



Social Psychology

Spring 2005

SECTION OFFICERS

Chair

Jane Sell
Texas A&M University
jsell@tamu.edu

Chair-Elect

Murray Webster
Univ. of North Carolina-Charlotte
mawebste@email.uncc.edu

Secretary-Treasurer

Lisa Troyer (2007)
University of Iowa
lisa-troyer@uiowa.edu

Council

Peter Callero (2006)
Western Oregon University
callerp@wou.edu

Diane Felmlee (2007)
Univ. of California - Davis
dhfelmlee@ucdavis.edu

Cathryn Johnson (2005)
Emory University
cjohns@emory.edu

Michael J. Lovaglia (2007)
University of Iowa
lovaglia@blue.weeg.uiowa.edu

Stefanie Bailey Mollborn (student)
Stanford University
smollborn@stanford.edu

Dawn Robinson (2005)
University of Iowa
dawn-robinson@uiowa.edu

Jan Stets (2006)
Univ. of California-Riverside
jan.stets@ucr.edu

SPQ Editor

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

Webmaster

Timothy J. Owens
Purdue University
towens@purdue.edu

Newsletter Editor

Gretchen Peterson
California State University-LA
gpeters@calstatela.edu

CHAIR'S REMARKS

Jane Sell
Texas A&M University
jsell@tamu.edu



From the Chair's Desk: Opening Methodological Access

In reading the (very) critical arguments against science presented by various scholars in science studies, I am struck by the truth to some of their narratives about the conduct of science. However, I am decidedly not struck by either their premises or their conclusions. One important line of argument within this literature rests with the critical importance of tacit knowledge in the process of doing science. About this, they are, indeed, correct. A person must be socialized into becoming, for example, a social psychologist. However, is the process itself an impenetrable, akin to learning to divine fortunes from tealeaves? Sometimes, we, ourselves give this impression. Some time ago, I was interested in doing an experimental comparison using a baseline from an older study in psychology. I called and emailed several of the researchers whose publications included the experiment. Nobody seemed to be able to find the manipulations. The very well intentioned researchers tried to be helpful, but nobody could locate what had actually been done. Finally, I tracked down a person who had been a graduate student during the time the study had been conducted. He had the actual scripts used in the study. The (former) graduate student himself told me that perhaps the scripts were not that important, because the senior researcher was a genius at "getting effects," that others couldn't! This was a frightening experience for me. And it really gives ammunition to the science studies folks who are so critical. (By the way, apparently not a genius myself, I didn't get the effect.)

In our discussion of methodology at the group process meetings two years ago, we considered the lack of accessibility to primary research materials. We were discussing this particularly in reference to experimental materials, but the point applies to all approaches and methodologies. So, for example, actual experimental manipulations or scripts, at least in their entirety, are not presented in the resulting publication. Of course, the reason that journals do not ask for or want these is that they require too much space.

(continued on pg. 4)

EDITOR'S COLUMN

Gretchen Peterson
California State University, LA
gpeters@calstatela.edu



Service-Learning: Self and Identity

One of the latest opportunities for curricular development at California State University has been in the area of service learning. Service learning is defined as a pedagogical model that links course content to community service experiences outside the classroom. CSULA has adapted guidelines from the University of Utah's Community Service Center to create seven criteria for a course to be designated as service learning. These criteria include:

1. The service experience must relate course content to clearly articulated course objectives and student learning outcomes, which helps foster or strengthen the students' awareness of social responsibility and sense of civic duty.
2. The service learning option or requirement must link course content with a community service component that addresses a need identified by a participating community.
3. Since knowledge from the course informs the service experiences with which the students are involved, the service opportunities must be appropriate for the course.
4. Service learning courses must provide a method to assess the learning derived from the service, and academic credit must be based on learning outcomes – not the service itself.
5. Structured and organized opportunities for critical reflection of the learning gained through the service experience and how the service relates to the course content must be evident.
6. Number of hours devoted to the service learning component must be specific and sufficient to provide meaningful service while also meeting course objectives and student learning outcomes.
7. Opportunities must be available for community partners to provide input into the evaluation process of students' community service activities within their agencies." (California State University-Los Angeles Service Learning Guidelines)

(continued on pg. 4)

2005 COOLEY-MEAD AWARD WINNER

Cecilia Ridgeway
Stanford University



Section members should be sure to attend the Cooley-Mead Award ceremony during the ASA meetings to congratulate Cecilia!

2005 Graduate Student Paper Award Winners

The recipients of the 2005 Graduate Student Paper Award are Justine Tinkler, Yan E. Li, and Stephanie B. Molborn (Stanford University) for their paper, "Can Legal Interventions Change Beliefs? The Effect of Sexual Harassment Policy on Gender Beliefs." These graduate students will be honored during the Social Psychology Section Business Meeting and Awards Ceremony of the ASA. Please join the committee in congratulating them!

Thanks go to the Graduate Student Affairs committee chair Jan Stets (University of California-Riverside) as well as committee members Larry Hembroff (Michigan State University), Kathy Kuipers (Montana State University), Terri Orbuch (Oakland University) and graduate student Jessica Collett (University of Arizona) for their hard work in reviewing all of the submissions.

The Traits We Find Most Important in Defining What it Means to be “In Love”

Cristina Bodinger-deUriarte

California State University-Los Angeles

cboding@calstatela.edu



The following provides a preview of the first stages of “tier one” in a three-tiered survey-based research project on what it means to be “in love” (as distinct from the love of family and friends). I am in the additional sampling stage of “tier two,” a dovetailed project focusing on sexual-orientation-differentiation; I am in the survey-translation phase of “tier three,” a comparison study involving countries with very different dominant cultural attitudes towards gender roles and sexuality. The following provides a preview of the initial work on “tier one” of the research project.

The current research builds on Robert Sternberg’s triangular theory of love (1986) and Beverly Fehr’s identification of peripheral versus central features of love (1988). Of special interest in the current research is consideration of age-differentiation, sex differentiation, and race/ethnic/cultural differentiation among American respondents.

Methods and initial conceptualization were adapted from work by Fehr (1988) in which undergraduates generated a list of features associated with love and a different group of undergraduates then rated these features on an 8-point scale. Fehr considered the “top ten” to be the most “central” features of love.

In my current research, phase one of the data collection took place during 2004 and early 2005; approximately 1,500 surveys were completed by undergraduate and graduate students, at California State University, Los Angeles (a school serving traditional and returning-adult age-groups, a high proportion of first generation college students, representing working-class backgrounds, and a student population judged to be among the most ethnically/racially/culturally student body in the nation).

Phase two is currently underway and entails survey distribution among non-college-based populations during mid-2005 to broaden age and economic class representation, as well as to include a more balanced sampling of white respondents.

The current study departs from Fehr’s approach in six ways:

- the demographic diversity of the subject pool;
- the time allotted for generating the features of love list (10-20 versus 3 minutes);
- the more strictly definitional rather than somewhat evaluative focus;
- the collapsing of synonymous features to provide a non-redundant list;
- the 4-point ranking rather than 8-point ranking of features/traits; and
- the non-overlapping categorization of these features into a seven-part typology that includes the three parts of Sternberg’s triangular theory of love (intimacy, passion, and commitment).

The first phase of the current research involved asking respondents to consider what it meant to “be in love” (as opposed to feeling love for friends and relatives). With this concept in mind, 52 undergraduate and graduate university students in late 2003, and another 48 in early 2004, were asked spend 10-20 minutes writing down the elements or traits they believed to be important in defining what it meant to be “in love.” This group was quite diverse (13% Asian; 10% Black, 52% Latino; 10% White; 5% Mixed; and 10% Other) and consisted of students from a wide variety of majors and age groups. The additional time was considered crucial for this population of students, many of whom are not native English-speakers. Less time would potentially favor the more English-proficient with greater representation, thus undermining the manifestation of potential cultural patterns of differentiation among responses.

(continued on pg. 6)

CHAIR'S COLUMN
(continued from pg.1)

Lack of access to these primary materials is problematic for a number of reasons. First, of course, it interferes in complete assessment of the research, and consequently interferes in replications. But it also creates problems in access that lead to research social networks that are difficult for outsiders to penetrate. Some people might argue that such networks are important for the patrolling of the technique. There is some truth to this, but there is more truth to the open access. An obvious way to develop access is to develop websites that would contain such materials. A centralized website does not seem feasible because of the notorious problems of coordination. But individual researcher websites certainly are possible, and some, of course, already employ them. (Kudos to these researchers.) So, really, the only problem is to encourage scholars to develop them. This we can do in two ways. First we can begin to include expanded information in our own articles for the review process. That is, we could develop a norm by which more detail is included with the understanding that it is just for the reviewers' consideration. Then when publication occurs, the detailed information could be posted upon the researcher's website.

The second way to encourage such a process is by suggesting it when we review articles, so the journal editors as well as researchers become used to the suggestion. This would be a simple request to post the manipulations or coding instructions and specific questions on the website once the paper was accepted. No doubt, many will say that we can't post everything—so much of research is tacit knowledge that one learns through doing. That is true; but it can't be everything. If it is, then some of the science studies scholars are correct that science is really not about testing of ideas, or the determination of truth. It is just about the adjustment of the smoke and mirrors.

EDITOR'S COLUMN
(continued from pg. 2)

My initial foray into the realm of service-learning was an upper-division sociology elective on Self and Identity. One of the great opportunities afforded by developing a service-learning course on this topic is its amenability to service in a broad range of arenas. In the two times I have taught the class thus far, students have volunteered at schools, after-school programs, child-care programs, homeless shelters, environmental groups, and senior citizen centers.

One of the reasons students like service-learning is the opportunity it affords to apply the concepts and theories from class to situations they encounter in their lives. This type of pedagogical model allows students to clearly see the relevance of their sociological knowledge. As an instructor in a service-learning course, the real challenge I face is in getting students to not only relate the concepts to events which occur during their service, but also to relate the concepts to one another. Students tend to try and view each concept in isolation. My efforts at pushing students to grasp the interrelatedness of various course concepts involves developing a course paper project in which students initially relate a single course concept to their service experiences in a series of papers and then must unite their papers into a coherent final paper.

While service learning seems to be gaining in popularity (on our campus as well as others), bureaucratic challenges exist that may stifle service learning possibilities in the future. One example is the California State University's creation of a "Best Practices for Managing Risk in Service Learning Manual". This manual outlines procedures which must be followed in order for a student to participate in service learning at a particular location. In particular, all locations for service learning must be approved in advance by the Educational Participation in Communities Office on our campus. It remains to be seen how these new bureaucratic regulations impact service learning opportunities on our campus.

GRADUATE STUDENT PROFILE

Heather R. Rodriguez
Purdue University
email@purdue.edu



Heather R. Rodriguez is a Ph.D. candidate in the sociology department at Purdue University in West Lafayette, Indiana. Her main areas of interest are medical sociology and social psychology. Her dissertation (“Social and Cognitive effects on Adolescent Sexual Self-Efficacy and Sexual Behavior”) uses the Add Health data set. It is a longitudinal study that examines how adolescent sexual self-efficacy develops over time. It also examines adolescent beliefs about outcomes expected from engaging in sexual behavior, and the effect that past sexual experiences and social factors (i.e., race, gender, and socioeconomic status) have on future sexual self-efficacy and sexual experiences. Her dissertation committee members include Viktor Gecas, Timothy Owens, James Anderson, and Jeni Loftus.

Over the past ten years, Heather has actively engaged in numerous social and professional experiences that have complimented her research interests. Most of these experiences fall into three main areas: 1) working with children with various mental illnesses and physical abilities, 2) working in hospitals and clinics that serve low-income families, Spanish-speaking families, and homeless individuals, and 3) working with HIV+ individuals and researching the effectiveness of HIV prevention programs.

As an undergraduate at the University of Notre Dame, Heather formed an attachment with sociology subject matter specifically related to women’s health issues and cultural aspects of medicine. This led her to explore graduate school options in sociology. It was the research agenda and guidance of medical sociologist Dr. James Anderson that drew her to Purdue University.

Over the past five years at Purdue, Heather has proposed, conducted, and assisted in various research projects related to HIV/AIDS, chronic illness, the internet and health care, feminist theory, and adolescent sexual behavior. She is also pursuing a graduate minor in Women’s Studies and currently teaches General Social Psychology. Heather is interested in doing further research related to self-efficacy and adolescent sexual behavior, health care experiences of elderly Latino women, chronic illness and the social psychological effects on significant others, topics on race and identity, HIV prevention program effectiveness, and beginning stages of mental illness in young adults and identity formation. She is also interested in further exploring the role that agentic, cognitive, and social factors play in the lives of individuals (e.g., adolescents, minorities, women) and the formation of these processes over time.

In the summer of 2005, Heather plans to complete her dissertation and continue her research through a postdoctoral fellowship at UCLA with the National Institutes of Mental Health supported AIDS Training Program, under the direction of Oscar Grusky.

GROUP PROCESSES CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENT

The annual group processes conference will be held again this year in conjunction with the ASA meetings. The date of the conference is August 12, 2005 (the day before the annual meetings start). More information about the conference will appear in the Summer newsletter.

RESEARCH COLUMN

(continued from pg. 3)

This process generated a slightly shorter list of responses than those generated by Fehr's subject pool over a decade ago (59 as compared to 68). These responses were then reviewed and the synonyms clustered and collapsed, yielding 36 distinct features respondents identified as indicative of being in love.

These 36 features were then used to construct an analytic typology of seven non-overlapping definitional categories. The typology below shows the number of discrete features of love associated with each category, provides the (at this preliminary stage) most highly rated feature in each category by way of example, and gives mean score on a 0-4 scale where 4 is "crucial: cannot be in love without it." Please note this is based solely on the first 1,500 surveys collected from students and may not represent findings once responses from the broader survey sample are included.

Typology: What it Means to be "In Love"

	Commitment	General Affect	Interpersonal Skills	Intimacy	Passion	Similarity	Situational Elements
# Features n=36	5	5	5	11	3	3	4
Example of Feature	Commitment	Happiness	Respect	Trust	Sexual Passion	Similar Values	Time Spent Together
Mean Score	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.1	2.8	3.2

The current research is not intended as a replication, but rather, as providing complementarity to Fehr's earlier work. First, Fehr's scale might be seen as containing an evaluative element about the quality of love rather than defining love per se (from 1 = an extremely poor feature to 8 = an extremely good feature). The current study relies on a 5-point scale, (0-4) to generate scores of the relative importance of a trait in defining being in love.

0 = Not at all important to what it means to be "in-love."

1 = Only slightly important to what it means to be "in-love."

2 = Moderately important to what it means to be "in-love."

3 = Very important to what it means to be "in-love."

4 = Absolute importance – it is not possible to be "in-love" without this.

Whereas Fehr interpreted the highest scoring "good" features as most "central" in a prototype of love, the current study interprets the highest scoring "important" features as defining what people believe it means to be "in-love." Nonetheless, the 36 features generated in phase one include all ten of the features Fehr identified as most central;

Phase three, the analysis, will be completed in May 2005. The ratings will be analyzed across all respondents, and by age, by gender, and by ethnicity. The ten most highly-rated features for each of these groups will be compared with one another and also with Fehr's ten most central features of love. The data will identify potential variations among demographic groups in terms of overall prototypes of love, and will also be analyzed to ascertain whether there is a discernable variation among demographic groups in the pattern of alignment between love prototypes and Sternberg's love triangles. The research interest is in whether there is any pattern of differentiation and the implications that such differentiation (or lack thereof) might have in the study of emotions.

Fehr, B. 1988. Prototype Analysis of the Concepts of Love and Commitment, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55: 557-579.

Sternberg, R. J. 1986. A Triangular Theory of Love, *Psychological Review*, 93: 119-135.

CANDIDATES FOR SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY SECTION ELECTIONS

Chair-Elect:

Judith A. Howard
University of Washington

Timothy Owens
Purdue University

Social Psychology Council:

Karen Hegtvedt
Emory University

Howard Kaplan
Texas A&M University

Elizabeth Menaghan
Ohio State University

Michael Shanahan
Univ. of North Carolina

Candidate biographies can be viewed through the ASA website at: <http://www.asanet.org>.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO SECTION BYLAWS

Section members should also read through the proposed bylaw changes. The text of the original bylaws and the proposed changes can be found on the ASA website at: <http://www.asanet.org>. The proposed changes amend sections of the bylaws covering officers, committees, and awards.

The deadline for voting is noon on June 1, 2005.

NEW BOOK ANNOUNCEMENT

The Sociology of Emotions, Jonathan H. Turner and Jan E. Stets, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

This book reviews the theoretical and empirical work in the sociology of emotions, with appendices on relevant psychological theories as they intersect with sociological theories. The theories are grouped into several basic approaches: dramaturgical and cultural, interaction ritual, symbolic interactionist, exchange, structural, and evolutionary. The theories that have been developed within these diverse traditions are summarized, and illustrative empirical work using each theory is reviewed.

Table of Contents:

1. Conceptualizing emotions sociologically; 2. Dramaturgical and cultural theorizing on emotions; 3. Ritual theorizing on emotions; 4. Symbolic interactionist theorizing on emotions; 5. Symbolic interactionist theorizing on emotions with psychoanalytic elements; 6. Exchange theorizing on emotions; 7. Structural theorizing on emotions; 8. Evolutionary theorizing on emotions; 9. Prospects for a sociology of emotions.

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING

The centennial meeting of the American Sociological Association will be held August 13-16, 2005 in Philadelphia. The meeting theme is Comparative Perspectives, Competing Explanations: Accounting for the Rising and Declining Significance of Sociology. More information about the meetings can be found at the ASA website: <http://www.asanet.org/convention/2005>.

CALL FOR NEWSLETTER CONTRIBUTIONS

Future issues of the newsletter depend on contributions from section members. Any ideas for future teaching columns, theory/research columns, or other announcements should be sent to the newsletter editor, Gretchen Peterson, at gpeters@calstatela.edu.

The summer edition of the newsletter will be published in July. Any contributions for the summer should be sent by June 24, 2005.

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 Social Psychology 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.