




Fall 9-11-2013

Meta-Analysis of the Book: "Privilege, Power and Difference" -- A Review of the Dimensions of Institutional Segregation as Psychological Paradox

Alexej Savreux

Johnson County Community College, alexej.savreux@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarspace.jccc.edu/soc_stu_pp

 Part of the [Educational Sociology Commons](#), [Inequality and Stratification Commons](#), and the [Other Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Savreux, Alexej, "Meta-Analysis of the Book: "Privilege, Power and Difference" -- A Review of the Dimensions of Institutional Segregation as Psychological Paradox" (2013). *Sociology Student Papers and Presentations*. 1.
http://scholarspace.jccc.edu/soc_stu_pp/1

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Sociology at ScholarSpace @ JCCC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sociology Student Papers and Presentations by an authorized administrator of ScholarSpace @ JCCC. For more information, please contact bbaile14@jccc.edu.

Meta-Analysis of the Book
“Privilege, Power and Difference”

A Review of the Dimensions of Institutional Segregation as Psychological Paradox

by
Alexej Savreux

Meta-Analysis of the Book: “Privilege, Power and Difference”

The influence of the empirical subject matter in the genesis of social inequality has its historical, mechanical and consequentialist roots in the rigidly defined terms of underlying anthropological miscues. As a purported concretion, Johnson’s analyses rely on the continued misguided efforts at social reform, as well as the manifest and latent misapprehensions of indirect, taxing cultural quagmires. The unreconstructed division(s) of inequality’s mechanical interplay are underscored by Johnson’s emphasis on the unequal distribution of the privileged and the underprivileged, and the engines of stratification that invigorate this divide (Johnson, c. 2 p. 12). Theoretically, nothing, by this criterion, in the existence of issues like racial bias(es), subcultural social-interaction, cross-religious belief, social-distance, etc. remain subjective. It becomes a statistical matter, and one that has long been known to be able to be modeled under periodic ‘social-change’ in the dimensions of institutional segregation.

The importance and variability of the computational processes of the perpetuation of inequality is important to Johnson. Johnson observes the undercurrent of the power and influence of the institutionalization of a sociobehavioral paradox, - where the injustices exacted on minority groups is owed to deficits in understanding subcultural differences by dominant-parties. By remaining ‘inadaptible’ to these differences, Johnson cites the immutable adaptivity of human beings as a psychological paradox common to all parties (Johnson c.1 p. 5). This paradox serves the perpetuation of the ‘power-privilege’ dichotomy well, and the latent intellectual freeze pertaining to its origins remains a byproduct of faulty perceptions and inaction.

Johnson considers a serious modification of this type of hypothesis as the predominant causation of ‘inequality’ -- in congruence with the expansion of ‘social-distance(s)’ and the expansion of the quantity of economic differentiation that takes place; as a result, emerging spheres of comprehension on these closely conjoined epiphenomena become better understood.

In this broader hypothesis, on the basis of once homogenous occurrences new instances of institutional segregation continue to reappear, which result in the appearance of overstated system(s) of further institutionally based obedience(s).

Johnson also emphasizes a construction that has a co-dependent theoretical framework. In Chapters 1-5 of 'Power and Privilege' Johnson focuses on the power of retaining social awareness as - when privilege and power are combined, dominant groups more often than not, ignore the contradictions of privilege, provided it keeps their privileged quantities and qualities intact (Johnson c.2 p. 21). By confronting these issues of neglect, Johnson applies sociological theories and methods to seek rectification of the technical, interactive problems with reconstructionist amendments and approaches. The models of criteria systems of the causes of 'social-assignment' and 'learned-behaviors' dominate his definitions. The ongoing system of the causes of inequality based on this dichotomy provides a certain critical-theoretic construction, which on the one hand, projects the undesired consequences of rapid hierarchical triumphalism, and on the other hand, serve to enlighten the functions of society in a manner best serving the public well-being.

Further models of criteria are based on the cross-cultural misfirings of items such as 'conferred dominance' and 'unearned advantage' that do little to ameliorate the conditions of certain segments of the population as they relate to 'comparable worth'. The elaboration of 'inequality' as psychological paradox, also indicates a routine of presumption based on preemptive subjective inferences, and the danger(s) that follow (Johnson c. 2 p. 13). Adapting to the continuous changes of the commands of this premise include the versatility of dominant-groups to set boundaries, autonomy, inflexibility and interdependence, manufacture notions of proper identity, -- which then become prevailing.

These expressions of perception refer to the sharp isolation of inequality and execute their primary function of the temporal saturation of conventional circumstances and voluntarily render minority life inferior, as a result, the 'social-distances' and socioeconomic conditions become disparate. To better understand the cognitive paradox of the consequences of inequality,

it should be noted that with the suprahistorical advent of industry, the enslavements of millions soon followed. This was done primarily to obtain a cheap labor force and expedite production and minimize labor costs (Johnson c.3 p. 45). As a corollary, the utilization of a process of perpetual debt continues to serve components of human 'self-esteem' and 'dignity' contingent upon competitive results, in a systematic fashion and sunders the mental well-being of the minority-groups and fosters socioeconomic, and psychosocial inequity.

Organic and dysfunctional flexibility in spheres of misperception in inequality can be seen too -- the mechanics are determined by the indefinite nature of the many forms of privilege and the lengths to which 'dominant-parties' go to distort history to reimagine and reallocate 'social-assignment(s)' (Johnson c. 4 p. 62). The problems are versatile and remain independent; following a methodical way of procedure they make their own outcomes, considering the cynical conditions. The observable limitations concern the compliance of a dominant-group's unwillingness to engage in the problems of privilege (Johnson c.5 p. 69) which also limits minority-autonomy.

The other variable of minority-autonomy is the flexibility of 'ownership'. This means that 'short run thinking' is mostly flexible within the limits determined by 'dominant-parties' - the coordination of these applications, remain at the crux of these mechanics, and stay an undebatable short-circuiting of the rectification of the causes of inequality, -- e.g. lack of autonomy, and psychological self-control in the form of the dynamics of change. This single dimension of 'inequality', makes it permissible to instantiate the rudiments of anthropological misbehavior(s) as a 'model-mechanism' that manifests itself in the form of further misapprehensions and miscues.

Johnson's original analyses of 'inequality' dealt with the dichotomizing of important social-distance(s) as they correlate to social functions, though his 'learned behavior' definitions lack the value-neutrality necessary to explain anthropological hegemony; as it relates to the sundering of minority-individualism. Johnson relies on the 'macro', rather than 'micro' analytic-approach, and conversely, appropriates an inverse paradox in the elaboration of his own

hypotheses. The rectification of his model, lies in Chapter 6, where Johnson introduces the topicalities of the psychological undercurrents, that form the basis of the paralysis of 'individualistic-thinking' and its relation to 'social-mapping' as a means of further stratification in the broader model of 'social-systems' which often results in isolation, and unfair cultural assumptions.

The description of an adoption of a version of reality constructed by dominant-parties as the default model follows the first five chapters, and elucidates the socioeconomic constraints on 'subordinate groups', and emphasizes the need to examine and rectify items at the 'micro' and 'macro' levels (Johnson c. 6 p. 79). The ever emerging inversion of obligatory expectations soon follows; and Johnson describes these correlations to a terse and oversimplified variation of a phenomenon closely paralleled to relative-deprivation.

The formulation taken toward mending the broken structural concretions of 'inequality' and 'privilege' beginning and ending with individuals (Johnson, c. 6 p. 77) is a novel direction - the discourse of power becomes a psychosocial paralysis. According to this, the process of 'participation', 'domination' and 'identification', can be seen as the enforcement of interests of a narrow placement in a co-dependent 'we in relation to them' dichotomy that remains a sociological rivalry (Johnson c.7 p. 96). Also revealed are the facts of passive oppression; in essence, the paradox of psychological hierarchy among this dichotomy. This governs the so-called high-prestige and declaims minority-parties to a state of supreme redundancy in efforts to overcome obstacles; as passive oppression, the psychologically troubling 'inverse' form of mass perception-based discrimination becomes doubly challenging to eliminate, and makes the paradox of institutional segregation a highly intractable psychosocial premise.

The rapid development of 'hierarchical triumphalism' is proven by the expansions of negligent 'social-systems' and can be described as a concise definition for Johnson's groundwork in elucidating 'psychosocial paralysis'. An even bigger number of problems are found in patronizing subordinate groups, where owing to an enhanced specialization of necessary modification; the psychological overlap between dissimilar social parties becomes

indistinguishable. Owing to the identification of this, modifications in Johnson's analyses - the internal differentiation of the establishment of 'social-systems' has reached a level where these particular arenas are recognized at different plateaus of interchangeable conditions.

By reducing human beings to homogenous psychological dimensions, and ignoring their individualism, Johnson's hypotheses are indirectly forced to cope with the inner competition of competing claims of ingenuity. Chiefly, by delving into the psychological complexities of the constituent components of anthropological behavior, Johnson cedes the premise of his own analyses. The work and the tasks laid before humanity in rectifying the infinite dimensions of institutional segregation require a higher framework of sociological cognitive complexity.

The issues are to be handled in a thoughtful way, the problems are to be considered and sorted out, though Johnson appears to be redundant in his analysis, and does not afford a workable framework of a higher modification of his analysis, -- in that there exists a psychologically significant inverse correlation to the attendant problems of 'inequality', on a supranational scale, that should not be neglected. By proposing that all stratas of anthropological populations and behaviors be categorically homogenized, and ethically formalized as a means to achieve an equal economic and psychosocial ends, we are left with the paradoxical collapse of the idealism of individualism, -- the very idealism Johnson also endeavors to obtain.

Source

Johnson, A. G. (2006). *Privilege, Power and Difference* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.