



# Social Psychology

Fall 2004

---

## 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:

I would like to thank Willie Jasso for her steady leadership for the section this past year. The ASA meetings were a great success and Willie also alerted us to some inconsistencies in the bylaws. Consequently, this year when you receive your ballots, you will also receive changes to the bylaws for approval. Some of these changes resolved ambiguities (for example, who votes and who doesn't?) and some just make wording changes. I would also like to thank the members of the council who stepped down this last year: Karen Hegtvedt after serving her three years as secretary-treasurer, Mark Konty after serving in the student member position for two years, and Dave Snow and Spencer Cahill after serving for three years on the council.

I want to give particular thanks to the folks who keep us all in communication. We have a website that is maintained and updated in innovative ways by Tim Owens. (See <http://web.ics.purdue.edu/~towens/socialpsych/>) Additionally, Gretchen Peterson is doing a terrific job editing our newsletter. (You can see editions of the newsletter on our website.) In addition, the committees and the council make the smooth running of the section possible. You can see the present members of our council on the masthead of the newsletter and the committees for the 2004-2005 year are listed on page 2. I appreciate everyone's willingness to serve. We survived a membership scare this year when our numbers temporarily dipped below the 600-person mark (this is critical because the numbers determine how many sessions we are allocated at the annual meeting; if we had fallen below 600, we would have lost one of our sessions.) This resulted in a flurry of (innovative) activities to enlist members. I want to encourage you to continue to enlist your colleagues in the section; the benefits are many (access to the listserv, the newsletter, and all other communications) and the costs are really very low once you are a member of the ASA.

Also, I would appreciate any thoughts you might have for the section and membership. One possibility is that we could host a very informal reception in which social psychology graduate students might meet with faculty who are or will be recruiting for social psychology jobs. This would be a low-keyed event in which information could be traded.

(continued on pg. 6)

## EDITOR'S COLUMN

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



You will surely notice that this edition of the newsletter is somewhat longer than previous editions. In order to be as inclusive as possible for all of the various announcements and section business, I added 2 pages to this edition. I do not anticipate this to be a regular occurrence, just something done for this issue. Since the newsletter is now handled entirely electronically, these kinds of accommodations can be made without affecting the section's budget. The extended edition of the newsletter bodes quite well for our section. It is always good news when our section members have so many things to report.

I also need to ask for volunteers to write future teaching and theory/research columns. I have been very fortunate that people like Anne Eisenberg and Jan Stets have been willing to contribute when asked to do so. However, since my social networks do not encompass all areas of social psychology, volunteers are needed so that the newsletter can reflect all the various perspectives within social psychology.

I believe I have finally gotten through the bumps in the road that have accompanied my first year as newsletter editor. Each issue has presented some unique challenges, but I finally have a handle on using the software and handling the various aspects of putting this together. I anticipate the next issue should be ready in early April so I need announcements sent to me by early March.

As I was finishing my column, I received my Call for Papers for the ASA annual meeting. The submission deadline this year is January 18, 2005. The conference will be in Philadelphia from August 13-16.

I hope everyone has a happy holiday season!

## Social Psychology Section Committees 2004-2005

### Cooley-Mead Award Committee

Edward J. Lawler, Cornell (Chair)  
Jody Clay-Warner, University of Georgia  
Judy Howard, University of Washington  
David Knottnerus, Oklahoma State  
Brian Powell, Indiana

### Nominations Committee

Cecilia Ridgeway, Stanford (Chair)  
Viktor Gecas, Purdue  
Carla Goar, Northern Illinois  
Karen Miller-Loessi, Arizona State  
Kevin Vryan, Indiana (student member)

### Graduate Affairs Committee

Jan Stets, UC Riverside (Chair)  
Jessica Brown, Arizona (student member)  
Larry Hembroff, Michigan State  
Kathy Kuipers, Montana  
Terri Orbuch, Oakland

### Program Committee

Jane Sell, Texas A&M (Chair)  
Alicia Cast, Iowa State  
Martha Copp, Eastern Tennessee State  
Michael Flaherty, Eckerd  
Karen Hegtvedt, Emory  
Anna Johannsson, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center  
Linda Molm, Arizona  
Timothy Owens, Purdue

### Professional Affairs

Sheldon Stryker, Indiana (Chair) (04)  
Jeylan Mortimer, Minnesota (05)  
Carmi Schooler, NIH (06)

### SSSI Liaison

Kent Sandstrom, Northern Iowa

### Membership (Ad hoc committee)

Lisa Rashotte, UNC-Charlotte  
Stuart Hysom, Texas A&M

### Bylaws (Ad hoc committee)

Guillermina Jasso, NYU  
Jane Sell, Texas A&M

**The Moral Self**

Jan Stets

University of California-Riverside

jstets@ucr.edu



I would like to discuss an area of research that I have been investigating recently: the moral self. The dearth of research on the moral self suggests that it is ripe for important theoretical and empirical advance for social psychologists. In my own work, I have been focusing on the self-meanings, behaviors, and emotions associated with social actors as moral actors. To me, this is exciting research, so let me share some of my theoretical ideas and initial findings.

I work within the theoretical research program of Identity Control Theory (ICT), so an immediate concern has been how to conceptualize an actor as having a moral identity. Carter and I (Stets and Carter, 2005) argue that the moral identity is a person identity (rather than a role or group identity) that operates at one of the highest levels of control in the identity control hierarchy: the principle level. Principle-level identities are self-meanings that act as general standards: one's values, beliefs, and ideals. They guide the selection, implementation, and control of action-sequences at the level just below them: the program level. Programs are a set of behaviors or activities that control a desired state of affairs set by principle level identities.

Applying the above to the moral self, we conceptualize the moral identity at the principle level as revealing itself in patterned moral conduct at the program level – programs of activity that verify higher level principles. Following ICT, when there is a discrepancy between the meanings of one's moral identity standard at the principle level, and the meanings implied by one's moral action at the program level, negative emotions will emerge. Recent research using a large sample of UCR students supports these ICT predictions. Moral identity meanings are positively associated with students' reports of their moral conduct when faced with several moral dilemmas. Further, when there is a lack of correspondence between one's moral identity and moral behavior, it reflects a problem in verifying the self, and individuals report negative feelings

(go to <http://wat1224.ucr.edu/papers.htm> for the full results).

The above serves as fertile ground for further work in the social psychology of the moral self. Let me give you a sample of the ways I am developing this work. The meanings associated with one's moral identity needs development. For example, what other meanings are associated with being moral than the principles of justice (Kohlberg 1981) and care (Gilligan 1982)? Do these meanings and their structure differ given one's position in the social structure? Do the multiple moral orders associated with various social institutions (e.g. family, religion, science, health care, business etc.) (Smith 2003) influence the content and structure of one's moral identity?

Identifying the meanings and structure of one's moral identity should enable us to predict better an individual's moral conduct within and across situations. However, it is difficult methodologically to measure moral behavior. Capturing a person's responses to moral dilemmas in a survey, which often is done, is only a proxy as to how a social actor behaves. Consequently, I am devising moral situations in the UCR Social Psychology Lab (<http://sociology.ucr.edu/spyrl/index.html>) in order to better measure actual moral conduct and, through that, the theoretical relationship between the moral identity and moral behavior.

Finally, beyond the fact that negative emotions signal a discrepancy between one's moral identity and moral conduct, emotions define an individual as a moral actor such that we can conceptualize many emotions as moral emotions (Turner and Stets, forthcoming). For example, negative emotions such as guilt, shame, embarrassment, and anger signal a violation of norms and reinforce the structure not only of the local situation but also of society as a whole. Similarly, positive emotions such as empathy, sympathy, gratitude, and love signal commitment, solidarity, and the larger integration into society. In general, studying social actors as moral actors and identifying the patterns that emerge at the micro level will provide insights into how the moral order at the macro level is constituted.

(continued on pg. 7)

**“Constructing the Introduction to Social Psychology Course:  
Putting the Sociological Back into the Survey of Social Psychology Class”**

Anne Eisenberg

SUNY - Geneseo

eisenber@geneseo.edu



Previous writers in this column have presented interesting discussions of specific assignments and activities they used to make social psychology relevant to students both as a unique and separate subject area as well as a topic within the broader discipline of sociology. A necessary condition for using such assignments and teaching tools is to have already constructed an intellectually sound course relevant to the study of sociology. I discovered that it is far more difficult to construct a course to teach a survey of social psychology than it is to teach a focused topics class, such as a course on symbolic interactionism or group processes. In this discussion I share my own experience in developing the survey of social psychology class as well as the more general approach that can be used in developing any such introductory, or survey, class.

The first time I taught “Individual and Society,” the general survey of social psychology class for undergraduates, I prepared the class by reviewing a variety of general social psychology texts and choosing the text that seemed to most adequately cover a range of topics. I then constructed the class around the text and developed class activities to encourage student understanding of these key topics. I taught the class three different semesters using this approach although I used different texts each semester.

I learned several things based on student evaluations of the three classes as well as student performance on class assignments. Through the evaluations I learned two things. On the multiple choice responses students indicated that they thought the class was well organized and felt as though they learned something about social psychology. However, on the written, discursive feedback students stated that while they thought they learned something about social psychology, they were not necessarily clear about how it related to their other sociology classes. The second thing I learned from class evaluations is that, as students stated, they did not see the difference between this class and the social psychology class they took in psychology.

The third thing I learned was based on student performance in class assignments. Each time I taught the class, the assignments included three in-class exams

and two essays asking students to apply key social psychological ideas to their own lives and experiences. I found that students’ understanding of these key social psychological ideas as identified in the texts I selected, were simplistic and did not indicate any deep understanding of the material. Additionally, they did not consistently understand the relationship between different ideas or how studying this aspect of human society was sociological. So, while the students were gaining a surface understanding of some key ideas I felt I was not adequately sharing my expertise in social psychology by successfully teaching what I thought were extremely important and relevant ideas.

After the third time teaching the class I re-examined the course to determine how to address the limitations discussed above. During this reflective period I rediscovered the most basic principle of effective pedagogy - determine what you want to teach before constructing the class, selecting the reading materials, and developing the assignments. More to the point, and more poetically, I did not have a picture of sociological social psychology to paint for students through class readings and assignments. In the following paragraphs I share the process with which we can paint the picture of any area taught in sociology. Once you have a picture to paint, to continue the metaphor, it is relatively easy to construct the actual course (sketch the picture) and to develop the assignments to help teach the class (select the colors with which to paint the canvas). More to the point, constructing an effective and compelling topical survey course of any area in sociology is a four-step process.

The first step of the process in constructing a general survey class is to determine the picture of the course by identifying and defining its meta-theoretical focus, or theme. In other words, I explicitly identify the overall perspective students will learn from the class. For example, my meta-theoretical focus in “Individual and Society” is to teach about sociological social psychology as a distinctly unique

(continued on pg. 7)



## GRADUATE STUDENT PROFILE

David Schaefer  
University of Arizona  
schaefer@u.arizona.edu



David Schaefer is a doctoral candidate in sociology at the University of Arizona. His primary research interests are in group processes, social networks, and economic sociology. David is interested in the transmission of information across networks and how information flows interact with network structure to influence the development of power. His dissertation, entitled “Resource Variation in Social Exchange Networks: The Effects of Duplicability and Transferability on the Use of Power” draws on social network and social exchange theories to investigate how characteristics of the resources actors exchange influence the use of power.

David’s dissertation notes that neither the social network nor the social exchange perspective provides a complete picture of information exchange. The network approach typically defines power as the ability to accumulate or control the movement of a broad variety of resources, ignoring power as a function of the costs actors impose on one another, the definition favored by exchange researchers. Further, the characteristics of the resources actors exchange vary on several dimensions across the two perspectives. For instance, while much of the imagery in social network research is of resources such as information that flow freely through a network, very little social exchange research examines resources that move across a network, focusing instead on resources, like prestige or friendship, that are constrained to a single dyad within a network. David integrates these two traditions, first, by drawing upon both conceptualizations of power and, second, by identifying several dimensions of resource variation and explaining how the type of resource actors exchange affects the emergence of both types of power. David focuses specifically on duplicability and transferability, and identifies the mechanisms that produce power under various configurations of resource characteristics. Duplicability, whether a resource can be copied, and transferability, whether resources received from one exchange partner can

be passed on to another partner, are fundamental resource dimensions with implications for the variety of resources actors are able to acquire and their ability to use power during acquisition. Because multiple mechanisms produce power with some resource types, simulations are used to predict how often each process will operate. Simulation results indicate that the proportion of exchanges in which each mechanism operates varies across resource type and position within the network. An experiment using a computerized exchange setting is used to test these predictions. This research is funded in part by a National Science Foundation Dissertation Improvement Grant.

David is also interested in how exchange contributes to the integrative bonds that develop between individuals. Research with Professor Linda Molm has examined the mechanisms through which exchange form influences the affective ties that develop between actors. He is building on this research by investigating how the type of connection between relations influences the trust and solidarity that emerge during exchange. He hypothesizes that the mechanisms underlying power use have an effect on the formation of integrative bonds. Because different mechanisms produce power when relations are positively versus negatively connected, levels of affect and solidarity are expected to vary across relations of each connection type.

### NEW BOOK ANNOUNCEMENT

**Paradise Laborers: Hotel Work in the Global Economy** by Peter and Patricia Adler, Cornell University Press, 2004

Based on their nearly decade long participant observation research of 5 luxury hotels in Hawaii, this book touches on issues of identity, self, work, ethnicity, and gender.

## CHAIR'S REMARKS, continued.

This year the section theme will be Across the Social Psychological Spectrum. Sometimes it seems that social psychologists don't emphasize enough the perspectives that we share in common. And I suspect that at this time in our development, we have more than the famous "three faces" of social psychology. I have asked folks who represent differing views within social psychology to organize sessions that speak to the breadth of our discipline and look for opportunities to lead us in discussions. So each one of the sessions are titled "Across the Social Psychological Spectrum" followed by a subtitle. Michael Flaherty and Linda Molm are organizing new Theoretical Developments; Karen Hegtvedt and Anna Johansson are organizing New Developments in Ethical Concerns; Jodi O'Brien and Tim Owens are organizing New Developments in Methods. Additionally, Alicia Cast and Martha Copp are planning the roundtables with special emphasis upon trying to address "Questions We Haven't Asked."

One person who has aggressively asked questions heretofore unasked, is our 2004 Cooley-Mead Award recipient, Karen Cook. Karen's work on trust and exchange has been important for many different disciplines, in part because it bridges topics that were once viewed as unrelated—topics such as bargaining, networks, rational choice, distributive justice, emotion and commitment. Karen has also been important for keeping areas outside of social psychology focused on social psychology. She has done this with her research and with her professional association in so many different subfields within the discipline. I think it important to recognize that Karen has participated in opening our field and the entire discipline to both a more diverse set of practitioners and a more diverse audience.

In Karen Cook's Cooley-Mead Address, she focused upon trust and social capital. In many ways, trust is an elusive phenomenon. Cook notes that one important way to theoretically manage the concept of trust is to conceptualize it in relational terms so that we speak of trust in terms of two actors with respect to certain domains. I was struck by paradoxes of trust in the last election in which I volunteered with

voter registration groups in North Carolina. Many voters told me that they didn't trust politicians and hadn't voted in years, but wanted to vote in this election. I would help them fill out the information, or write the letter for an absentee ballot, always showing them everything and telling them that I wanted them to see everything so they knew exactly what I was writing. Almost always people would laugh at that. "No, we don't need to see it; of course, we trust YOU," they would say. But why would they trust me? They didn't know me. The paradox, which many of us face I expect, is that we do not trust our governmental officials, yet we trust most individuals, even those that we do not know. Perhaps the key to the paradox is that government officials have simply earned our mistrust.

### SECTION AWARD ANNOUNCEMENTS

#### **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 Meeting. To nominate an individual or for more information, contact Edward J. Lawler: [ejl3@cornell.edu](mailto:ejl3@cornell.edu)

#### **Graduate Student Paper Award**

The Social Psychology Section of the ASA invites submissions for the Graduate Student Paper Award. The paper should be article length. It can be based on a master's thesis or doctoral thesis, course paper, or a paper submitted to a journal or conference. Co-authored papers are accepted if all authors are students, but the prize must be shared. The recipients will receive financial support to attend the ASA meetings in August in Philadelphia where the prize will be awarded. Please send an electronic version of the paper by February 15, 2005 to Jan E. Stets at: [jan.stets@ucr.edu](mailto:jan.stets@ucr.edu).

area of study in sociology and as distinctly different from psychological social psychology. I define sociological social psychology as studying and understanding universal social psychological processes that impact on individual interactions that then affect groups and social institutions. I clearly convey this during the first week of class by presenting explicit definitions of social psychology, and in distinguishing between sociological and psychological approaches to the area. To reinforce this focus, I consistently return to the theme throughout the semester by asking students to explain how particular ideas discussed in class reflect sociological social psychology.

The second step in the process, after identifying the meta-theoretical theme of the class, is to identify three to five major theoretical issues or topics reflecting the breadth of research in the area of study. In selecting three to five specific topics discussed during the semester I am further defining and specifying the area. I identified four main theoretical topics for the “Individual and Society” class – the individual, interactions, groups, and social institutions – as representing the range of research in sociological social psychology. Additionally, specifying topics that represent the area of study allows us to explicitly demonstrate the connection between different issues. Finally, discussing each topic provides an opportunity to examine how they represent sociological phenomenon.

The third step of the process in constructing a general survey class is to identify two to three theoretical or empirical approaches to studying each topic. Focusing on specific ways of examining each topic enables students to gain an in-depth understanding of the topic. For example, I start the “Individual and Society” class examining different aspects of studying individuals in which we discuss Mead’s ideas about humans as uniquely symbol using creatures. We then discuss how humans become such social creatures through socialization by referring to the life course perspective.

The fourth step of the process requires identifying reading materials relevant to studying each theoretical or empirical area as well as developing class assignments to encourage student learning.

For example, I use a reader of primary sources for the key theoretical ideas along with monographs about cultures and lives different from those of our students. The assignments include two take home tests in which students use the key theoretical ideas to explain the lives portrayed in the monographs. Additionally, students complete two laboratory essays in which they are required to collect data on their own lives and experiences, and use key social psychological ideas to explain their findings. Finally, I ask students to read the primary sources critically by submitting discussion sheets that require them to link together different ideas from the material.

In closing, student learning in general survey classes can be enhanced by constructing the class purposely by engaging in a four-step process. This process requires us to think about the general perspective, or framework, the students will learn and the range of topics that represent it. Once we establish the framework and highlight the key topics, we can then focus on the specific theoretical and empirical approaches that reflect the topics. It is in the fourth step that we select the specific assignments and activities that encourage student learning. Reconstructing the “Individual and Society” class using this process has resulted in student clearly learning the distinction between sociological and psychological social psychology, as well as gaining an in-depth understanding of key ideas in the field.

**RESEARCH COLUMN, cont.**

**References**

- Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence. 1981. *The Philosophy of Moral Development*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Smith, Christian. 2003. *Moral, Believing Animals*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stets, Jan E. and Michael J. Carter. 2005. “The Moral Identity: A Principle Level Identity.” In *Control Systems Theories in Sociology*, edited by Kent McClelland and Thomas J. Fararo. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Turner, Jonathan H. and Jan E. Stets. Forthcoming. “Moral Emotions” In *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions*, edited by Jan E. Stets and Jonathan H. Turner.

## Dramatic Expansion of Social Psychology at Duke

The Department of Sociology at Duke University offers a new specialization in Social Psychology that incorporates core Sociology Faculty - Lynn Smith-Lovin, Linda George, Angie O'Rand, and Ken Spenner - with a new Duke Interdisciplinary Initiative in Social Psychology (DIISP) headed by Wendy Wood in Psychology and including faculty from Political Science, Economics, Law, Business, and the Medical School. The department offers basic courses in theories and research in social psychology; role, self and identity; inequality in interaction; as well as more specialized courses relating social psychological principles to health outcomes, work and occupations, and life course processes of aging.

A new Center for Research in Identity, Emotion and Social Structure (CRIESS) is currently being developed, allowing senior social psychologists to come to Duke as Research Professors to conduct research and hold workshops for students. Psychology also plans to add at least three additional social psychologists to its faculty in the next year or two.

Both the Department and DIISP hold weekly colloquia where scholars present research from around campus and across the country. There is a laboratory for experimental work on social interaction in the department that is solely devoted to Sociology faculty and student use. A much larger laboratory facility for all DIISP faculty and student use is located in a lovely renovated mill building at the edge of campus; this larger facility has four rooms for the study of open interaction, two rooms for computer data collection (with 24 and 16 machines respectively), and eight cubicles for the study of computer-mediated interaction. A control room, work areas for data coding and a large array of psych-physiological measurement equipment are also available.

There are close connections between the Duke and UNC-Chapel Hill campuses (including the ability to take courses at either campus, use any of the campuses' libraries and use faculty from the other institution on committees); there is a free bus that connects the campuses every half hour. Peggy Thoits (the current editor of *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*), Sheryl Kleinman, and Karolyn Tyson on the UNC faculty offer extra depth to the Research Triangle social psychology community.

The Department of Sociology offers nationally competitive funding that is guaranteed for five years of graduate study. See the departmental website for more information on the program and application procedures: <http://www.soc.duke.edu> or contact Lynn Smith-Lovin ([smithlov@soc.duke.edu](mailto:smithlov@soc.duke.edu)). For a sense of the broad, interdisciplinary nature of social psychology here at Duke, here is a list of faculty associated with DIISP in other departments:

James R. Bettman - Burlington Industries Professor of Marketing - [Jrb12@mail.duke.edu](mailto:Jrb12@mail.duke.edu)

Tanya L. Chartrand - Associate Professor of Marketing and Psychology - [Tanya.Chartrand@duke.edu](mailto:Tanya.Chartrand@duke.edu)

Harris M. Cooper - Professor of Education and Psychology - [cooperh@duke.edu](mailto:cooperh@duke.edu)

Philip R. Costanzo - Professor of Psychology - [costanzo@duke.edu](mailto:costanzo@duke.edu)

Rick H. Hoyle - Senior Research Scholar, Center for Child and Family Policy - [rhoyle@duke.edu](mailto:rhoyle@duke.edu)

Patricia W. Linville - Associate Professor of Management - [Linville@duke.edu](mailto:Linville@duke.edu)

John G. Lynch, Jr. - Merilee and Roy Bostock Family Professor of Marketing, Hanes Corporation Professor of Business Administration - [John.Lynch@duke.edu](mailto:John.Lynch@duke.edu)

Laura Smart Richman - Assistant Professor of Psychology - [lrichman@duke.edu](mailto:lrichman@duke.edu)

Joseph J. Ruvane, Jr. - Professor of Management, Professor of Psychology, research Professor of Statistics & Decision Sciences - [jpayne@mail.duke.edu](mailto:jpayne@mail.duke.edu)

Timothy J. Strauman - Chair and Professor of Psychology: Social and Health Sciences - [tjstraum@duke.edu](mailto:tjstraum@duke.edu)

Neil Vidmar - Russell M. Robinson, II, Professor of Law, Professor of Psychology - [vidmar@law.duke.edu](mailto:vidmar@law.duke.edu)

Wendy Wood - James B. Duke Professor of Psychology - [w-wood@duke.edu](mailto:w-wood@duke.edu)



Pictures from the ASA conference in San Francisco

Cooley-Mead Award Ceremony



Cooley Mead award winner Karen Cook (center), with Rebecca Erickson (l) and Lynn Smith-Lovin (r)



Karen Cook delivering her Cooley-Mead address

Section Business and Council Meetings



Graduate Student Paper award winner, Matthew E. Brashears, with Anne Eisenberg



Section Council Meeting

Section Reception Pictures



**CALL FOR PAPERS**

**Journal of Contemporary Ethnography: Special Issue on Social Constructionism and Social Inequality**

The Journal of Contemporary Ethnography announces a call for papers for a special issue on “social constructionism and social inequality.” We welcome papers that use qualitative, interpretive methods to study how putative inequalities are defined, framed, narrated, and/or symbolically enacted in diverse ways. Any social justice topic can be explored; however, papers should examine “equality”, “inequality”, “domination”, “exploitation”, “superiority”, and similar issues primarily (if not exclusively) from the viewpoints of social actors rather than analysts. We also invite theoretical statements on the use, risks, and/or benefits of constructionist approaches to studying inequality, as long as the ethnographic implications are explicit and clear. Papers may be grounded in a number of interpretive frameworks, such as phenomenology, ethnomethodology, interactionism, narrative analysis, and others.

If you are unsure whether your topic or research is suitable, or are interested in reviewing for the issue, contact the Special Issue Editor, Sciott Harris, via e-mail at [Harriss3@slu.edu](mailto:Harriss3@slu.edu) or phone at (314)977-2190. All papers will be peer reviewed. The deadline for submissions is June 1, 2005. Papers are scheduled to appear in the June 2006 issue.

We prefer electronic submission of manuscripts via e-mail attachment to [Harriss3@slu.edu](mailto:Harriss3@slu.edu). Those without e-mail access should send four hard copies and an electronic copy on disk to Scott R. Harris, Department of Sociology & Criminal Justice, Saint Louis University, 3500 Lindell Blvd., St. Louis, MO 63103.

**NEW BOOK ANNOUNCEMENT**

**Remembering Reet and Shine: Two Black Men, One Struggle** by Michael Schwalbe, University Press of Mississippi, 2004

As working-class African Americans who grew up in the American South, Mason and Atwater struggled to live authentic lives and earn respect as men, while being caught between the demands of their families and the white world in which they had to survive.

Mixing biography, memoir, and journalism, *Remembering Reet and Shine* delves into the southern past, following Mason and Atwater as they age, decline, and die. It also explores the great contradiction of American manhood: the expectation of control and the reality of powerlessness. This moving account does not herald heroes or saints, but raises the profile of ordinary men trying to reconcile the demands of manhood with the limits imposed by social forces beyond their control.

**NEW BOOK ANNOUNCEMENT**

***From Adolescence to Adulthood in the Vietnam Era*** by Timothy J. Owens, New York: Springer, 2005.

This book provides a unique, detailed, long-term study of the psychological and social worlds of male adolescents who were on the cusp of adulthood as the 1960’s were ending. This longitudinal analysis follows adolescent boys who graduated with the class of 1969 and transitioned into adulthood either through military service, full-time employment, or college life. The results examine the different pathways these boys chose and the effect these choices had on their transition from adolescents to young adult men.

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.