

**EVALUATIONS IN SOCIAL INTERACTION**  
(Wednesday, 1-4 p.m., Tarbutton Hall 104)

Instructor: Dr. Karen A. Hegtvedt  
Office: Tarbutton Hall, Room 227  
Hours: MW 10:30-11:30; by appointment  
Phone/Email: 404-727-7517; khegtv@emory.edu

**Course Objectives**

How do people evaluate themselves, their feelings, and their outcomes in social interaction? This course first addresses a critical process underlying evaluations: the comparisons individuals make between themselves and others. When people make comparisons, with whom do they compare themselves, and what are the consequences of those comparisons are key questions to be addressed. The second part of the course notes how such comparisons influence emotional experiences and expressions. We will examine more generally debates within the sociology and psychology of emotions regarding the nature of emotions, including the roles of biology and cognitions in stimulating and controlling emotions. Theoretical approaches focus on the construction of emotions as well as their consequences for interaction. Both social comparisons and emotions are fundamental components of fairness evaluations. Thus the course pertains to the processes underlying evaluation of fairness in small groups as well as in society as a whole. Here we will consider questions such as: What is justice? How do people perceive injustice? How do people respond to injustice? These questions highlight the antecedents and consequences of both procedural and distributive justice processes in social interaction.

Students should acquire an understanding of the central issues and debates in the sub-fields of social psychology specified above. In addition, the course should prepare students to formulate their own critical assessments of these issues as well as links among the various sub-fields.

**Course Readings**

The course outline indicates readings for specific topics. Some of the readings are selections from various journals and books. Copies of these articles will be in the reserve section of the Sociology Departmental Lounge. (I will attempt to get them up on electronic reserves also as a number of the class members are from other departments.)

## Course Requirements

You are, of course, expected to attend class regularly, to complete all assigned readings before class, and to participate actively in class discussions. If you should foresee missing a class session due to illness, please notify me so that we do not delay the start of class waiting for you. Missing more than two class sessions may jeopardize your grade for the class. In addition to participation, your course grade will be based on the following: (parenthetical expressions indicate percent of your total grade).

### 1. Reading Critiques

For each weekly topic, class members will offer reviews of the readings. Typically, two or three class members will write and circulate reviews, which will be used as a basis of discussion. A review consists of a summary of the article, identification of its strengths and weaknesses (including critical comments), statement of how a reading fits with others, and identification of new questions stemming from the article. Class members will choose or I will assign readings to review within each section of the course. Students should write up their critiques in no more than two double-spaced, type-written pages (per article) and circulate them to other class members 24 hours before the class session. (Depending on the topic and the reading to be covered, students will meet with me to discuss how we will coordinate our roles in class.) We will make sure that students do about the same number of critiques in the course of the semester. These will be graded satisfactory/unsatisfactory. The evaluation is based on thoroughness and thoughtfulness. Students will have to re-write any review on which they receive an unsatisfactory. (15%)

At the beginning of class sessions, each student will offer a question raised by the set of readings (which may coincide with the reading critiques offered by others). These questions will be addressed during the class discussion at appropriate times.

### 2. Essays

In order to provide students with the opportunity for expressing their individual analyses of various issues discussed, the course includes three essay exams. Students will complete **one** exam on a topic *other than* the topic addressed in their papers. Each exam requires students to respond to one of two essay questions, which are much like questions that appear on preliminary examinations. I will hand out an exam at the conclusion of each section of the course. Responses may be no more than 10 pages in length and will be due about two weeks later. (25%)

### 3. Research Paper and ALTERNATIVE

Because individuals take courses for different reasons, the intent of the research paper is to allow you to study in detail a topic that is specific to your own purpose. Thus the research paper may take one of the following forms:

- (A) a position paper presenting a cogent argument regarding a theoretical or empirical issue on a topic relevant to evaluations in social interaction;
- (B) a research proposal that includes a review of relevant literature, hypotheses, and tentative research methods; or
- (C) report of your own empirical research, completing the research proposed for another class (this option would include a literature review and theoretical statement in addition to empirical results);
- (D) an analytical synthesis of topics stemming from two different parts of the course.

To facilitate development of the research paper, a one-page prospectus is due September 28. Preliminary drafts should be completed one week prior to the class discussions. We will discuss papers on December 14 (extra day owing to "off" day before Thanksgiving) or, perhaps, another day agreeable to all. Final papers are due December 20, in my box by 5 p.m. (50%)

ALTERNATIVE: Because students take this course for various reasons and at various points in their graduate careers, sometimes it does not make sense to devote effort to the development of a research paper that will be solely an exercise and never used for other scholarly purposes. Thus, as an alternative to the research paper, students may opt to take all three essay exams (one for each topic).

### 4. Paper Critiques

Seminar members will read and critique papers of at least two of their classmates. Authors are responsible for copying papers and distributing them to class members approximately one week before discussion dates. Readers will take the role of "journal reviewer" in examining the papers. Each review (approximately one type-written page) should critique the author's argument and identify other inadequacies as well as offer constructive suggestions for revisions. Readers should provide copies of their reviews to all class members. The critiques will form the basis for the paper discussions; authors will have the opportunity to address the criticisms of classmates and use the reviews as a basis for revising their papers. (5%/15%)

## Course Outline

I. Introduction (7 September)

II. Social Comparisons

A. What are social comparisons? (12 September)

Suls, Jerry and Ladd Wheeler. 2000. A selective history of classic and neo-social comparison theory. Pp. 3-19 in *Social Comparison Processes: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*, edited by J. Sulz and R.L. Miller. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere.

Festinger, Leon. 1954. A theory of social comparison. *Human Relations* 14:48-64.

Goethals, George R. and John M. Darley. 1977. Social comparison theory: An attributional approach. Pp. 259-278 in *Social Comparison Processes: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*, edited by J. Sulz and R.L. Miller. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere.

Buunk, Bram, P. and Thomas Mussweiler. 2001. New directions in social comparison research. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 31:467-475.

Wood, Joanne V. 1996. What is social comparison and how should we study it? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22:520-537.

B. What are consequences of various types of comparisons? (19 September)

Wood, Joanne, V., John L. Michela and Caterina Giordano. Downward comparison in everyday life: Reconciling self-enhancement models with the mood-cognition priming model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79:563-579.

Mussweiler, Thomas and Katja Rüter. 2003. What friends are for! The use of routine standards in social comparison. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85:467-481.

Wilson, Anne, E. and Michael Ross. 2000. The frequency of temporal-self and social comparisons in people's personal appraisals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 78:928-942.

Mussweiler, Katja Rüter, and Kai Epstude. 2004. The ups and downs of social comparison: Mechanisms of assimilation and contrast. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87:832-844.

Locke, Kenneth D. 2003. Status and solidarity in social comparison: Agentic and communal values and vertical and horizontal directions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 84:619-631.

C. How do social comparisons affect social behavior? (26 September)

Himself, Amy J., and Wendy A. Goldberg. 2003. Social comparisons and satisfaction with the division of housework: Implications for men's and women's role strain. *Journal of Family Issues* 24:843-866.

Tennen, Howard, Tara Eberhardt McKee and Glenn Affleck. 2000. Social comparison processes in health and illness. Pp. 443-483 in *Handbook of Social Comparison: Theory and Research*, edited by J. Suls and L. Wheeler. New York: Kluwer Academic.

Jones, Diane C. 2001. Social comparison and body image: Attractiveness comparisons to models and peers among adolescent girls and boys. *Sex Roles* 45:645-664.

Gartrell, David. 2002. The embeddedness of social comparison. Pp. 164-184 in *Relative Deprivation: Specification, Development, and Integration*, edited by Iain Walker and Heather J. Smith. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hogg, Michael A. 2000. Social identity and social comparison. Pp. 401-421 in *Handbook of Social Comparison: Theory and Research*, edited by J. Suls and L. Wheeler. New York: Kluwer Academic.

### III. Emotions

#### A. What are emotions? (5 October)

\*Smith-Lovin, Lynn. 1995. The sociology of affect and emotion. Pp. 118-148 in *Sociological Perspectives on Social Psychology*, edited by K.C. Cook, G.A. Fine, and J. House. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Schachter, S. and J. Singer. 1962. Cognitive, social and physiological determinants of emotional state. *Psychological Review* 69:379-99.

Zajonc, R.B. 1984. On the primacy of affect. *American Psychologist* 39:117-23.

Lazarus, R.S. 1984. On the primacy of cognition. *American Psychologist* 39:124-29.

Kemper, Theodore D. 1987. How many emotions are there? Wedding the social and the autonomic components. *American Journal of Sociology* 93:263-89.

Ortony, Andrew, Gerald L. Clore, and Mark A. Foss. 1987. The referential structure of the affective lexicon. *Cognitive Science* 11:341-364.

Mesquita, Batja, Nico H. Frijda, and Klaus R. Scherer. 1997. Culture and emotion. Pp. 255-297 in *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, volume 2, edited by J.W. Berry, P.R. Dasen, et al. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

#### B. How do emotional experiences emerge? (12 October)

Mills, Trudy and Sheryl Kleinman. 1988. Emotions, reflexivity and action: An interactionist analysis. *Social Forces* 66:1009-1027.

Heise, David R. 2002. Understanding social interaction with affect control theory. Pp. 17-40 in *New Directions in Contemporary Sociological Theory*, edited by J. Berger and M. Zelditch, Jr. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lively, Kathryn J. And David R. Heise. 2004. Sociological realms of emotional experience. *American Journal of Sociology* 109:1109-1136.

Rashotte, Lisa Slattery. 2002. What does that smile mean? The meaning of nonverbal behaviors in social interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 65:92-102.

Kemper, T. D. 1990. Social relations and emotions: A structural approach. Pp. 1207-237 in *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*, edited by T. D. Kemper. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Turner, Jonathan H. 1999. Toward a general sociological theory of emotions. *Journal of the Theory of Social Behavior* 29: 135-162.

C. How are emotions managed? (19 October)

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1990. Ideology and emotion management: A perspective and path for future research. Pp. 117-142 in *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*, edited by T. D. Kemper. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Martin, Joanne, Kathleen Knopoff, and Christine Beckman. 1998. An alternative to bureaucratic impersonality and emotional labor: Bounded emotionality at The Body Shop. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43:429-469.

Lively, Kathryn J. 2000. Reciprocal emotion management. *Work and Occupations* 27:32-63.

Brody, Leslie R., and Judith A. Hall. 2000. Gender, emotion, and expression. Pp. 338-367 in *Handbook of Emotions*, edited by Michael Lewis and Jeannette M. Haviland-Jones. New York: Guilford Press.

Erickson, Rebecca J. 2005. Why emotion work matters: Sex, gender, and the division of household labor. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67:337-351.

D. How does group structure and the context affect emotions? (26 October)

Ridgeway, Cecilia and Cathryn Johnson. 1990. What is the relationship between socioemotional behavior and status in task groups? *American Journal of Sociology* 95:1189-1212.

Lovaglia, Michael J. and Jeffrey A. Houser. 1996. Emotional reactions and status in groups. *American Sociological Review* 61:867-883.

Shelly, Robert. 2004. Emotions, sentiments, and performance expectations. *Advances in Group Processes* 21:141-165.

Thye, Shane, R., Jeongkoo Yoon, and Edward J. Lawler. 2002. The theory of relational cohesion: Review of a research paradigm. *Advances in Group Processes* 19:139-166.

Johnson, Cathryn, Rebecca Ford, and Joanne Kaufmann. 2000. Emotional Reactions to Conflict: Do dependence and legitimacy matter? *Social Forces* 79:107-137.

Simon, Robin W., and Leda E. Nath. Gender and emotion in the United States: Do men and women differ in self-reports of feelings and expressive behavior? *American Sociological Review* 109:1137-1176

#### IV. Justice Processes

A. What is distributive justice? (2 November)

\*Hegtvedt, Karen A. and Barry Markovsky. 1995. Justice and injustice. Pp. 257-280 in *Sociological Perspectives on Social Psychology*, edited by K.C. Cook, G.A. Fine, and J. House. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Stolte, J.F. 1987. The formation of justice norms. *American Sociological Review* 52:774-84.

Leventhal, Gerald S., J. Karuza, Jr., and William R. Fry. 1980. Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. Pp. 167-218 in *Justice and Social Interaction*, edited by G. Mikula. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Tyler, Tom R., Robert J. Boeckman, Heather J. Smith, and Yuen J. Huo. 1997. *Social Justice in a Diverse Society*. (Chapter 9: Social Structural Influences) Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Wenzel, Michael. 2001. A social categorization approach to distributive justice: Social identity as the link between relevance of inputs and need for justice. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 40:315-335.

Jasso, Guillermina. 1983. Fairness of individual rewards and fairness of the reward distribution: Specifying the inconsistency between the micro and macro principles of justice. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 46:185-199.

\*Jasso, Guillermina. 2002. Formal theory. Pp. 37-68 in *Handbook of Sociological Theory*, edited by Jonathan H. Turner. New York: Kluwer/Academic/Plenum.

B. How do people perceive distributive injustice? (9 November)

Olson, James M. and Carolyn Hafer. (2001). Tolerance of personal deprivation. Pp. 157-175 in *The Psychology of Legitimacy: Emerging Perspectives on Ideology, Justice, and Intergroup Relations*, edited by John T. Jost. and Brenda Major. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, Ronald L. 1982. Perceiving justice: An attributional perspective. Pp. 119-60 in *Equity and Justice in Social Behavior*, edited by J. Greenberg and R.L. Cohen. New York: Academic Press. (SKIM)

Moore, Dahlia. 1991. Entitlement and justice evaluations: Who should get more and why? *Social Psychology Quarterly* 54:208-33.

Skitka, Linda J. 2003. Of different minds: An accessible identity model of justice reasoning. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 4:286-297.

Van den Bos, Kees. 2003. On the subjective quality of social justice: The role of affect as information in the psychology of justice judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85:482-498.

Greenstein, Theodore N. 1996. Gender ideology and perceptions of the fairness of the division of household labor: Effects on marital quality. *Social Forces* 74:1029-1042.

C. How do people respond to injustice? (16 November)

Hegtvedt, Karen A. 1990. The effects of relationship structure on emotional responses to inequity. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 53:214-228.

Markovsky, Barry. 1985. Toward a multilevel distributive justice theory. *American Sociological Review* 50:822-839.

Hegtvedt, Karen A., Elaine A. Thompson, and Karen S. Cook. 1993. Power and equity: What counts in attributions for exchange outcomes? *Social Psychology Quarterly* 56:100-119.

Younts, W. and Mueller, C. W. (2001). Justice processes: Specifying the mediating role of perceptions of distributive justice. *American*

Lind, E. Allan, Laura Kray, and Leigh Thompson. 1998. The social construction of injustice: Fairness judgments in response to own and others' unfair treatment by authorities. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 75:1-22.

THANKSGIVING (23 November)

D. How does procedural justice function in interaction? (30 November)

Lind, Alan and Tom R. Tyler. 1988. *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. (Chapter 10: Two models of procedural justice). New York: Plenum.

Tyler, Tom R., P. Degoey, and Heather J. Smith. 1996. Understanding why the justice of group procedures matters. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70:913-930.

Tyler, Tom R., and Stephen Blader. 2003. The Group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 7:349-361.

Molm, Linda D., Gretchen Peterson, and Nobuyuki Takahashi. 2003. "In the Eye of the Beholder: Procedural Justice in Social Exchange." *American Sociological Review* 68:128-152.

Randall, Christina S. and Charles W. Mueller. 1995. Extensions of justice theory: Justice evaluations and employees' reactions in a natural setting. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 58:178-194.

E. How do forms of justice and other processes combine in interaction? (7 December)

Van den Bos, Kees, Allan E. Lind, and Henk A.M. Wilke. 2001. The psychology of procedural and distributive justice viewed from the perspective of fairness heuristic theory. Pp. 49-66 in *Justice in the Workplace: From Theory to Practice* (vol. 2), edited by Russell Cropanzano. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brockner, Joel et al. 2003. High procedural fairness heightens the effect of outcome favorability on self-evaluations: An attributional analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 91:51-68.

\*Tyler, Tom R. and P. Degoey. 1995. Collective restraint in social dilemmas:

Procedural justice and social identification effects on support for authorities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69:482-497.

Cohen-Charash, Yochi and Paul E. Spector. 2001. The role of justice in organizations: meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 86:278-321. (SKIM)

Hegtvedt, Karen A. and Cathryn Johnson. 2000. Justice beyond the individual: A future with legitimation. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63:298-311.

Clay Warner, Jody, Karen A. Hegtvedt, and Paul Roman. 2005. "Procedural justice/distributive justice: How experiences with downsizing condition their impact on job commitment." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68:89-102.

Mikula, Gerold and Michael Wenzel. 2000. Justice and Social Conflict. *International Journal of Psychology* 35:126-135

Student Paper Discussions

(14 December)