



Social Psychology

Fall 2001

SECTION OFFICERS

Chair

Phillip Bonacich
UCLA
Bonacich@soc.ucla.edu

Chair-Elect

Carmi Schooler
NIMH
schooec@irp.nimh.nih.gov

Secretary-Treasurer

Karen A. Hegtvedt (2004)
Emory University
khegtve@emory.edu

Council

Spencer Cahill (2004)
University of South Florida
scahill@luna.cas.usf.edu

Kristen A. Marcussen
(student member)
University of Iowa
Kristen-Marcussen@uiowa.edu

Terri L. Orbuch (2002)
Oakland University
orbuch@umich.edu

Timothy J. Owens (2002)
Purdue University
towens@purdue.edu

Jane Sell (2003)
Texas A&M University
j-sell@tamu.edu

David Snow (2004)
University of California-Irvine
dsnow@uci.edu

Jan E. Stets (2003)
Washington State University
stets@wsu.edu

SPQ Editor

Cecilia Ridgeway
Stanford University
ridgeway@leland.stanford.edu

Newsletter Editor

Jane Sell
Texas A&M University
j-sell@tamu.edu

CHAIR'S REMARKS

Phillip Bonacich
UCLA
Bonacich@soc.ucla.edu



First, I'd like to thank Peter Burke for his service as Chair of the section in 2000-2001. I'd especially like to thank him for being so helpful to the chair-elect.

Plans for the 2002 Annual Meeting

The theme for the 2002 Annual Meetings will provide the rationale for two of our sessions. The theme for the meetings is "Allocation Processes and Ascription" - how ascriptive characteristics like sex and race affect the allocation of rewards and costs in groups and in society. Social Psychology has a lot of say about these processes. One major branch of social psychology, the Expectations States approach, studies how ascriptive status characteristics affect attitudes, behavior, rewards, and power in groups. One session will be organized by Lisa Troyer, University of Iowa, a researcher active in this tradition. Social psychologists have also become increasingly concerned with the affect of identity on social processes. Ascriptive characteristics are clearly an important component of identity, and thus the identity that a person chooses or is given by others will affect the distribution of rewards in a group. Dawn Robinson, a specialist in identity processes and also at the University of Iowa, will organize a second session. One session, organized by Noah Mark, Stanford University, will be completely open in its content. The fourth session, organized by Jan Stets, Washington State University, will consist of roundtable discussion groups on a variety of topics.

Issues facing the section

The section needs to maintain or increase its membership. Various strategies will be discussed and possibly implemented by the Membership Committee in the coming year. One is to annually mail section registration materials to those who have dropped their section membership in the past year. The ASA provides such a list. Another possibility is to email materials to all those who have indicated that social psychology is an area of interest in the ASA membership forms. Third, section members could encourage graduate students in their departments to join (and even pay their dues).

It's Not All Good, But It's All Social Psychology

Social psychology has something to contribute to this country staying on an even keel during these troubled post September 11 times. What we have to contribute is a sense that what has happened can be understood and explained. Students in social psychology classes can be told about cases of collective behavior in which populations have panicked about diseases. In my class I use the displaying of a flag on ones automobile as an instance of contagion that could be explained by Thomas Schelling's critical mass model. Past instances of religious cults that captured members by cutting off all their other ties outside the group could also be relevant to understanding terrorism. I'm sure each of you could contribute something to this list of ways in which social psychology could shed light.

I think I'm making a general point here, the same point I try to make when I teach statistics. Knowledge of statistics (and social psychology) can make our students better citizens who are less prey to media manipulation.

EDITOR'S COLUMN

Jane Sell
Texas A&M University
j-sell@tamu.edu



Many thanks to Peter Burke for his leadership this past year. Peter's consistent efficiency, creativity and cheerfulness were all amply demonstrated at the meetings. The sessions and roundtables featured a real diversity of views and sparked a great deal of interchange. Also thanks to Peter for taking great pictures and maintaining the web site!

During the 2001 meetings, we honored Ed Lawler with the Cooley-Mead Award (see page 3 for an interview with Ed.) At the end of the business meeting, Peter passed on the section leadership to Phil Bonacich. Phil is organizing the section meetings around topics consistent with the ASA theme for 2002, Allocation Processes and Ascription (see his discussion on page 1). For the new committees for 2002, see page 4.

In this edition, Murray Webster (University of North Carolina-Charlotte) discusses the issue of conscious versus unconscious processing of information within the expectation states tradition. If others would like to address this same issue from a different perspective, I would welcome such an exchange. Somewhat related to this, Carla Goar (Northern Illinois University) writes of the double-edged experience of being an educator of color. She analyzes the situation through the expectation states language of referent actors. We highlight two students. Steve Hitlin (University of Wisconsin-Madison) writes of his interest in self and identity and in particular how this relates to teaching. Danielle Lavin (Indiana University) details her research on how inmates build a case for early release during their interactions with parole boards.

Maintaining an emphasis on exploring ethics, the next edition of the newsletter will feature a discussion of some aspects of scientific misconduct. Editors within the social psychological community will respond to some of the problems raised in the book, *Stealing Into Print* by Marcel C. LaFollette. The book details concerns related to publication, differing norms among disciplines and the diversity of ethical issues that can arise during the processes of academic peer review and publication.

This year we will not print hard copies of the summer newsletter UNLESS a reader specifically requests one. (Of course the summer newsletter will be available at the web site.) If you would like a hard copy, please send the request directly to me. Finally, I would like to thank all of you who have helped me with the newsletter. Please continue!

New Book!

Arenas of Comfort in Adolescence: A Study of Adjustment in Context

Kathleen Thiede Call and Jeylan T. Mortimer
2001

Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

This book examines stressors and rewards in adolescents' lives. The results of the research indicate that making adolescents' contexts more supportive and comfortable will be reflected in improved mental health and achievement.

SECTION MEMBERSHIP

Mathew Hunt
Northeastern University
mohunt@lynx.neu.edu



Currently, our section has 609 members. This is a slight decrease in membership from the last few years (2000=651, 1999=693, 1998=666, 1997=621), though still sufficient (at least 600) to qualify for four ASA sessions. Other members of the Membership Committee and I will undertake various efforts to sustain, and hopefully increase, membership in the sections.

These activities will include contacting all current section members to encourage them to (1) renew their membership, and (2) help identify and recruit others who might want to join the section. In addition, we will attempt to identify non-members who have expressed an interest in social psychology and/or have participated in social psychology sections at ASA or regional meetings and encourage them to join. Membership forms are available in this newsletter or at:

<http://burkep.libarts.wsu.edu/spnews/applicat.htm>

Other members of the membership committee are: Shane Thye (University of South Carolina), Kathleen Crittenden (University of Illinois, Chicago), Lisa Rashotte (University of North Carolina, Charlotte), and Anne LoMascolo (Virginia Tech University). We would like to thank the past committees and their chairs (Sue Sprecher and Diane Felmlee) for their efforts on behalf of the section.

Graduate Student Paper Award

This award is for the best paper written in social psychology by a graduate student in sociology. The paper should be article length and format. It can be based on a Master's or doctoral thesis, course paper, or a paper submitted to a journal or conference. Co-authored papers are acceptable if all authors are students, but the prize must be shared. The recipient will receive financial support to attend the 2002 ASA Annual Meeting in August, where the prize will be awarded. Papers should be received by February 15, 2002. Please send an electronic copy of the paper in Word or Wordperfect format to sfeld@lsu.edu. Only if it is impractical to send an electronic copy, then send five hard copies of the paper to: Scott Feld, Department of Sociology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803. Inquiries should be made by email or mail at the above addresses.

Ed Lawler: An Ambassador for Social Psychology

by Jane Sell



Ed Lawler was awarded the Cooley-Mead Award, the highest honor awarded by the social psychology section, at the 2001 American Sociological Association Meetings. The Cooley-Mead Award is given for distinguished and long lasting contributions to the field of sociological social psychology.

Ed Lawler is a native Californian and went to Long Beach State where he received his undergraduate degree. At this time he was interested in probation and parole processes. He took courses from David Dressler who convinced him to consider an advanced degree and so Ed decided to go to graduate school believing he would probably to pursue a Masters of Social Work. He went to Los Angeles State thinking that this would broaden his background. While he was there he took a course from Franz Adler and he became interested in sociological theory. He remembers becoming very interested in Karl Mannheim and the history of theory. He was influenced by Adler to apply to the University of Wisconsin (as Adler was from Wisconsin). Although Ed's primary interests were theory and organizations, he was very interested in obtaining a research assistantship and one was available from Andrew Michener. Michener's study involved experimental studies of coalition formation and the endorsement of leaders. So, it was through this relatively random opportunity that Ed was first introduced to issues related to bargaining and coalition formation.

Ed notes that Michener had a unique work and research style. He would ask Ed to meet with him for exceedingly long periods of time—often five hours long. During these meetings, they would sometimes write up the research, line by line. Ed indicated that while such meetings were intimidating at first, they speedily advanced his socialization within the discipline because he learned what a research paper was and how it came into being.

Ed took his first job at the University of Iowa in 1971 and within a decade became chair of the department. Iowa, of course, had a long and strong social psychology tradition. Carl Couch was already at Iowa and while he and Ed did not share the same social psychological perspective, they shared a passion for social psychology. Ed founded *Advances in Group Processes*, a series dedicated to advancing theories of group phenomena. During the 70s through 90s Ed and other collaborators (many of them also at Iowa) developed a highly productive research program in power and conflict, while maintaining his important work within the discipline through his editorship of *Social Psychology Quarterly*. (Ed was the editor of the journal from 1993-1996.)

Ed joined Cornell in 1994 where he is Professor of sociology and organizational behavior and Dean of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations. I asked Ed how he maintains a heavy schedule of administrative duties along with his high research productivity. Ed modestly claimed he accomplishes his research and does the administration by carefully controlling his schedule. That is, he carefully schedules, in advance, periods of time to devote to research. And, he maintains, he is extremely fortunate to have exceptionally good people as collaborators and research assistants. The autonomy given deans at Cornell, along with the support and understanding of the Provost, also have helped Ed keep his research moving along despite his administrative responsibilities.

I asked about the relationship between his group process research and his life as a dean: Is there a feedback loop? He argued that being a dean has certainly made him question certain aspects of sociology (in particular, perhaps some rational choice models) and the importance of balancing practicality with principle. Additionally, he stressed the importance of laying the groundwork for decisions, that is, consulting with different individuals and groups and trying to provide a clear and consistent rationale for whatever decision is made. And in particular, Ed noted, that he is frequently struck by the “importance of collegial, team-oriented environments in which responsibilities are broadly, but not precisely defined.”

I inquired about some present theoretical controversies and Lawler's view of them. First, remembering his early passion for sociological history, I asked his opinion of the importance of teaching the sociological masters. Lawler replied that sociological history is important, not for the development of intact theory, but for providing foundation. For example, reading *The Elementary Forms of Religion* doesn't provide the specific ideas involved in his own theories of group cohesion and affect, but it does provide important connections and historical perspectives.

And postmodernism? Lawler noted sometimes it is difficult to understand what is meant by the term “postmodernism.” It would be important, perhaps, stated Lawler, to separate epistemology from ontology. “The ontological portions are important, thought-provoking and challenge us to consider and think from different perspectives.” Such intellectual currents are positive for the discipline. However, the epistemological portion is more problematic. “I'm concerned about the attack” and loss of confidence in the social sciences. And further, “I don't see its potential to contribute to a cumulative body of knowledge.”

What about the state of social psychology, intellectually within the discipline and institutionally, throughout the academy? Lawler believes that social psychology is healthy in the following sense. The ideas of social psychology theorists are tied into other areas of sociology. Macrosociologists are more interested and more respectful of social psychological theories developed, for example in exchange networks, identity, bargaining, issues related to trust and social dilemmas. Another indicator of this is the number of social psychological

(see page 8...)

TEACHING CORNER

Carla D. Goar
Northern Illinois University
goar@niu.edu



Social psychologists have shown a great interest in creating strategies to combat the effects of the low states of characteristics for the individuals who possess them. Individuals who possess low states of status characteristics (women, people of color, children) are often at a disadvantage when interacting with individuals who possess the high states of these characteristics (men, white people, adults). One method of intervention has been the use of a referent actor, an individual who possesses both low states of the diffuse status and a high states of a specific status. If the referent actor is competent, then that competence can affect competence expectations for others with whom he is interacting. The existing literature provides multiple examples in which the use of referent actors results in individuals possessing the low state of a diffuse status characteristic becoming more active and influential when working on a given task. However, if referent actors are seen as incompetent, expectation disadvantage is reinforced.

My classroom is a composed mainly of white and African-American students. We openly discuss issues of race and how institutional aspects of race and racism touch our daily lives. I discuss the situation at length when I lecture on expectation states theory. After giving a short overview of the theory, my students of color begin to apply its relevance to their own lives, giving examples of task situations where they felt their skin color activated performance expectations. Also, importantly, my white students can identify task situations in which they predetermined a person of color's ability and competence based solely upon skin color before the task began. The insight of my white students has been overwhelming: many have told me that their expectations are automatic (consistent with what the literature tells us) and that they are committed to interrupt the process. When I asked a student how she planned to do this, she replied "When I see a person of color—whether we're working together in a group or not—I remind myself that color does not equal competence." Another said, "I mean, it's not as if, like, all the white people I know are smart or anything, you know?"

As an educator of color, I have been struck by the strong and very real responsibility of being a referent actor for my students. It is an overwhelming task and one for which my graduate training could not prepare me. For many of my students, I am the first African-American faculty member they have run across in their academic career. For some, I will be the only one they encounter. This knowledge has resulted in making me a more prepared teacher as I feel like I do not have the luxury of a bad day. However, I find myself in a precarious situation as I balance the needs of my black students' desire to connect with my white students' suspicion that I am showing favoritism or preference to their black peers.

I continue to happily struggle in this situation. My students have had a great impact on me. As a referent teacher, I have learned that I operate on several levels in the classroom: instructor, mentor, sponsor, persuader, assurer. It's not only what I teach, it's that I am there.

Social Psychology Section: Committees 2001-2002

Nominations committee

Jan Stets, Chair, stets@wsu.edu
Noah Fredkin
Gretchen Peterson
Marta Elliott
Teresa Tsushima

Professional Affairs

Geoffrey Tootell, gtootell@email.sjsu.edu
Jane Piliavin
Alison Bianche

Graduate Student Affairs

Scott Feld, sfeld@lsu.edu
Linda Francis
Jeffrey Houser
Shirley Keeton
James Moody
Blane DaSilva

Cooley-Mead Award

David Willer, willer@gwm.sc.edu
Shane Thye
Robert K. Shelly
Jeremy Freese
Karen Cook

Membership

Matt Hunt, mohunt@lynx.neu.edu
Shane Thye
Kathleen Crittenden
Anna LoMascolo
Lisa Rashotte

COOLEY-MEAD AWARD

The Cooley-Mead award is given annually to an individual who has made lifetime contributions to distinguished scholarship in social psychology. In addition to receiving the Award, the person presents an address to the Social Psychology Section at the American Sociological Association's Annual meetings. To nominate an individual or for more information contact:

David Willer
Department of Sociology
University of South Carolina
willer@gwm.sc.edu

Murray Webster

University of North Carolina-Charlotte

mawebste@email.uncc.edu



Volume 18 (2001) of *Advances in Group Processes* includes a chapter by Ann Branaman labeling status generalization theories as cognitive, arguing that they explain behavior in heterogeneous groups as produced by conscious responses of individuals to status differences. While anyone might construct a cognitive theory, I want to make it clear that I have always stressed that my theoretical work (usually with collaborators) describes processes outside the realm of awareness and conscious choice.

Status generalization theories posit a process called “burden of proof.” If actors are differentiated by one or more status characteristics, the burden of proof would be upon someone to show that those are *not* relevant to the task at hand. Absent such demonstration, they treat status as relevant and form performance expectations consistent with their society’s treatment of the status characteristics—high expectations from status advantages, low expectations from disadvantages. Behavioral effects and the group power and prestige structure flow from the pattern of aggregate expectations thus formed. This is the unconscious processing of status information.

But people’s *cognitions* do not work that way. If you ask, for instance, men on a jury if they thought the men had better ideas than the women, or if they knew that they encouraged men to speak and discouraged women, they would respond with surprise, perhaps denying such effects occurred. If you ask women jurors whether they knew *they* encouraged men to speak and discouraged women, they probably also would be surprised. It is important not to confuse our theoretical understanding of status generalization processes and their predictions for behavior with a theory of how people *think about status*, or a theory of *how people direct their behavior consciously*.

Perhaps Branaman had in mind a very simple case, one man and one woman, and a simplistic idea that the man would think something like “I will deny her chances to speak in order to preserve my favored status position.” (Leave aside the awkward question of what the woman is thinking as she encourages the man to speak more.) Status theories do not predict such thoughts, though they do predict behavior. And the theory covers many more cases than that simplistic one. For instance, consider a woman with an M.D. and dark skin. Suppose she is on a jury with a male store clerk with dark skin. Suppose that a third juror is a white female store clerk. While the theory can predict aggregate expectations associated with each actor here, and their relative positions in the group hierarchy of speaking frequency, could anyone seriously maintain that jurors themselves deliberately distribute chances to talk according to those three status characteristics? If they tried to do so, they would lose sight of their primary purpose, to make the best possible decision regarding guilt of the accused.

Take it further. According to the theory, status characteristics combine according to explicit (and testable) mathematical functions. Thus, for instance, expectations formed for actor #1 who has an advantage on two characteristics will actually be higher than expectations formed for actor #2 who has an advantage on 3 characteristics and a disadvantage on a fourth characteristic. (Berger et al., *ASR* 1992, tested and confirmed that prediction.) In fact, those theorists predicted by *how much* the expectations formed for #1 exceed those formed for #2, and they also predicted how much difference that makes in their behavior. No one could seriously maintain that actors in such situations calculate the precise expectations they form from such status information, or that they fine-tune their behavior to reflect differences in their status positions.

Call for Papers

Special Issue of *Social Psychology on Race, Racism, and Discrimination*, edited by Lawrence D. Bobo

Scholarly engagement with the “problem of race” has never been more vigorous and theoretically rich. A special opportunity thus exists to extend our current knowledge base in particularly innovative ways and to better systematize and integrate this rapidly proliferating body of scholarship. The past two decades brought forth several fertile lines of research. Within the survey-based literature these developments include the controversy over symbolic racism/racial resentment theory versus group conflict/group position theory versus political ideology and conservatism theories; a more explicit concern with social stratification beliefs and causal accounts of racial and ethnic inequality; the emergence of new theoretical frameworks such as social dominance theory; renewed attention to the contact hypothesis; and the resurgence of interest in contextual analyses. Within the experimental literature these developments include such topics as the implicit, automatic, and unconscious effects of stereotypes; the pervasive influence of affect; and the impact of cultural stereotypes and of status organizing processes on actual performance and achievement outcomes. More qualitative studies filled in major gaps in our knowledge about the micro-processes of discrimination and on how racism emerges and is re-constituted in everyday interaction. In addition, there has been some but not sufficient growth in work based on either multi-racial/multi-ethnic samples; examining both dominant and subordinate group processes; and merging research methodologies or working at different levels of analysis.

It is the distinctive aim of this special issue to highlight work that transcends single methodological traditions. Focused but synthetic theoretical papers are welcome. We are especially interested in new empirical research that combines data on both dominant and subordinated groups or that is comparative in scope. Research that reflects a cross-fertilization of methods is particularly welcome such as combinations of in-depth or qualitative interviews and surveys; survey-based experimentation; media content analysis and attitude outcomes; participant observation/ethnography and discourse analysis; and multi-level or hierarchical modeling approaches.

The deadline for submitting papers is June 15, 2002. The usual ASA requirements for submissions apply (see “Notice to Contributors” in this journal). Please send four copies, the submission fee, and a cover letter indicating submission to the special issue to the regular editor of SPQ, Cecilia Ridgeway. Send one copy of the paper to special issue editor, Lawrence D. Bobo, Department of Sociology, Harvard University, 33 Kirkland Street, William James Hall, Cambridge, MA. 02138. Prospective authors may communicate with the special issue editor about the appropriateness of their papers (bobo@wjh.harvard.edu). Encouragement to submit will not, of course, have any implication for the ultimate acceptance of the paper.

Steve Hitlin
University of Wisconsin-
Madison
hitlin@ssc.wisc.edu



GRADUATE STUDENT PROFILES



Danielle Lavin
Indiana University
dlavin@indiana.edu

Steve Hitlin is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. His primary research areas revolve around the study of self and identity, with additional interests in theory, emotion, gender, culture and qualitative methods. Steve's substantive interests in self and identity trace back to his days as an undergraduate at the College of William and Mary. As a double-major with B.A. degrees in sociology and philosophy, Steve has long been interested in the social construction of morality, and how individuals internalize cultural moral systems, appropriating them as being constitutive of 'who they really are'. Steve is currently developing a paper applying Ralph Turner's *true-self* method for studying self-conception in the service of empirically extending Viktor Gecas's theory of the motivational nature of the self-concept. Steve argues that sociologists need to focus more explicitly on issues of motivation, and authenticity is an important arena in which we can address such issues.

These long-standing interests in self, morality, and social systems have led to Steve's current research focus on the relationship between values and the self concept. His dissertation aims at introducing, developing and illustrating a theory of the self that incorporates current research and understanding of the nature of human value-systems. Borrowing a metaphor from the philosopher Charles Taylor, Steve presents 'self-horizon theory' as a way to conceptualize the 'personal' identity. Ultimately, Steve uses self-horizon theory to theorize and empirically measure personal identity, arguing that values form the horizons through which we make sense of ourselves and others.

Teaching is, for Steve, fundamental to the enterprise of sociology and cultivating the sociological imagination in non-professionals. Steve has lectured courses in undergraduate research methods and social psychology, and would be interested in teaching theory as well. He has a paper in a forthcoming volume on 'emotions in the college classroom' where he applies his interests in authenticity and social psychology to the fundamental paradox of teaching: how to be 'real' while simultaneously enacting a socially prescribed role.

Statement: There is an inherent irony in making a statement – a form of self-presentation – to an audience whose area of study involves issues of self-presentation. It is precisely this interplay between the study of sociology and daily life that intrigues me the most. I view sociology as the primary means to answering important philosophical questions, ranging from 'who am I' to 'what is morality'? We need to know how the social world is assembled, internalized, and transformed before we can ever answer the 'ought' questions that all cultures wrestle with. Sociology provides the tools to frame and pursue these fundamental issues. Finally, a sense of perspective, and irony, is an important part of the enterprise of sociology, as well as being the underpinning for a sense of humor, itself vital for the teaching and learning of social worlds. As Peter Berger writes, "These remarks, needless to say, are not meant to denigrate the serious study of society, but simply to suggest that such study itself will profit greatly from those insights that one can obtain only while laughing" (1963, p. 165).

Danielle Lavin is a doctoral candidate in sociology at Indiana University. During her graduate career, she has worked most closely with Douglas W. Maynard, with whom she co-authored an article stemming from her masters thesis, "Standardization vs. Rapport: Respondent Laughter and Interviewer Reaction During Telephone Surveys" in *American Sociological Review*. In 2000, she received the Teaching Excellence Recognition Award as well as the Department of Sociology's Edwin H. Sutherland Award for Excellence in and Commitment to Teaching at Indiana University. Her research and teaching interests include criminology, deviance, social psychology, conversation analysis, and ethnomethodology.

Currently, Danielle is an American Association of University Women (AAUW) fellow and is working on completing her dissertation. Her thesis, entitled "Building a Case and Getting Out?: Inmate Strategies for Obtaining Parole," (expected completion: May, 2002) synthesizes her diverse interests by exploring *how* inmates build a case for early release during interactions with a state parole board. In it, she critiques the view of parole hearings as merely ceremonial events and argues for a more social psychological, interaction-based examination of the parole process. Numerous macro level investigations into the parole system have advanced theoretical renderings of how the system operates, examined the correlates of conditional release, and further scrutinized the characteristics of decision makers in an attempt to explain the parole process. Yet, she argues, these studies tend to overlook the dealings and relations that occur behind closed doors, in casual conversations, and through more formal procedures (such as the hearings) as sites for social order and sociological investigation. She identifies a number of speech practices whereby inmates: make claims that they are rehabilitated, mitigate their own blame, or complain about inequities in the criminal justice system in an attempt to advance their case for release. Taken together, these speech practices and the associated case building strategies represent a stable feature of parole hearings and thus allow for the demystification of one pivotal portion of the parole process—the hearing.

Statement: My mother imparted these words to me: "Always look for the extraordinary in the ordinary." Looking back, I assume she meant for me to take pleasure in the little things. But, somehow I took it literally, and more to heart than she ever could have imagined. In my study of talk and of the mundane, I come to realize on a daily basis that the aspects of social life that we take for granted or overlook are precisely the "things" that we should investigate. It is in the mundane that we come to understand the complex.

ASA SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY AND GROUP PROCESS CONFERENCE PHOTOS



Murray Webster and Ed Lawler



Ed Lawler receiving Cooley-Mead Award from Shane Thye



Phil Bonacich (Section Chair), Peter Burke (past Section Chair)



Cecilia Ridgeway



Sheldon Stryker and Martha Foschi



John DeLamater, Joseph Berger, Jane Piliavin

(Lawler, continued from page 3)
publications and the greater number of journals in which we see them. Intellectually, then, social psychology has a stronger tie to the discipline than it enjoyed even ten or fifteen years ago. Institutionally though, there does not seem to be a growing commitment or interest in social psychology as an area of concentration. However, Lawler noted, "I am struck by the new theoretical work I witnessed at the Group Process meetings and the Social Psychology Section sessions." This new generation of social psychologists is integrating theories across many boundaries—sometimes discipline boundaries. My hope for social psychology is that we are clearly in the heart of the discipline. While we always have been critical to sociology, "I think that we are now more attuned to the rest of the discipline."

Call for Papers

Special Issue of Social Psychology Quarterly on Social Identity Theory: Sociological and Social Psychological Perspectives edited by Michael A. Hogg and Cecilia L. Ridgeway

Since its original formulation by Tajfel in about 1970, social identity theory has grown to become a major social psychological perspective on collective self, the social group, and group and intergroup processes and relations. It is a perspective that contributes to an explanation of a wide range of phenomena. These include stereotyping, prejudice, discrimination, conformity, intergroup conflict and cooperation, social dilemmas, group cohesion, collective behavior, group decision-making, leadership, deviance, normative behavior, roles, and attitude-behavior correspondence.

Although it is a social psychological perspective that invokes social-cognitive processes and structures, it is firmly grounded in a metatheory that privileges the collective self, and concepts that integrate social-structural and social-cognitive levels of explanation. As such it is a perspective and theory that stands, not unproblematically, at the crossroads of sociology and social psychology. In recent years, a growing number of sociological social identity theory articles have been published and there is a similar and fast growing cross-disciplinary link in political science and organizational behavior.

It is the aim of this special issue to facilitate a closer link between sociology and social psychology (of both the sociological and psychological variety) through a focus on social identity theory and identity processes more generally. We seek theoretical and empirical papers that focus on any aspect of the social identity perspective, its relationship to other sociological perspectives, or on any phenomena that can be or have been conceptualized more generally from a social identity perspective. We are interested in papers that explicitly relate or contrast social psychological and sociological approaches to social identity phenomena.

The deadline for submitting papers is March 15, 2002. The usual ASA requirements for submissions apply (see "Notice to Contributors" in this journal). Please send *four* copies, the submission fee, and a cover letter indicating submission to the special issue to the regular editor of SPQ, Cecilia Ridgeway. Send one copy of the paper to special issue co-editor, Michael Hogg, School of Psychology, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia. Prospective authors may communicate with the editors about the appropriateness of their papers (m.hogg@psy.uq.edu.au or ridgeway@stanford.edu). Encouragement to submit will not, of course, have any implication for the ultimate acceptance of the paper.

Call for Papers--Personal Relationships

Sociologist Susan Sprecher leads the new editorial team for *Personal Relationships*. She and her Associate Editors (Graham Allan, Julie Fitness, Leanne K. Lamke, Dan Perlman, and Steven R. Wilson) would like to encourage ASA sociologists doing research on relationship issues to consider submitting to the journal.

Personal Relationships, the official journal of the International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships (ISSPR), is an international, interdisciplinary journal which has as its aim the promotion of scholarship in the field of personal relationships throughout a broad range of methodologies and disciplines including sociology, psychology, family studies, and communication. We welcome submissions on a number of topics, including social networks, exchange, power, love, conflict, intimacy, social support, attachment and bonding, communication, kinship, and sexuality and on a wide range of personal relationships, including those between romantic partners, spouses, parents and children at various stages of the life-span, siblings and friends. The one caveat is that the journal will not publish work which focuses on relationship relevant processes (such as emotion, communication, sex, etc.) outside of the relationship context.

To expedite the review process, you should, when your paper is ready, send a copy of the title and abstract pages to the Editor, Susan Sprecher, by e-mail (specher@ilstu.edu) The editor will then advise you of the editor/associate editor to whom four paper copies and an e-mail attachment of the paper should be sent. For further information about the submission process, e-mail the editor or go to <http://www.isspr.org/issjour.html>



Name: _____ Address: _____

e-mail _____

____ I am an ASA member and want to join the Social Psychology Section. Enclosed is a check for \$12.00 for section dues this year (\$5.00 for students). Make checks payable to the **American Sociological Association**.

____ I am not an ASA member but am interested in joining the Section. Please send me information about membership in the ASA.

Mail to: Membership Services, American Sociological Association, 1307 New York Avenue NW, Suite 700 Washington DC 20005-4701