

ADVANCES IN GROUP PROCESSES

ADVANCES IN GROUP PROCESSES

Series Editors: Edward J. Lawler and Shane R. Thye

Recent Volumes:

- Volume 18: Edited by Edward J. Lawler and Shane R. Thye
- Volume 19: Group Cohesion, Trust and Solidarity – Edited by Edward J. Lawler and Shane R. Thye
- Volume 20: Power and Status – Edited by Shane R. Thye and John Skvoretz
- Volume 21: Theory and Research on Human Emotions – Edited by Jonathan H. Turner
- Volume 22: Social Identification in Groups – Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler
- Volume 23: Social Psychology of the Workplace – Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler
- Volume 24: Social Psychology of Gender – Edited by Shelley J. Correll
- Volume 25: Justice – Edited by Karen A. Hegtvedt and Jody Clay-Warner
- Volume 26: Altruism and Prosocial Behavior in Groups – Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler
- Volume 27: Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler
- Volume 28: Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler
- Volume 29: Edited by Will Kalkhoff, Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler
- Volume 30: Thirtieth Anniversary Edition – Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler
- Volume 31: Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler
- Volume 32: Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler
- Volume 33: Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler

ADVANCES IN GROUP PROCESSES VOLUME 34

ADVANCES IN GROUP PROCESSES

EDITED BY

SHANE R. THYE

*Department of Sociology,
University of South Carolina, SC, USA*

EDWARD J. LAWLER

*School of Industrial and Labor Relations and Department of
Sociology, Cornell University, NY, USA*



United Kingdom – North America – Japan
India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2017

Copyright © 2017 Emerald Publishing Limited

Reprints and permissions service

Contact: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-78743-193-5 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-78743-192-8 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-78743-439-4 (Epub)

ISSN: 0882-6145 (Series)



ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

<i>Celeste Campos-Castillo</i>	Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, WI, USA
<i>Nicole T. Carr</i>	Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work, University of South Alabama, AL, USA
<i>Nicole Civettini</i>	Department of Sociology, Winona State University, MN, USA
<i>Jenny L. Davis</i>	School of Sociology, The Australian National University, ACT, AU
<i>Lisa M. Dilks</i>	Department of Sociology and Anthropology, West Virginia University, WV, USA
<i>Steven Hitlin</i>	Department of Sociology, University of Iowa, IA, USA
<i>Hsiang-Yuan Ho</i>	Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, MD, USA
<i>Christopher P. Kelley</i>	Department of Behavioral Sciences & Leadership, US Airforce Academy, CO, USA
<i>Amy Kroska</i>	Department of Sociology, University of Oklahoma, OK, USA
<i>James Daniel Lee</i>	Justice Studies, San José State University, CA, USA
<i>Michael J. Lovaglia</i>	Department of Sociology, University of Iowa, IA, USA
<i>Tony P. Love</i>	Department of Sociology, University of Kentucky, KY, USA

- Jeffrey W. Lucas* Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, MD, USA
- Tucker S. McGrimmon* Department of Economics, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa
- Jennifer McLeer* Forensic Psychology Program, The George Washington University, DC, USA
- Marek Posard* RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, USA
- Christabel L. Rogalin* Department of Behavioral Sciences, Purdue University Northwest, IN, USA
- Carmi Schooler* Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, MD, USA
- Shane D. Soboroff* Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice, St. Ambrose University, IA, USA
- Shane R. Thye* Department of Sociology, University of South Carolina, SC, USA
- Lisa Slattery Walker* Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina Charlotte, NC, USA
- Murray Webster, Jr.* Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina Charlotte, NC, USA

PREFACE

Advances in Group Processes is a peer-reviewed annual volume that publishes theoretical analyses, reviews, and theory-based empirical papers on group phenomena. The series adopts a broad conception of “group processes.” This includes work on groups ranging from the very small to the very large, and on classic and contemporary topics such as status, power, trust, justice, conflict, social influence, identity, decision-making, intergroup relations, and social networks. Previous contributors have included scholars from diverse fields including sociology, psychology, political science, economics, business, philosophy, computer science, mathematics, and organizational behavior.

Two years ago, we added an editorial board to the series to broaden the review process and draw upon the expertise of some of the top scholars in the discipline. That board consists of Steve Benard, Jessica Collett, Karen Hegtvedt Michael Hogg, Will Kalkhoff, David Melamed, and Jane Sell. This group of scholars has made the series better and we are grateful for their service, guidance, and advice.

The volume opens with a review of three theoretical research programs that detail the emergence and spread of status beliefs and status value. In “How Status Spreads,” Murray Webster Jr. and Lisa Slattery Walker compare and contrast status construction theory, a formal theory of status value, and the status value theory of power. This work is wholly unique, in that it is the first of its kind to place all three programs under the same evaluative light. The authors give the reader a comprehensive view of how these programs emerge – tracing the roots of such ideas from the 1970s to the latest publications of today. This analysis is a “must read” for students and seasoned researchers interested in the emergence or transfer of status.

The next two papers apply theories of group processes to problems within the criminal justice arena. First, in “Juvenile Delinquency, Criminal Sentiments, and Self-Sentiments: Exploring a Modified Labeling Theory Proposition,” Amy Kroska, James Daniel Lee, and Nicole T. Carr ask if criminal sentiments modify the effect of delinquency labels on self-sentiments. The authors collect survey data from two samples of college students and one sample of delinquent youths enrolled in an aftercare program. Their data indicate that the negative impact of a delinquency label turns critically on how young individuals view that label. Overall, this is the first paper of its kind to test a modified version of labeling theory as it applies to self-esteem and delinquency. The next paper examines how the conveyance of status information – specifically, information conveyed

by expressive or indicative status cues — impacts the distribution of negative rewards. In “Assessing the Impact of Status Information Conveyance on the Distribution of Negative Rewards: A Preliminary Test and Model,” Lisa M. Dilks, Tucker S. McGrimmon, and Shane R. Thye rely on previously published data to investigate how status cues impact negative rewards in the form of sentencing. The authors find that expressive status cues impact negative reward allocations more so than indicative status cues. More importantly, the authors offer up a new graphing procedure for the graph theoretic model of reward expectations theory and they find that this new model displays an improvement of fit relative to the standard model.

The following two papers address issues of how to best model the impact of status characteristics. The first paper addresses the age at which the status value of men and women is maximized in the workplace. In “The Status Value of Age and Gender: Modeling Combined Effects of Diffuse Status Characteristics,” Michael J. Lovaglia, Shane D. Soboroff, Christopher P. Kelley Christabel L. Rogalin, and Jeffrey W. Lucas use a nationally representative survey experiment to determine the age at which status value peaks for men and women. The findings indicate that status value for both men and women peaks around middle age, and the status value for women reaches a maximum earlier than for men. The paper contributes broadly to the areas of status, the complex modeling of multiple status characteristics, and gender discrimination in the workplace. Next, Jennifer McLeer examines the variability we might expect to see around the status characteristics theory parameters m and q in “Measuring the Impact of Status Manipulations using Monte Carlo Simulations.” In short, the paper introduces a method that researchers can use to assess the strength of their status manipulations by comparing them to simulations that use aggregated data from several published meta-analyses. The findings indicate that explicitly manipulated status characteristics generate more distinction in $P(s)$ scores across high- and low-status actors than do implicitly manipulated characteristics. Both papers contribute broadly to refining procedures within the status characteristics research program.

The final four papers address the ways in which individuals perceive cognitive orientation, roles, selves, values, others, and groups. Jeffrey W. Lucas, Carmi Schooler, Marek Posard, and Hsiang-Yuan Ho examine how variations in social network structures produce differences in perceptual and cognitive orientation in “Social Structure and Cognitive Orientation.” They experimentally studied three-person networks that varied the form of exchange before administering a framed-line test. The results indicate that networks that cause the individuals to focus on the more distal parts of the network performed relatively more holistically on the framed-line test. This is an important paper, in that it demonstrates how network structures impact cultural variations in cognitive orientations. Next, Jenny L. Davis and Tony P. Love bring together three central concepts from sociology and psychology in “Self-in-Self, Mind-in-Mind, Heart-in-Heart: The Future of Role-Taking, Perspective Taking and

Empathy.” In this piece, the authors focus on the definitions, measures, and interventions of these constructs with particular emphasis on points of overlap and divergence. They note that these conceptualizations vary around two dimensions of importance: the role of affect and cognition and that of self compared to structure. This paper serves to clarify the relationships between these ideas as well anchor them in the context of contemporary sociology and psychology. Also focusing on individual perceptions, Steve Hitlin and Nicole Civettini examine how values change in “The Situated Durability of Values.” They incorporate measures of values in a standardized competition experiment and find that winning, losing, and the status of the perceived competition impact values which are often thought of as stable. The study is groundbreaking, in that it is the first of its kind to link the measurement of values with the expectation states tradition. Finally, in “Perceiving Groups During Computer-Mediated Communication,” Celeste Campos-Castillo examines how computer-mediated interaction impacts perceptions of groupness. More specifically, this paper addresses how computer-mediated communication impacts visual cues that, in turn, impact perceptions of groupness that are exaggerated beyond that impressions of the individuals who comprise the groups. A laboratory study varied the levels of visual cues as well as the status of group members. The results indicate that those in the middle of the status hierarchy and those with the fewest visual cues had the most biased perceptions. The paper should especially interest those in the computer-mediated communication areas where this sort of research is scarce.

Shane R. Thye
Edward J. Lawler
Series and Volume Co-Editors