



# Social Psychology

Summer 2003

---

## SECTION OFFICERS

### Chair

Carmi Schooler  
NIMH  
[schoolec@irp.nimh.nih.gov](mailto:schoolec@irp.nimh.nih.gov)

### Chair-Elect

Gullermina Jasso  
New York University  
[gj1@nyu.edu](mailto:gj1@nyu.edu)

### Secretary-Treasurer

Karen A. Hegtvedt (2004)  
Emory University  
[khegtve@emory.edu](mailto:khegtve@emory.edu)

### Council

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

Catheryn Johnson (2005)  
Emory University  
[cjohns@emory.edu](mailto:cjohns@emory.edu)

Mark Konty (student member)  
Washington State University  
[mkonty@wsu.edu](mailto:mkonty@wsu.edu)

Dawn Robinson (2005)  
University of Iowa  
[dawn-robinson@uiowa.edu](mailto:dawn-robinson@uiowa.edu)

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

David Snow (2004)  
University of California-Irvine  
[dsnow@uci.edu](mailto:dsnow@uci.edu)

Jan E. Stets (2003)  
University of California-  
Riverside  
[jan.stets@ucr.edu](mailto:jan.stets@ucr.edu)

### SPQ Editor

Cecilia Ridgeway  
Stanford University  
[ridgeway@leland.stanford.edu](mailto:ridgeway@leland.stanford.edu)

### Webmaster

Timothy J. Owens  
Purdue University  
[towens@soc.purdue.edu](mailto:towens@soc.purdue.edu)

### Newsletter Editor

Jane Sell  
Texas A&M University  
[j-sell@tamu.edu](mailto:j-sell@tamu.edu)

## CHAIR'S REMARKS

Carmi Schooler  
NIMH  
[schoolec@irp.nimh.nih.gov](mailto:schoolec@irp.nimh.nih.gov)



---

## Sociology and Cognitive Psychology--Possible Lessons

This column continues the discussion of some of the "peculiar" concerns that come to my mind due to my dual professional affiliations— sociology and psychology. This time, the focus is not on career and guild issues that arise from following such a dual career. Instead, my concern is with the substantive lessons that psychology and sociology might, and should, learn from each other. Since my career as a psychologist has drifted from social psychology to the study of both normal and abnormal cognitive processes throughout the life course, I will focus primarily on cognitive psychology. Since any readers are likely to be sociologists, I will tread lightly on the question of what psychologists might learn from sociologists and concentrate instead on what sociologists might learn by taking into account the concerns and perspectives of cognitive science.

My central point is that if, following Marx, Mannheim and Merton, a sociologist is concerned with how individuals' vantage points in their social systems affect their beliefs and thought processes, he or she should be cognizant of the psychological processes through which people learn about their environments and generalize what they have learned from one context to another. Complicating this task are the findings from both psychology and sociology demonstrating that the very ways in which people think, and quite possibly generalize, are affected by social-structurally and culturally determined experiences. An array of experimental cognitive studies has shown that the content, as well as the nature, of thinking processes can be affected by experiences, such as training on and practice with various cognitive strategies. The likelihood of undergoing an experience which affects thinking processes is often a function of the individual's place in the social structure. For example, by 1989, there was substantial experimental evidence that spatial thinking, mathematical thinking, statistical thinking and logical thinking could be affected by training and/or practice (Schooler 1989). An impressive body of experimental psychological evidence has similarly shown differences between novices' and experienced experts' problem solving approaches in a wide range of tasks such as solving physics, chess and even social science problems. The probability of being exposed to any of these experiences would seem to be highly influenced by social structural position position in the social structure.

All of this suggests that during the human life span, learning is a progression in which 'core cognitive mechanisms' interact with experience to develop the processes through which the individual learns. In interaction with biological developmental and aging processes, these modes of learning permit individuals to operate on their environments in ways that further affect how they will learn and react to new environmental circumstances. At each point, the present nature of the individual's cognitive processes, biological state, environmental circumstances and their interaction determine how the individual can react. Cognitive psychologists are far from an understanding of the complexities involved. They have, however, learned some things and sociologists should pay attention.

(continued on page 3)



In this edition of the newsletter, we feature Joseph's Whitmeyer's discussion of the value of simulation in developing theory (see page 5). Angela Hattery responds to Richard Felson's research column on gender and violence (see Spring newsletter) by arguing that violence against women is gendered (see pages 3 and 4). Jeffrey Houser and Anna LoMascolo deliver their committee reports (see below). We feature the social psychology section sessions, along with their tentative schedules (pages 6-7). Further in the Chair's Remarks, Carmi

urges us to consider the importance that psychology has for sociology (and vice versa, of course!)

I am especially pleased to announce that **Gretchen Peterson**, California State University-Los Angeles, has agreed to become the newsletter editor! Her first newsletter will be Winter of 2004. The section is fortunate that we could convince Gretchen to become the editor—she brings great expertise and enthusiasm to the position.

I also want to remind members that our section activities will be concentrated on the last two days of ASA, Monday and Tuesday, August 18 and 19. Please plan on attending the activities, most especially Peter Burke's Cooley-Mead Address on Tuesday afternoon. Also, plan on staying over for the Group Process Meetings (sponsored by Emory and the University of South Carolina) on Wednesday.

Hope to see you at ASA in August!

**MEMBERSHIP REPORT**



Anna LoMascolo  
Virginia Tech  
*alomasco@vt.edu*

The membership committee has undertaken several recruiting efforts so far this year in order to boost section membership. We contacted current members with a reminder to renew, encouraged lapsed members to rejoin, and invited ASA members with an interest in social psychology to join our section. Our efforts have been successful, as numbers are up and projections for year-end membership look good. According to ASA, the most recent membership count was 572. Last year at the same time it was 552. The social psychology section ended 2002 with 623 members, ended 2001 with 609 members, ended 2000 with 651 members, and ended 1999 with 693 members. So, as you can see, we still have some work to do in order to insure our goal of 600+ members by the end of 2003. With this in mind, members are asked to continue encouraging colleagues to join the social psychology section. We also encourage faculty members to sponsor graduate student membership by paying the \$5.00 fee.

I would like to thank Shane Thye (University of South Carolina), Lisa Rashotte (UNC-Charlotte), and Jason "Jake" Milne (Virginia Tech) for their efforts on behalf of the section this year. I would also like to thank last year's committee chair, Matt Hunt, for the valuable help he has given me this year in prioritizing and executing my duties.

**STUDENT AFFAIRS REPORT**

**Hitlin Wins 2003 Graduate Paper Competition; Ueno Receives Honorable Mention**



Jeffrey A. Houser  
Bowling Green State University  
*jhouser@bgsu.edu*

This year's graduate student paper competition yielded a diverse set of excellent papers ranging from the use of gesture as a status cue to the role of emotion in social movements. In other words, the papers covered the gamut of sociological social psychology. Indeed selecting a winning paper from this group proved to be an exciting and difficult task for committee members Anne Eisenberg (SUNY-Geneseo), Jeff Lucas (U. of Akron), Leda Nath (U. of Wisc.-Whitewater), Terrence Hill (grad. student U. of Texas-Austin) and myself.

This year's winning entry "Values as the Core of Personal Identity: Drawing Links Between Two Theories of Self" by Steven Hitlin of the University of Wisconsin-Madison explores the relationship between one's values and one's personal identity. Hitlin notes that current theories of the self, particularly role-based identities (e.g., Strykers' (1980) identity theory) and group-based affiliations (e.g., Tajfel's (1981) social identity theory), fail to account for the "uniqueness that is...an important part of modern Western understandings of the self" (Hitlin 2003:132). In order to fill the void Hitlin proposes that one's values or value structure can be understood as a personal identity that is utilized transsituationally or in situations where roles and/or memberships conflict. Hitlin further notes that the inclusion of values into our understanding of the self allows for the incorporation and investigation of affective dimensions of group affiliations, role portrayals, and more general aspects of social structure (i.e., gender, race, ethnicity, class, etc.). Section members don't have to take the committee's word on how good the paper is. You can check out the recent special edition of SPQ for a complete examination of this award winning paper.

The committee also awarded honorable mention to Koji Ueno's submission "Costs And Benefits Of Parental Control: An Exception To The Multiple Outcome Hypothesis?" Ueno is a doctoral candidate at Vanderbilt University. Ueno's work integrates social control theory and stress theory as a means to understanding the complex effect of parental control on adolescent behavior. He posits that parental control may serve to diminish unwanted behavior (e.g., delinquency and drinking), while simultaneously increasing the amount of stress adolescents experience.

The awards for this year's competition will be distributed at the social psychology section business meeting in Atlanta later this summer. Be sure to congratulate this year's winners for a job well done.

Finally, I would like to thank the committee members for their time and effort and in making my chairmanship an enjoyable experience.

## Sociology and Cognitive Psychology--Possible Lessons

by Carmi Schooler

Among psychological social psychologists there has been concern that their field would be swallowed up by the “cognitive revolution” in psychology, so that it would become a mere branch of cognitive psychology. That does not seem to have happened (Fiske 2003). I am certainly not advocating that sociological social psychology be reduced to something like, heaven help us, ‘cognitive sociology’. What I am concerned about is that in developing their research strategies and formulating their theories, sociological social psychologists pay attention to relevant findings of psychologists — even though the latter are unlikely to return the favor.

### References:

Fiske, S. Presidential Column: Save the Hyphens. *American Psychological Society Observer*, 16 :5, 2003

Schooler, C. Social structural effects and experimental situations: Mutual lessons of cognitive and social science. In K.W. Schaie and C. Schooler (Eds.), *Social Structure and Aging: Psychological Processes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 129-147, 1989

## Reply to Felson: Reflections on Violence Against Women

Angela J. Hattery  
Wake Forest University  
hattery@wfu.edu



Violence against women is not *gendered* it is just violence, claims Professor Richard Felson. “Just merge the data, run the equations, and examine how violence against women is special.” In new-age sociological fashion, Professor Felson assumes that running a series of regression equations will unlock the ways in which violence against women is just like any other violence. Strauss and Gelles in a variety of publications have argued this point, that battering (a common form of violence against women) is just like any other form of family violence, people hit because they can. In contrast, feminists, myself included, have noted that men hit (and rape, and terrorize, and *murder*) women because they can, because it has been *legal*, and because there is ideological support for such behavior. Violence against women is unique.

Straus and Gelles noted that in marriages men and women are equally likely to engage in violence and to be victims, a phenomenon they refer to as mutual combat. But, when qualitative investigations are used to illuminate the quality of the violence experienced, we see that most often when women hit their husbands it is in self-defense. Qualitative studies of battering have also noted that whereas women may hit their husbands or male partners, that torture or other degrading forms of abuse are not common. Nor are these forms of abuse common in male to male violence. Yet, abuse and torture are relatively common experiences for battered women. I have interviewed women who were repeatedly raped by their husbands, tortured, humiliated, and disfigured. One woman I interviewed showed me the scars where she has been repeatedly bitten in the face by her boyfriend. He BITES her in the face! A marker that leaves her undesirable to any other man (Hattery and Gendrich)

Are women men’s only victims? No, of course not. Men hit each other and murder each other at a very high rate. But, when men rape other men they do so because the victim is either gay (or believed to be) or because it is believed that the victim needs to be toughened up, he needs to be un-pussyfied (Sanday). Beatings such as that of Matthew Shepherd follow this same pattern. Why do straight men rape gay men? Because secretly they want to have gay sex? NO. Straight men rape gay men because men have learned all along that rape is a tool for humiliating women (or men who act like women). Rape is a tool of domination and control.

The evidence on battering and rape suggests that men abuse and rape women because they are *women*. Stranger rape has nothing to do, for example, with control or even getting sex. Stranger rapists choose their targets because they have one thing in common: a vagina. If this is not *gendered* violence, I don’t know what is? Violence against women is a direct outcome of a power structure that is constructed and reinforced by a system of oppression known as patriarchy.

But, all of this is well known and documented by feminist theorists and researchers such as Angela Browne, Susan Brownmiller, and Peggy Sanday, and others. In order to better unlock violence against women, I think the questions we need to ask are about *men*.

Men hit and rape because they have been taught certain lessons about what it means to be a man—primarily that masculine identity is highly tied to certain activities such as breadwinning (interestingly something Professor Felson cites in the opening paragraph of his remarks). When men feel unsuccessful in their ability to establish their masculine identity via these behavioral strategies they will seek alternative ways to assert their masculinity. One popular tool is to engage in violence....especially violence against women (Kimmel and Messner).

Taking this notion of masculinity one step farther, it is interesting to note the incredibly high rates of violence against women by men in hyper-masculinized cultures, including the US (see Sanday). Furthermore, when men who live in these hyper-masculinized cultures engage in hyper-masculinized institutions—such as fraternities, sports, and the military—they seem even more likely to engage in

(continued on page 4)

## Reply to Felson: Reflections on Violence Against Women

by Angela P. Hattery

violence against women. Certainly there may be a strong selection factor, but the cultural norms and ideologies that are prevalent in these groups are misogynistic and endorse or at least tolerate violence against women (Messner, Sanday). Recently a piece in the NY Times reported on a rape at the Air Force Academy. In this case, one of the rare cases in which the offender was actually punished, he was forced to run 40 laps alongside the victim. She was punished because she had been drinking on the night of the rape. The clear message sent by this action is that women are at least as much to blame for the violence against them, and that the offense is not that serious. 40 laps is an appropriate punishment for rape? I disagree with Professor Felson when he claims that men face severe penalties for engaging in violence against women. Rather, I'd suggest that if men engage in cost-benefit, rational choice decision making before deciding to rape or batter, they would come to the conclusion that rape and battering are safe crimes...there are rarely any consequences, even when women report.

In addressing change over time, Professor Felson claims that what has changed is the way we view privacy in the family, not the overall attitudes toward violence against women. He refutes the existence of codified support for violence against women. However, a careful reading of history tells a different story. Violence against women is different than other forms of violence because the culture has defined it as less serious. There was, in fact, a "rule of thumb" on the books for many years (see Browne). In addition, battering and marital rape have only become illegal in all 50 states in my lifetime.

Women, like African Americans, have been considered less than full citizens, and sometimes less than fully human. Until very recently rape has been considered a property crime, not a personal crime. When a woman was raped it was considered a crime against the man who owned her: her father or her husband. And, the retribution (based on the fact that after a rape she was damaged goods) was due the man who "owned" her, not her. If she was unmarried and thus her broken hymen rendered her damaged and virtually unmarriageable, the retribution often included a dictate that she marry the rapist, thus releasing her father from having to find a man who would take her. Marry the rapist! With this sort of historical context what is surprising is why more men don't batter and rape. There are plenty of messages telling them it is ok to do so.

Perhaps what "motivates" men to hit or be violent isn't any different whether they intend to hit or abuse another man or a woman. But, what is different is the gender of the person they choose to assault. Because women are devalued and because of a long history of legalizing violence against women, men see women as targets. They are less likely to be punished for battering than for simple assault at a bar. They are seldom punished for rape or battering. What is gendered is the choice of the victim. Men choose to engage in violence against women because for part or most of their lives it

was legal and because they know that women are inherently less valuable and thus violence against them is not a serious offense.

Men don't rape just because there is a supply and demand problem, and we all, even sociologists, know what men want, what they have been *socialized* and *trained* to want...if you don't believe me, watch a few minutes of MTV or read the Sports Illustrated Swimsuit issue! Men rape because they have been taught that women are less than fully human. That women don't mean no when they say no. That women don't have any sexual desires of their own, we are only there to please men. Men rape and batter because they can get away with it.

Men hit and kill each other. But, violence against women *is* different than many forms of male-male violence. Women and girls who are raped and battered have higher rates of alcohol and drug abuse, they become sexually active sooner and may have more partners. Women who have experienced violence at the hands of men develop eating disorders, depression, some engage in self-mutilation. Research with sex workers documents that rape and battering are tools used to break women down in order to recruit and retain them as prostitutes. During war rape was used as a tool of oppression...the expression rape and pillage...refers to what occupying and conquering troops do to *women*. Men fight each other in combat, where each has weapons and a motivation to win the battle. But, after the battle is won, the conquerors rape women...to degrade and humiliate them, to further destroy the property of the conquered men, and to leave a permanent and indelible mark of their victory (Brownmiller).

We live in a misogynistic, patriarchal culture that *teaches* men that violence against women is ok. The following Fraternity ditty (1985) illustrates this point:

"When I'm old and turning gray, I'll only gang bang once a day."

Imagine a similar ditty about violence against men. You can't. Neither can I. Because they don't exist. And, they never will.

Don't wait until you have tenure to work on this problem. Every day you wait, 11 more women will die at the hands of their husbands and lovers and thousands will be raped.

### Selected References:

- Browne, A. 1989. *When Battered Women Kill*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Brownmiller, S. 1975. *Against our Will : Men, Women, and Rape*. New York, NY : Bantam Books.
- Gelles, R.J. 1974. *The Violent Home*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gelles, R.J. 1997. *Intimate Violence in Families*. Third Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gelles, R.J. and M..A. Straus. 1988. *Intimate Violence*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Hattery, A.J. and C.M. Gendrich. 2003. "Female Devaluation: the role of sexual (gender) abuse in intimate partner violence". Under Review.
- Kimmel, M. 1996. *Manhood in America*. New York: The Free Press.
- Messner, Michael. 2002. "Playing Center: The Triad of Violence in Men's Sports." Pp. 27-62 in *Taking The Field: Women, Men and Sports*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sanday, P.R. 1981. "The socio-cultural context of rape." *Journal of Social Issues*. 37:5-27.
- Sanday, P.R. 1990. *Fraternity Gang Rape*. New York: New York University Press.



Increasingly I have found computer simulation to be a valuable tool for developing theory. So I would like to put in a plug for this method by enumerating a few ways I have found it useful. Preliminarily, I should note that it does not require a special skill or much training. I myself am far from an ace programmer; often I have simply adapted programs written by others.

First, simulation can help with explanation of emergent group phenomena. Often we can lay out a simple model of individuals or of dyadic interaction, but beyond that things get quite complicated. For example, my most recent project starts with the idea that prestige is granted in an exchange process, an idea that has been around at least since Homans. However, suppose we are interested in prestige in a *group*, in how one person gets to be the leader. Can a dyadic exchange process explain the emergence of a single leader in a group, such as for example, Bales found? It is neither obvious nor straightforward to show that it can.

So I have written a simulation model for groups of arbitrary size (up to at least 80 members), in which leaders can facilitate provision of a collective benefit and group members grant prestige if it enhances their individual benefit. Without going into details, in the simulation a single leader *does* emerge, but only under certain conditions. One implication, for example, is that prestige will be granted only for non-rival or nearly non-rival benefits (see [http://www.uncc.edu/jwhitmey/Hierarchy\\_Formation.pdf](http://www.uncc.edu/jwhitmey/Hierarchy_Formation.pdf)).

Second, many group processes are not close to being linear, and simulation may help us discover or explain them. Take for example the possibility of multiple equilibria under identical conditions, noted by game theorists among others. I found one specific instance of this in exploring a simulation model of group-mediated social control created by Heckathorn (1990). In this model, an agent can use collective sanctions to get group members to enforce each other's compliance. Heckathorn (1990) reports on a curious collapse in compliance for intermediate values of the agent's monitoring efficacy. Specifically, if the agent is very likely or very *unlikely* to detect noncompliance, compliance is high, but if in between, then there is no compliance.

However, as I show in a forthcoming article, it turns out that for those intermediate values there are *two* equilibria. If for some reason most people are not complying then the group ends up at the total non-compliance equilibrium Heckathorn found. However, if most people are complying, then the group ends up at a high-compliance equilibrium. It's possible that such

multiple equilibria processes are widespread in group phenomena and social phenomena generally (Ormerod 1998). For obvious reasons, we are unlikely to discover them using statistical analysis of empirical data. However, theory can suggest them, and simulation can help us develop such theory.

Third, simulation can substitute when closed-form mathematical deduction is too difficult. An example here is work I have done on friendship networks. I developed a deductive model of certain characteristics of networks, and wanted to test it using large empirical friendship networks. My model implied several rules, which the empirical networks violated many times. However, I showed that they violated those rules far less than you would expect for networks similar in all aspects except that ties were random. The closed-form mathematics for that were beyond me, but I was able to show it by simulating a large number of random tie networks, calculating rule violations for those networks.

Finally, simulation provides verisimilitude. With appropriate descriptors for its variables (and perhaps nice graphics!), it looks much more like an actual social process than closed-form mathematical deduction. This can help to convince people to consider and trust the results. For example, I wanted to argue that in exchange networks, not just the network structure but also the distribution of interests around that structure affects the distribution of power. I did so by taking two very different simulation programs of exchange networks, one by Barry Markovsky and the other by Toshio Yamagishi. I modified each to allow interests to vary around network structures, and showed that both predicted strong and nearly identical consequences of such variation. I think this was more convincing than if I simply had argued my point logically or mathematically.

Let me finish by acknowledging that of course we also need to test our results empirically; developing logical consequences of theoretical assumptions is only half of theory development. Nevertheless, I have found simulation to be a powerful tool for that task.

#### REFERENCES

Heckathorn, Douglas D. 1990. "Collective Sanctions and Compliance Norms: A Formal Theory of Group-Mediated Social Control." *American Sociological Review* 55:366-384.

Ormerod, Paul. 1998. *Butterfly Economics: A New General Theory of Social and Economic Behavior*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Whitmeyer, Joseph M. Forthcoming. "The Group Control Catastrophe." *Sociological Perspectives*.

## ASA 2003 Section Sessions!

### INVITED PAPER SESSION: SOCIAL STRUCTURE IN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY: A DISTINCTIVE CONCERN

(Tentative schedule time ?)

Organizer: Carmi Schooler

1. "Social Structure, Culture and Individual Functioning" – Carmi Schooler, NIH/NIMH
2. "Social Structure in Groups" – Murray Webster, University of North Carolina, Charlotte
3. "Social Structure in Social Interaction" – Sheldon Stryker, Indiana University

### SOCIAL STRUCTURE, CULTURE AND INDIVIDUAL FUNCTIONING

(Tentative schedule time: Tuesday, 8/19, 8:30am)

Organizer: Karen Miller-Loessi, Arizona State University

1. "A Microbelief Analysis of American Religious Belief, 1988-1998" Carter T. Butts and Christin Hilgeman, University of California at Irvine.
  2. "Role-taking as an Interactive Resource in Socialization" Megan Henning and Josh Rossol, Bowling Green State University
  3. "Race, Social Relationships, and Mental Health" K. Jill Kiecolt & Michael Hughes, Virginia Tech; Verna M. Keith, Arizona State University
  4. "The Psychological Dynamics of Radical Social Change: A Study of Ukraine in Transition" Melvin L. Kohn, Johns Hopkins University; Valeriy Khmelko, National University of Kiev-Mohyla Academy; Vladimir Paniotto, Kiev International Institute of Sociology; Ho-fong Hung, Johns Hopkins University
- Discussion: Karen Miller-Loessi, Arizona State University

### SOCIAL STRUCTURE IN GROUPS

(Tentative schedule time: Tuesday, 8/19, 10:30am)

Organizer and Presider: Murray Webster, University of North Carolina, Charlotte

1. "The Middleman" Pamela E Emanuelson, University of South Carolina
  2. "The Theory of Power and Influence in Social Structure" Kinga Wysienska, Jagiellonian University
  3. "Cultural Identity and Micro-Social Closeness: Progress in a Program of Theoretical Experiments" John F. Stolte, Northern Illinois University
  4. "The Status Value Theory of Power: The Effect of Status and Resource Differentiation on Power in Exchange" Shane Thye, University of South Carolina
- Discussion: Jan E. Stets, University of California, Riverside

### SOCIAL STRUCTURE IN SOCIAL INTERACTION

(Tentative schedule time: Monday, 8/18, 2:30pm)

Organizer: Jan E. Stets, University of California, Riverside

1. "Gender Status Effects Among Contemporary College Students" – Lisa Rashotte & Murray Webster, UNC, Charlotte
2. "Sociocognitive Processes as Social Structure of Freshman Year Social Networks" – William Tyson, Duke University
3. "The Two Actor System: Dynamic Models" – Diane Felmlee, University of California, Davis
4. "Processes in Developing and Maintaining Attraction" – Susan Sprecher, Illinois State University

# ASA 2003, Social Psychology Section Roundtables, Meetings, Receptions

---

## Roundtables

schedule tentatively set for Tuesday, August 19 at 12:30

**Organizer: Alicia D. Cast**

### **Table 1: Construction and Deconstruction of Reality – President: Michael Flaherty**

- a. “A Conversational Analysis of the Language of Stock Trader” Margo Capparelli, Framingham State College
- b. “Stance Analysis: Stance Used to Measure Speakers’ Relationship to a Topic and to Other Participants” Peyton Mason, Linguistic Insights, Inc. and Boyd Davis, University of North Carolina, Charlotte
- c. “Variation in the Perceived Passage of Time: A Cross-National Study” Michael Flaherty, Eckerd College, Betina Freidin and Ruth Sautu, Brandeis University
- d. “Mass Media: Facilitating Media Reform through Social Action with College Women” Alison Brzenchek, Health Education Coordinator

### **Table 2: Extending Affect Control Theory – President: Rachael Neal**

- a. “The Emotional Significance of Race: Affective Responses to Racial Difference” Jeremiah Coldsmith and Rachael Neal, University of Arizona
- b. “Too Bizarre to Be True: Concept Redefinition as an Extension of Affect Control Theory” Steven Nelson, University of Arizona
- c. “Understanding Trust through Affect Control Theory” Joseph Cabrera, University of Arizona

### **Table 3: ‘Gendered’ Interactions – President: Sharon R. Bird**

- a. “Being Gendered: Bringing the Body Back In” Jennifer Fortado, University of Maryland, College Park
- b. “Can legal Interventions Equalize Interactions? The Effect of Sexual Harassment Policies on Gender Beliefs” Justine Tinkler, Yan Li, and Stefanie Bailey Mollborn, Stanford University
- c. “Participation in ‘Non-Traditional’ Spheres and the Role-Taking of Husbands and Wives” Alicia D. Cast and Sharon R. Bird, Iowa State University

### **Table 4: Group Processes – President: James Kitts**

- a. “Demarcating Science and Group Legitimacy: A New Theory of Group Legitimacy and an Exploratory Study” Anne Eisenberg, SUNY–Geneseo
- b. “Productive Competition? Hybrid Control Systems and the Divergence of Formal and Informal Norms” James Kitts, University of Washington
- c. “Supervisors’ Self-Sacrificial Behaviors and Subordinates’ Leadership Attribution” Jeongkoo Yoon, Ajou University
- d. “Team Mental Models and Team Size, A. Hare, Ben-Gurion University and Sharon Hare

### **Table 5: Analyses of Exchange Networks – President: Gretchen Peterson**

- a. “Haitians Helping Haitians: The Social Construction of Helping Exchange Networks” Eric Shaw, Rutgers University
- b. “Network Connections and Affective Responses in Social Exchange” Gretchen Peterson and James McKeever, California State University – Los Angeles
- c. “‘The Strength of Strong Ties’: Clique Networks and the ‘Clique Effect’ among Undocumented Migrants from Mexico to the United States” Nadia Flores, University of Pennsylvania

---

Social Psychology Business Meeting and Cooley-Mead Award Address, Tuesday, August 19, 2:30-4:30
---

Social Psychology Reception (Joint with Sociology of Children and Youth and Sociology of Emotions) Monday, August 18, 6:30-8:30
--

**Section Web Site Seeks Book Announcements and Syllabi!**

(http://web.ics.purdue.edu/~towens/socialpsych/)

The section's Webmaster seeks information about new or in-print books of interest to social psychologists for posting on the section's Web site. Please send abstract and full references in ASA format. Links to other sites featuring the book are also welcome.

As a service to the social psychology community, the Webmaster also seeks undergraduate or graduate social psychology syllabi.

Send all material to towens@purdue.edu.

**15th Annual Group Processes Conference!**

(Sponsored by Emory University and the University of South Carolina)

**Wednesday, August 20**

The Atlanta Hilton

For information:

*khegtve@emory.edu*

**Newly Elected Officers**

Chair Elect:

Jane Sell

Council:

Peter Callero

Lisa Troyer

**Social Psychology Section Committees 2002-2003**

**The Nominations Committee:**

Noah Friedkin (Chair)

Henry Walker, University of Arizona

Joseph Whitmeyer, UNC-Charlotte

Dawn Robinson, University of Iowa

Steven Nelson (Graduate Student, University of Arizona)

**The Membership Committee:**

Anna LoMascolo, Chair, Virginia Tech

Jason (Jake) Milne, Virginia Tech

Lisa Rashotte, UNC-Charlotte

Shane Thye, University of South Carolina

**Cooley-Mead Award Committee:**

Robert Shelly, Chair, University of Ohio

Robecca Erickson, University of Akron

Gary Fine, Northwestern University

Dawn Robinson, University of Iowa

Shane Thye, University of South Carolina

**Undergraduate Affairs Committee:**

Jeff Hauser, Chair, Bowling Green State University

Anne Eisenberg, SUNY-Geneseo

Jeff Lucas, University of Akron

Leda Nath, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Terrance Hill, (Graduate Student, University of Texas-Austin)

**Program Committee:**

John DeLamater, University of Wisconsin

Jan Stets, University of California-Riverside

**Professional Affairs:**

Jane Piliavin, University of Wisconsin



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