May 31, 2016

Dear SPQ Subscribers,

We would like to highlight the articles in the June 2016 issue of SPQ and share with you other SPQ news. The June issue includes three articles and two research notes. The three research articles present findings that help advance legitimacy theory, social exchange theory, and expectation states theory, respectively. The research notes reveal further tests of ideas in expectation states theory.

The first article by Johnson, Hegtvedt, Khanna, and Scheuerman entitled “Legitimacy Processes and Emotional Responses to Injustice” examines how the negative emotions associated with perceived injustice brought about by a person in a position of authority are tempered when the authority figure is legitimized through authorization and endorsement. They also find that individuals are less likely to display negative emotions when the authority figure is endorsed. Taken together, the results show that responses to unjust situations are influenced by whether the individual in charge of distributing resources is perceived as legitimate.

In the second article, “Should I Stay or Should I Go? Reciprocity, Negotiation, and the Choice of Structurally Disadvantaged Actors to Remain in Networks,” Savage and Sommer examine the conditions under which actors stay in exchange networks that disadvantage them. They consider whether the decision to stay in such networks is influenced by the form of exchange, specifically whether it is a negotiated or reciprocal exchange. They find that when social actors are given the opportunity to leave their network, they are less likely to exit reciprocal exchange networks compared to negotiated exchange networks. Actors in reciprocal exchange networks become more attached to group members compared to those in negotiated exchange networks, they come to view their network as a group, and this psychological group formation attaches them to a structure that disadvantages them.

The third article by Skvoretz and Bailey, “‘Red, White, Yellow, Blue, All Out but You’: Status Effects on Team Formation, an Expectation States Theory” examines the probability of choosing a teammate based on status characteristics. At issue is who is most competent to contribute to the team’s success, and individuals turn to differences based on diffuse status characteristics as a guide. Selection for teammates, however, may not simply be based on competence, and the researchers consider other factors such as “suitability” that is not addressed by an expectation states model. Suitability implicates homophily as a selection principle and
choosing persons who are competent as well as who can communicate effectively and efficiently with others can lead to group success.

In the first research note, “Status Characteristics and Ability Attributions in Hungarian School Classes: An Exponential Random Graph Approach,” Grow, Takács, and Pál study the influence of two status characteristics: gender and ethnicity on ability attributions among students in Hungarian school classes. They find that the effect occurs for ethnicity but not for gender. Roma pupils are less likely than Hungarian pupils to receive ability attributions. Although women have a lower status in the wider society in Hungary, female pupils are not less likely to receive ability attributions compared to male pupils. This latter finding might be explained by the changing status of women in many countries including Hungary in which women outperform men in educational attainment. Thus, their lower status may not be due to assumptions about intelligence but perhaps leadership.

In the second research note, “Is Popular More Likable? Choice Status by Intrinsic Appeal in an Experimental Music Market,” Lynn, Walker, and Peterson investigate the interplay of status and quality by using data from the Columbia Musiclab project. They study the impact of the popularity of songs on people’s private ratings of a song’s likeability. The findings show that the effect of popularity (status) influences lower quality songs but not higher quality songs. Thus, above a certain threshold, status has no advantage.

As you recall, SPQ SNAPS provide the latest social psychological research in a format that is accessible for teaching in the classroom. Over the past year, views of our SNAPS articles has increased, but the increase is slight, from 11.8 views per month to 24.2 views. We want to encourage more of you to explore the SPQ SNAPS catalog at http://www.asanet.org/journals/spq/snaps.cfm and consider using these articles in your courses. There are over two dozen SPQ SNAPS for your use. In June, we are adding the paper:

- “Should I Stay or Should I Go? Reciprocity, Negotiation, and the Choice of Structurally Disadvantaged Actors to Remain in Networks,” which offers insights into why actors remain in networks rather than leaving them even when staying disadvantages them (Scott Savage and Zachary Sommer).

We often receive queries regarding SPQ’s acceptance rate and how long it takes to review a paper. For the last year, our acceptance rate was 11.8%, and we have averaged 36 days from submission to initial decision. We want to acknowledge that this turnaround time is due both to the hard work of our colleagues who review for the journal and our editorial board. In 2015, we received reviews from 248 members of the scientific community, not including reviews from our 34 members of the editorial board.

The social media engagement and presence of SPQ continues to grow. Please be sure to like us on Facebook (https://www.facebook.com/pages/Social-Psychology-Quarterly/316918675176841?ref=hl) and follow us on Twitter (https://twitter.com/SPQuarterly). Finally, as always, feel free to contact either one of us if you have any questions or concerns regarding the journal at spq@ucr.edu.
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