			# National Boards Served		Total
			0	1	
NatDirector=0	0	Count		20	20
NonNatDirector = 1		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1		100.0%	100.0%
	1	Count	9	11	20
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	45.0%	55.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	9	31	40
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	22.5%	77.5%	100.0%

Fig. 2

NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1 * # Transnational Boards Served Crosstabulation

			# Transnational Boards Served		Total
			0	1	
NatDirector=0	0	Count	14	6	20
NonNatDirector = 1		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
	1	Count		20	20
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1		100.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	14	26	40
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%

Fig. 3

NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1 * # National Bussiness Associations Served Crosstabulation

			# National Bussiness Associations Served		Total
			0	1	
NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	0	Count	16	4	20
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	1	Count	19	1	20
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	95.0%	5.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	35	5	40
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%

Fig. 4

NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1 * # Transnational Buss. Assoc. Served Crosstabulation

			# Transnational Buss. Assoc. Served		Total
			0	1	
NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	0	Count	18	2	20
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	1	Count	11	9	20
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	55.0%	45.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	29	11	40
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	72.5%	27.5%	100.0%

Fig. 5

NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1 * # National NonProfit Affiliations Crosstabulation

			# National NonProfit Affiliations		Total
			0	1	
NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	0	Count	17	3	20
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%
	1	Count	18	2	20
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	35	5	40
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%

Fig. 6

NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1 * # Transnational NonProfit Affiliations Crosstabulation

			# Transnational NonProfit Affiliations		Total
			0	1	
NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	0	Count	17	3	20
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%
	1	Count	14	6	20
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	31	9	40
		% within NatDirector=0 NonNatDirector = 1	77.5%	22.5%	100.0%

References

- Mills, C. Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, William I. 2004. *A Theory of Global Capitalism: Production, Class, and State in a Transnational World*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Schaeffer, Robert K. 2003. *Understanding Globalization*. 2nd Eds. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Sernau, Scott. 2006 “Worlds Apart: Social Inequalities in a Global Economy”. 2nd Eds. Pine Forge Press.
- Sklair, Leslie. 2001. *The Transnational Capitalist Class*. Oxford UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Staples, Clifford L. 2006 (a). *Board Globalization in the World's Largest TNCs 1993-2005*. University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.
- Staples, Clifford L. 2006 (b). *A Global Power Elite*. University of North Dakota, Grand Forks. Paper presented at the Pacific Sociological Association Meetings, Los Angeles, April 2006

Closing Notes:

- We are looking to expand our selection of articles for upcoming issues. If you as a student are interested in submitting a paper to this journal, e-mail it to gabriel.kilzer@und.edu, with the subject line “SOC Journal.” If you are an instructor looking to recommend a paper for submission please send any information to the same address.
- Come check out the new board for Alpha Kappa Delta/Sociologists On Campus on the second floor of Gillette hall near the Graduate Teaching Assistant offices. The board has information on becoming a member of either organization along with other various bits of information that will be updated on a regular basis.
- We would like to recognize the addition of Dr. Krista Lynn Minnotte to the sociology department faculty. During Dr. Minnotte’s first semester this Fall, she will be teaching Introduction to Sociology and Juvenile Delinquency along with a Graduate Seminar on Social Disorganization, Youth Culture, Deviance, and Society.
- Any questions or comments on the journal can be directed to Gabe Kilzer at gabriel.kilzer@und.edu.