



social integration
to these issues

#Status Stratification

Definition: "status is the position of a social entity in a social system on set of relevant dimensions" (Nicholson, 1995 #5664)
 "The status system of a group reflects the distribution of power among its members" (Levine, 1998 #319) → see Power (macro) ? → see Power and Influence (micro)

A. Measures: Verbal and non-verbal behavior of group members. higher status more likely to stand erect, maintain eye contact, speak more, are more likely to criticize and to interrupt, and are spoken to more often than others → but correlational or causal?

B. How status systems are produced within small groups. can develop very quickly, minutes after some groups form. Recent studies suggest that status seems to be ascribed rather than earned: sex, race and attractiveness might play a role in determining who has higher or lower status. (Ridgeway 1991). Status as a shared cooperative process, based on shared performance expectations about group members → gives preferences to expectations vs. ethological approaches → task (performance) → better predictor than threat (dominance) → (Ridgeway, 1987 #4754). status could be distinguished from reputation → reputation: perceived past performance → status: add an associational dimension. Demographic effect: minority → negative effect of token → (Kanter, 1977 #4751). (Ridgeway, 1987 #4754).

C. The effects of status systems. People of higher status are evaluated more positively → People of low status have difficulty to challenge the system. status as an alternative to economic/rational market system → (Podolny, 1993 #3376). organizations have irrational recruitment and demographic division of labor → (Bielby, 1986 #4794). Minority get paid less individually, and position marked by minority are also discounted → (Baron, 1990 #4782). minority status have difficulty to convert human capital and positional advantage → (Barra, 1992 #4882). minority need a different network, which would reinforce their org identity, to progress → (Barra, 1992 #799).

critique: → overly functional, does not assume that status develop for domination (see (Eagly, 1992 #4473))

see "Stratification and Mobility within Organizations" papers in Mortensen/GSB/Intra

#Roles

Definitions: Roles are shared expectations about how a particular person in a group ought to behave" (Levine, 1998 #319). "roles are standardized patterns of behavior required of all persons playing a part in a given functional relationship, regardless of the personal wish or interpersonal obligations (irrelevant to the functional relationship)" (Katz, 1978 #284), p. 43. members tend to play specific roles in group interaction.

A. formal and informal roles on groups. Roles in organizations develop originally from task requirements. Recent studies suggest that status seems to be ascribed rather than earned: sex, race and attractiveness might play a role in determining who has higher or lower status. (Ridgeway 1991). → very little is known about the process of role development in informal groups → task roles emerge first, and socioemotional roles second (Burke, 1967, 1968). roles depend on technology → (Barley, 1990 #32).

B. Role conflicts. Role are rather beneficial to groups, but much research focus on role conflicts. Role assignments. Role strains (difficulty to cope). behaviors for enacting one role may be inconsistent with → the appropriate behaviors for enacting another role (inter-role conflict). Role dilemma (how to play the role). other requirements of the same role (intra-role conflict). Role innovation (different way to play the role), to avoid the conflict in negotiation, difficult to enact both gatekeeper and representative → (Friedman, 1992 #2669).

C. Role transitions. depend on (Brett 1994, Nicholson 1984). → self-confidence of the person playing the role. → the level of group consensus about how the role should be played. → the importance of the role for the group.

D. Psychological processes that produce roles within small groups. technology changes can create role changes → (Barley, 1986 #31).

D. The impact of role-playing on mental health.

Social Structure

→ see roles in inter personal (W)
 → on the taking of organizational roles
 → role expectations are evaluative standards applied to the behavior of any person who occupies a given organizational office or position
 → sent role consists of communications stemming from role expectations and sent by members of the role-set as attempts to influence the focal person
 → received role is the focal person's perception of the role-sending as addressed, including the reflexive role expectations that the focal person "sends" to himself or herself
 → role behavior is the response of the focal person to the complex of information and influence thus received.
 → Role sending and role behavior are ongoing and interdependent cyclical process

Norms

Definitions: → see def in influence

A. Allocation norms (laboratory groups) ??? Norms development has generated much research. Large research on conformity and deviance → see also Social Influence → (Sherif, 1937 #4616) → Autokinetic experiments

B. How are norms produced within small groups. social construction → Norms are valid only in the context of a culture which validate and carries it → (Bergin, 1964 #54). Evolutionary (Campbell, 1969 [1998] #4569) → Norms develop the behavior that aid in survival of group or individual. functional (Sherif, 1967 #5301) → norms emerge because they are functional for the group. Best known model is Feldmans (1984). Bases to group norms development: precedents set over time, carryovers from other situations, explicit statements from others, critical events in group history. Group norm emergence does not follow a linear path → (Bettenhausen, 1985 #4792) on norms formation in a decision making experiment

Perpetuation of norms: (Sherif, 1937 #4616) → Norms tend to be stable over time. → Norm can be Transmitted. → Uncertainty push individual to seek information out of the group. culture as substrate of norms → (Schein, 1985 #459). institutionalization of consensus → (Zucker, 1977 #587).

C. The effects of norms on groups and their members (conformity, deviance and performance). performance enhanced when group norms regarding effort, efficiency, quality control etc. are positive (Seashore 1954), but even positive norms cannot guarantee performance. Normative consensus and cohesion may be important co-factors → (Argyle, 1989 #211) → (O'Reilly, 1989 #3306).

critique: perception of norms may be problematic → see (Prentice, #5662) about difficulty to perceive alcohol consumption norms on campus

Cohesion

A. Conceptions and measurement of cohesion. Difficult to narrow. We can define cohesiveness as the pressures group members face to remain part of their groups (Baron and Greenberg 1990). Cohesion is studied under many guises, including solidarity, morale, and climate (distinguishing cohesion based on feelings of personal attraction among group members from cohesion based on feelings of social attraction (Hoog 1993)). many angles, many sub-constructs?

B. How is cohesion produced in small groups? Factors: → (Festinger, 1950 #4838) → seminal formulation: cohesiveness results from interpersonal attraction, liking for or commitment to the group task, group prestige or pride. → The severity of initiation into the group → (Sherif, 1966 #4424) → Cohesive group with intergroup conflict → Friendships ship to ingroup → Overestimation of leaders, and underestimation of followers → Intergroup: overestimate own performance → Reduction of hostility with through mutual cooperation → Mere proximity increase teasing. → Affiliative tendencies influenced by anxiety and hunger → (Schachter, 1959 #4619) → for social comparison, or support?

C. The effects of cohesion on a group and its members. effects on conformity → helpful when deviance endangers the group → (Festinger, 1950 #4838) → harmful when innovation is required → (Janis, 1971 #267). → increase compliance to group norms → (O'Reilly III, 1985 #4753). effects on performance → rather positive → (Mullen, 1994 #273) → cohesion improves performance → stronger if task commitment, rather than personal attraction or group pride → stronger effect from performance to cohesiveness (causality directions?) → field and lab produce the same results.

critique: see (Murnighan, 1991 #4747) with paradox that should not be resolved on leadership, follower, confrontations

Culture: → see social control issues → Game theory → see Social coordination / Commons → "collective traps" or "collective fences"



