Week 10:

9A: workplace deviance
9B: leaving deviance

10A: heteronormativity & sex norms
10B: draft exchange!
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Individual occupational crime

- White-collar crime – law violation committed in the context of the offender’s legitimate occupation
  - Sutherland (1949) – defined as crime by person of respectability and high social status (“occupational” is broader)
  - Most violate trust (fraud) and power
- Liederbach, Opportunity and Medical Crime pp. 237-246 “protective cloak” of doctors
  - kickbacks, fee-splitting, mass prescriptions, unnecessary treatments, sex, medicaid fraud
- Other professionals’ white-collar crime and deviance (priests, professors, others)
- Examples that Uggen could commit?

evals

- THANKS! Very helpful and appreciated
  - More: theory basics (2); readings (likes); graphs, local town research (2); ethnographies; class discussion; exam review; variety on exam; hot topics, positive deviance, more time
  - Less: irrelevant, critique, theory (1), Adlers,
  - Change: no MC (1); more MC (1); more IDs (1); less reading; return to theories
  - Annoying: hair flip; tangents; walk around Ums;
  - Likes: evals; emails; grading anonymously; passion;
  - Other: greek life, like study guide; family arguments; groups v. discussion; diet coke says “Mom”
- Philosophy: balanced view of research, but guided
  - More questions?
Cressey (1953) on embezzlers
b. Fergus Falls, MN 1919

- Interviewed financial trust violators who accepted trust in good faith, then violated it
- 3-stage sequence:
  - perceived unshareable financial problem
  - that can be secretly resolved by violating financial trust
  - create rationalizations (only borrowing) to protect a conventional self-concept.
- When they cannot repay, they get nervous - verbalization breaks down. A few adopt a criminal role
- Critique: low self-control (Gottfredson and Hirschi) dispute "sophistication" and planning

workplace deviance in MN

- general population (MN YDS) – St. Paul public schools
  - High school and twenties
- Jessica Huiras (Wegner)
  - UROP grant/senior project
  - "Who steals from work?"
    - Prior work: People who hate their jobs (low satisfaction)
  - Theories of social control and choice
  - People who have no "stake" in their jobs
- Hirschi, Sampson & Laub on informal controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Prevalence and Frequency of Employee Deviance in Past Year</th>
<th>Percentage Reporting</th>
<th>Mean Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Got to work late without a good reason</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called in sick when not sick</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave away goods or services</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claimed to work more hours than really did</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took things from employer or co-worker</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been drunk or high at work</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lied to get or keep job</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed or took money</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposely damaged property</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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summary

• Career stakes or commitment is a strong predictor of workplace deviance

• Other Predictors:
  – Job satisfaction (reduces)
  – Power! Authority - increased work deviance
  – Males (increases)

• Supports idea that informal social controls can reduce deviance

• So, who do you hire? Who do I hire?
corporate deviance

- Corporate or organizational crime - violation of law or regulations by organizations and their management – punished by the state through criminal, civil, or administrative law.
- Clinard’s typology
  - Crimes against consumers (Pinto)
  - Crimes against owners (stockholders)
  - Crimes against employees (safety, discrimination)
  - Crimes against public (pollution)

explaining corporate crime

- Profit Squeeze: (Mertonian) Pressures to deviate across industries, time
- Organizational Context: diffusion of responsibility, socialized into illegality
- Corporate Culture: A few justifications:
  - 1. Deny responsibility
  - 2. Everybody does it
  - 3. No one hurt
  - 4. It provides stability
  - 5. Government interference
  - 6. “Business is business”
- Industry Effects: Based on degree of competition, monopoly concentration

9B: leaving crime

- Desistance from crime
  - Organizations can “desist” as well
  - Deviant “role exit”
  - The “professional-ex”
  - Halting but inexorable march...
  - Work, family, housing correlates
- Management and stability in other roles
  - E.g., coming out
**stigma and desistance**

1. adlers: leaving dealing/smuggling
- 65 smugglers & dealers; up to $750k/yr
  - go through “shifts and oscillations”
  - “desistance” as a process, not an abrupt act
- Simple aging and burnout
- “Phasing out”
  - chance for 'last big score' can end in prison
  - attempts to try legitimate businesses
- Reentering as “comeback” or relapse?
- Career shifts (some in drugs, some out)
- Death as “ultimate bustout”

---

**devah pager (2006) criminal record**

- “audit study” in milwaukee, wi
  - Matched testers
- who was called back (shaded)?

![Graph showing comparison of matched testers.]

- are you surprised by the results? Would they be the same in minneapolis?

---

**Design – arrest study**

- recruit
- rehearse: high-school grads with basic work record (hotel, restaurant)
- convey: 3-year old disorderly conduct arrest
- apply: 600 entry-level jobs in twin cities metro
- audit
48 employer interviews

- **66% checked backgrounds (small n)**
  - two thirds have contracts with private data mining companies
  - 25% say any record disqualifies applicants from consideration
- **may be overstated**
  - personal contact
  - workplace diversity
African American tester callbacks by record and establishment diversity

stigma

- low-level arrest has a modest effect on entry-level employment
  - 4% difference in callbacks
  - Not a disqualifying condition
- people of color in establishment may mitigate effect (sophistication?)
- regulating stigma
  - threshold (arrest v. conviction)
  - severity (misdemeanor v. felony)
  - duration (7 years v. life)

age, work, and crime

- Question
  - Why didn't the big jobs programs of 1970s reduce crime?
- Idea
  - Lousy jobs, but also lousy timing if response to jobs is age-graded
- Approach
  - Experimental (mostly)
Week 10:

10A. heteronormativity & sex norms

11. sexual deviance

law, policy, & identity

- Same-sex marriages
  - over 50% approval and rising
  - religious marriage: church recognition
  - more favor civil unions: a legally protected relationship available to all
- Sexual orientation as a “protected class”
- Careers
  - individual (coming out)
  - social movement
- Nate Silver’s 538 data
social construction of sexuality

- Creating and enforcing sexual norms
  - Recognition or creation of separate categories based on sexual orientation
  - Sexuality is learned, at least in part, in interaction with others
  - Labels and stigma in discussing sexual orientation
- RW Connell’s “hegemonic masculinity”:
  - A gender system privileging one vision of adult heterosexual masculinity over all femininities and alternative masculinities
- Judith Butler: gender as performative
  - Identities shaped by action or performance rather than some preexisting reality
  - West and Zimmerman 1987: “doing gender”

Bemiller (2005)
Men who cheer

- Method: 8 men and 9 women on squad
  - Focus groups+Individual interviews (why?)
- Stigma is “discreditable” – not immediately visible
  - Perceived as a feminine sport or “sport”
  - Failure to do gender appropriately -> face-saving
  - Sexual identity questioned (discrimination)
- “Saving Face” and hypermasculinity
  - Territoriality – dominating females
  - Masculine toughness, aggression (fighting, injury)
  - Sexual objectification of women (“the most heterosexual males I’ve ever met”)
  - Redefining cheerleading (and other actions) to emphasize masculinity and subordinate femininity
- Wozniak & Uggen, 2009 “Real Men Use Non-Lethals” – marketing tasers to police officers
When and where is sexual orientation considered deviant?

- **heteronormative** -- heterosexuality taken as normative in society
  - Deviance as violation of norms that draws social disapproval and negative sanctions (v. statistical, absolutist, reactivist)
  - Queer as antonym of heteronormative and gender binary; LGBTQI (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex) plus sex and gender "rulebreakers"

- **norms and laws are changing**
  - Legalization -- same sex marriage (SCOTUS 10/6/14)
  - Repeal sodomy laws (Lawrence v. Texas 2003)
  - Public Acceptance 65 percent said "same-gender sex is always wrong" in Laumann (1992) but by 2006 Gallup poll (Saad), 54% agreed "homosexuality is an acceptable alternative lifestyle"

- De-Medicalization -- American Psychiatric Association 1973: not a disorder

bisexuality

- Weinberg, Williams, & Pryor (1995)
- sexual identity - careers
  - careers in heterosexuality and LGBTQI
  - identity formation as bisexual
  - interviews in SF subculture (better design? biases?)
- stages (fluidity or stability? Change since '95)
  - Initial confusion - strong feelings for both
  - Finding and applying label - naming
  - Settling into identity - social support
    - 66% stable bisexual orientation, but 86% could be exclusive in behavior/relationships
    - Minority remained uncertain – 25% still doubted
  - due to societal reaction or a stable relationship

- bisexual, non-monogamy, and polyamory
  - NYTM 3/14: Scientific Quest to "Prove" Bisexuality
  - Mimi Schippers on non-monogamy, polyamory
“homosexuality” & LGBTQI demographics

- **Elements of definition**
  - Gender of sexual partners (behavior)
  - Identity and self-concept (orientation)
- **Prevalence**: Laumann’s *National Health and Social Life Survey* (1992)
  - 3% of males, 2% of females report sex with someone of same gender in past year
  - too low? UK, Canada, France, Denmark similar
  - 5-10% report experience since puberty, or same-sex attraction
- **Gary Gates (UCLA)**: estimates 3.5% of US adults self-identify as lesbian, gay or bisexual; .3% as transgender
  - Up to 12.5% in Minneapolis (4th in ACS); 15% San Francisco
  - Up to 5.7% in MSP metro (8th)

homophobia

- **Homophobia** – prejudicial attitudes and feelings against non-heterosexuals, often manifest in overt discrimination or hostility
  - like racism, homophobia deviant in US
  - Fear and disease
- **HIV/AIDS and Homophobia (CDC data)**
  - 18.5 of 40 million AIDS cases now female
  - AIDS epidemic in women is overwhelmingly heterosexual – almost entirely so in Africa and South and South East Asia. - WHO 2004
  - 5 million new cases/yr; 3 mill. deaths in ’05
- **homophobia and/or assault? HIV+ Mpls. man charged w/ assault**

homophobia and women’s sport

(Blinde and Taub 1992)

- **What sexual stereotypes are applied to women athletes? Why? Which sports?**
  - Linking masculinity to athleticism
  - A “courtesy stigma” (Goffman) for all
- **Method** – 24 intensive interviews
- **Findings**
  - Didn’t want to talk about sexual orientation (internalized stereotypes)
  - Management techniques
- **Still true? Are female athletes a social threat to hegemonic masculinity?**
Uggen & Blackstone: Sexual harassment
sociological definitions

- **Sexual harassment**
  - conduct that is unwelcome or unsolicited, is sexual in nature, and is deliberate or repeated [Bar]  
  - beyond this, a lack of conceptual clarity and specificity [Welsh]

- **Data**
  - interviews, national (GSS), and community (YDS) survey

- **Methodology contested**
  - which behaviors count
  - how gender affects perceptions
  - use of subjective or “objective” behavioral measures

what is sexual harassment?

- “*Any of these may constitute sexual harassment:* leering; wolf whistles; discussion of one’s partner’s sexual inadequacies; sexual innuendo; comments about women’s bodies; ‘accidentally’ brushing sexual parts of the body; lewd & threatening letters; tales of sexual exploitation; graphic descriptions of pornography; pressure for dates; sexually explicit gestures; unwelcome touching and hugging; sexual sneak attacks, (e.g., grabbing breasts or buttocks); sabotaging women’s work; sexist and insulting graffiti; demanding, “Hey, baby, give me a smile”; inappropriate invitations (e.g., hot tub); sexist jokes and cartoons; hostile put-downs of women; exaggerated, mocking ‘courtesy’; public humiliation; obscene phone calls; displaying pornography in the workplace; insisting that workers wear revealing clothes; inappropriate gifts (ex. lingerie); hooting, sucking, lipsmacking, & animal noises; pressing or rubbing up against the victim; sexual assault; soliciting sexual services; stalking; leaning over, invading a person’s space; indecent exposure...” (source: NOW)

University of Minnesota

Section 2: Policy (approved by Regents December 11, 1998)

- **Sexual harassment** is prohibited. Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and/or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when:
  1. submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual’s employment or academic advancement,
  2. submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment or academic decisions affecting this individual, or
  3. such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment.
harassing behaviors in yds survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harassment during high school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive jokes/gossip about you**</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions about your private life</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasion of personal space*</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted touching**</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive materials*</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical assault**</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment since high school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive jokes/gossip about you</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions about your private life</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasion of personal space***</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted touching***</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive materials</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical assault</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting any of 6 behaviors</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global Indicator (both periods):

...Would you consider these experiences sexual harassment*** | 35% | 14% | 5.97

*p<.10  **p<.05  ***p<.01
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conclusions

- **Males & adolescents less likely to name behaviors sexual harassment**
  - More women experience strong form of harassment
  - Yet same males targeted repeatedly
  - Males had less powerful workplace positions and more egalitarian gender relationships than other males

- "Managing" validity problems
  - problems in interviews and surveys
  - some men "wouldn’t go there"

- Support for MacKinnon and Connell
  - sexual harassment deriving from power and heteronormative masculinity
  - for males and adolescents as well as adult women
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Week 11B. sexual deviance

- **Draft exchange and “draft grading”**

- Defining deviance: issues of consent, relationships, acts, and settings
  - A moving target: How have sexual norms changed in past 50 years?
  - Disease, deviance, and stigma, Concealment (why?) and disclosure
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