



Social Status & Social Interaction

Day to Day Social Interaction > Social Status & Social Interaction

Table of Contents

Abstract

Keywords

Overview

Social Status

Validation

Membership & Social Identity

Social Interaction & Well-Being

Social Status & Interaction

Group Interaction

Applications

Low Self-Esteem & Social Rejection

Popularity & Social Adjustment

Viewpoints

Conclusion

Terms & Concepts

Bibliography

Suggested Reading

Abstract

Factors that play a role in constructing one's social status vary and research will be presented in this article that is intended to increase social meaning and relevance. Insights will also be presented into ways social status impacts interaction in individual, group, and inter-group memberships. Applications regarding social status and interaction are offered through the lens of low self-esteem and age factors. A conclusion is presented suggest-

ing implications for further research into the relevance of social status and its subsequent impact on social interaction.

Overview

Social Status

Social status can be defined as the rank or placement of an individual in society. Social status can potentially be determined through stratification systems. Social stratification system theories are often multi-level and predictive of ways structural effects interact with communities and the poor (Wolf, 2007). Wolf (2007) further argued that the relationships within this system are contingent upon the effects of social isolation; socially isolated individuals may lack access to others or to human capital, resources, and influence. Arguably, limited resources result in the "lack of access to different kinds of human and social capital, such as financial resources, education, and peer role models..." ultimately resulting... "in a change in community values and aspirations" (p. 53 – 54). These components interplay in forming class systems operating within these sociological systems.

Weber (1978) [1920] indicated that 'class' means all persons in the same class situation. He defined social classes as follows:

- A 'property class' is primarily determined by property differences;
- A 'commercial class' by the marketability of goods and services;
- A 'social class' makes up the totality of those class situations within which individual and generational mobility is easy and typical (p. 302).

Smith (2007) indicated that contemporary sociology offers opportunities for social mobility, which can be understood as "breaking through the boundaries of social classes" (p. 91). Smith interpreted Weber's definition of class, and wrote that "a social class is not a class at all unless mobility takes place within its borders and, crucially, this type of social mobility does not therefore undermine the existence of social classes, but rather defines what these classes are" (pp. 88 – 89). Nesbit (2006) further argued: "Whether we like it or not, at individual, community, and societal levels, everything we believe and everything we do is influenced by our place in an economic and social order" (p. 172). Nesbit further indicated that

Keywords

Social Class

Social Competence

Social Identity

Social Interaction

Social Mobility

Social Status

Socio-Emotional Selectivity Theory

economic, social, and cultural factors profoundly influence how we live and what we do, and these factors operate within the structures of human societies and human relationships.

Moreover, these factors dictate ways we “accommodate or resist unfairness and oppression,” and our own thoughts regarding these phenomena are both limited and enabled by “our place in the economic structure of society” (p. 172). Body image has also been reported as one factor in obtaining positive social status. Reis, Wheeler, Spiegel, Kernis, Nezelek, and Perry (1982) suggested that more physically attractive people rely on their physical attractiveness to gain social influence. As a result, individuals with more physical attractiveness may use their attractiveness to gain social status and thereby improve their group influence. (Nezelek, 1999, p. 796).

Validation

According to Tyler (1994), individuals value their group status, because high status validates self-identity, self-esteem, and self-respect. Validation from others causes individuals to continually seek information that confirms that they have a respected position in the group (Diekmann, Sondak, & Barsness, 2007, p. 163). Perceptions of self-status indicate an individual’s perceptions of their own regard and approval they receive from others (Van Prooijen, Van den Bos, & Wilke, 2002). According to the “group value model of procedural fairness” (Lind & Tyler, 1988) and the closely aligned relational “model of authority” (Tyler & Lind, 1992), individuals want to understand, establish, and maintain the social bonds that exist between them and others in their group (Tyler, 1994). The treatment that individuals receive in a group enable them to infer their status in a group; for example, if the treatment they receive is respectful and fair, individuals perceive they have a high status in the group. On the other hand, if individuals are treated disrespectfully or unfairly, they infer that they have low status in a group. Information regarding group status subsequently impacts individuals’ reactions to procedural fairness (Tyler, 1989; 1994; Van Prooijen et al., 2002). Thus, perceptions of status affect how individuals react to fair or unfair procedures and treatment (Nezelek, 1999).

Membership & Social Identity

Through another lens, Nezelek and Smith (2005) argued that the world can be viewed through “in-groups and out-groups, or groups to which we do or do not belong.” To the extent that group memberships determine an individual’s internalized self-concept implies our sense of self or what Tajfel and Turner (1986) termed “social identity.” While additional research needs to be conducted regarding social identity in terms of understanding social interaction, past research has indicated that “[social identity] unfolds in naturally occurring social interaction” (p. 243).

Social Interaction & Well-Being

Social interaction can be described as an interchangeable sequence of dynamic exchanges through which individuals can attach meaning, interpret, and respond. Interactions take place in multiple ways and are impacted by multiple variables. According to Nezelek, Richardson, Green, and Schatten-Jones (2002), the quality and quantity of human relationships supports psychological well-being. Moreover, “people who report having more satisfying and active social lives tend to report feeling better about themselves and their lives” (p. 57). To support their hypothesis and previous, researched results, Nezelek et al. conducted a study in which they sampled healthy, older, adult participants utilizing a variant of the Rochester Interaction Record (RIR) (Wheeler & Nezelek, 1977). The primary hypothesis guiding the study was that well-being would be positively related to the quality of participant’s social lives. Using the RIR, participants were charged with the task of describing the social interactions they had each day for two weeks. These daily reports provided measures of the quality and quantity of participants’ daily social interaction and substantiated measures of these two characteristics and various measures of well-being.

The importance of daily social interaction for the well-being of older adults was suggested in part by Carstensen’s (1995) “socioemotional selectivity theory.” She argued that “older adults are more motivated than young people to regulate emotions during social interactions,” selecting specific close others for interaction, and limiting the size of social networks (Nezelek, et al., 2002, pp. 57 – 78). Other research suggests that the quality of interaction also relates to well-being. For example, individuals who report lower quality relationships also report lower levels of life satisfaction (O’Connor, 1995). Similarly, Mullins and Dugan (1990) argued that greater satisfaction with the quality of relationships is associated with decreased feelings of loneliness and depression, while other researchers have similarly reported an increased sense of well being in positive relationships (Fox & Gooding, 1998; Ishii-Kuntz, 1990). Other studies resulting in reported well-being in the elderly have also been reported (Beckman, 1981; Ward, Sherman, & LaGlory, 1984). Similarly, just as research suggested that well-being for older people was connected to social constructs, research also suggests that well-being is positively related to how socially active the nonelderly are (O’Connor, 1995) and to the quality of their relationships (Diener & Diener, 1995; McDonough & Munz, 1994).

Social Status & Interaction

Social status directly results from interaction that directly affects group and social identity. Tajfel (1978) stated that social identity “is a part of an individual’s self concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the emotional significance attached to that membership” (p. 63). According to Nezlek and Smith (2005), some people are born into membership such as in the case of race and gender. Others attain it by actively seeking through clubs and political organizations. The social identity theory then would initiate individuals to “maintain a positive social identity, which in turn leads to positive evaluations of the self. Group membership allows a person to reap all of the advantages and positive aspects that are associated with a particular group, such as status” (p. 244).

For example, Harasty (1997) determined that when people were asked to talk about relevant in- and out-groups, individuals spoke more negatively of out-group members than of in-group members. Additionally, when contributing to an interaction, individuals seemed more likely to attribute out-group members’ behavior to more stable, dispositional factors than to unstable situational factors (Nezlek & Smith, 2005). Hewstone, Rubin, and Wills (2002) indicated that inter-group bias is moderated by a variety of individual, group, and inter-group factors. Individual factors include identification with the group, mood or education. Group factors include size, status, and power of the group. Inter-group factors include stability of and/or threat to the inter-group hierarchy (Nezlek & Smith, 2005).

Nezlek and Smith report that the “effects of social identity are not limited to increasing the self-esteem of group members. Considerable research suggests that people’s social identities can have behavioral implications” (p. 244). They cite Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, and Flament (1971), who determined that a simple division into two groups prompted English schoolboys to treat the opposite group “less favorably” during task related interactions. Insko and Schopler (1998) learned that when people are assigned to groups and directed to engage in the “prisoner’s dilemma” task against another group, “they behave more competitively and less cooperatively than when they are not grouped and are told they are playing against an individual” (2005, p. 244-45).

Group Interaction

Group interaction has both positive and negative aspects. For example, members who interact with other members of the in-group may insure their group identity and benefit from the positive aspects of that group membership. However, members of a group involved in group membership and group interaction may also encounter negative aspects of that group membership, including reputation issues or assumption of conformity (Nezlek & Smith, 2005). Biernat, Vescio, and Green (1996) pointed out that, “by interacting with the out-group, people may be able to reflect on their in-group’s (perceived) superiority but they may also face an attractive, alternative out-group that they may not be able to join or choose not to join” (Nezlek & Smith, 2005, p. 247). They indicated that while group members may enjoy the positive aspects of belonging to their groups, they are nonethe-

less aware of the negative components of such membership (p. 246). Thus, Nezlek and Smith point out that social interaction either helps or hinders the pursuit of a positive social identity.

Theories about social identity, and social status and interaction may need to evolve to consider differing factors, such as the “nature of the identity being studied, individual differences in psychological traits such as social dominance and self-construal, individuals’ status within a group, such as the length of membership, and the dimensions on which judgments are being made” (Nezlek & Smith, 2005, p. 259). Overall, further research into specific kinds of interactions and social status needs to be conducted in order to better inform present thought. “Perhaps future research can determine how people react to interactions in which the social identities of one’s interaction partners is not known, something that allows some conclusion about the relative strength of these two tendencies” (Nezlek & Smith, 2005, p. 258).

Applications

Low Self-Esteem & Social Rejection

One potential application for better understanding social status and interaction is in comprehending the impact of an individual’s low self-esteem on their own sense of social status. For example, individuals with low self-esteem feel lonely (Levin & Stokes, 1986) and socially isolated (Hobfoll, Nadler, & Leiberman, 1986). Moreover, research indicates that individuals with low self-esteem often display insecure, preoccupied or fearful attachment styles (Brennan & Morris, 1997). These factors may also cause individuals with low self-esteem to experience elevated social anxiety, (Leary & Kowalski, 1993) and they may in turn question their partner’s feelings for them (Murray, Holmes, & Griffin, 2000). Often more highly attuned to rejection cues (Nezlek, Kowalski, Leary, Blevins, & Holgate, 1997), such individuals are “dispositionally high in rejection sensitivity” (Downey & Feldman, 1996), are preoccupied with social acceptance (Harter, Stocker, & Robinson, 1996), are motivated to avoid social disapproval (Tice, 1993), and are inclined to behave agreeably towards others (Schuetz & DePaulo, 1996) so they will be liked (Schuetz, 1998). Lastly, individuals with low self-esteem characterize their past as a series of rejections, and have poor expectations regarding future social acceptance (Leary, Tambor, Terdal, & Downs, 1995; Sommer & Baumeister, 2002). Arguably, an individual with low self-esteem may suffer impaired social interactions.

On average, social rejection lowers self-esteem (Leary, Haupt, Strausser, & Chokel, 1998; Leary et al., 2003). To counter the threat posed by such rejection, individuals with low self-esteem might be more inclined to shy away from the individuals who reject them and seek solace from accepting individuals. Indeed, the individual with low self-esteem may initiate a safer interaction method, because the possibility of failure is all but precluded. Therefore, this interaction method maintains the interpersonal status quo, given that it involves disdaining opportunities to promote social inclusion and raise social status. Specifically, individuals with low self-esteem may perpetuate their impaired

social standing by consistently seeking out only those who already accept them, rather than by squarely facing and trying to win over those who initially reject them. Sadly, individuals with low self-esteem may be handicapped by their lower levels of self-certainty (Campbell & Lavallee, 1993; Baumgardner, 1990), their greater proneness to demoralization (Brown & Dutton, 1995; Sedikides & Strube, 1997), and their suboptimal mood-regulation strategies (Heimpel, Wood, Marshall, & Brown, 2002; Rudich, Sedikides, & Gregg, 2006, p. 963 – 964).

Popularity & Social Adjustment

Research has suggested that popularity or rejection at early ages seems to be an important predictor of future social adjustment. Abundant support can be provided for the stability of popular and rejected children over time and across settings (Cillessen, Bukowski, & Haselager, 2000). Moreover, popular status predicts future social competence, that is, the ability to develop intimate relationships in adolescence, whereas childhood peer rejection leads to adjustment difficulties in adolescence and adulthood, such as aggression, social anxiety, academic failure and school drop-out, delinquency, and psychopathology (Coie, Dodge, & Kupersmidt, 1990; Kupersmidt, Coie, & Dodge, 1990; Parker & Asher, 1987). All of these maladjustments represent impairments in social interactions as a direct result of impaired social status. Clearly, social status impacts daily interaction in numerous ways.

Viewpoints

One significant issue regarding social status and interaction is the derivation from culture to culture based on how social status is informed and determinants related to appropriate versus inappropriate interactions. While it may be sociologically relevant to study social status and interaction, cultural consideration is one factor for consideration to elicit culturally framed results. One such example of this situation is presently occurring in Russia and was described by Zarubina (2008).

Zarubina (2008) described multiple ways Russian society has changed since the beginning of the 1990s. She indicated that the New Russians are the product of a new interpretation of strata bringing liberal socioeconomic reforms, stratification in terms of property ownership, an ever widening gap between the poor and the wealthy, the rapid collapse of previously held values, the pervasiveness of anomie, and criminalized economic activity. Resultantly, almost as soon as the New Russian came onto the scene in real life, “he was turned into an object of mockery and a character in jokes, which indicates that society began to view the phenomenon in the spirit of finding ways to reconcile contradictory worlds” (p. 97). Contrastingly, while the Old Russia called for comradeship, solidarity, and mutual assistance in relations among people, the New Russian relates to the people around him, those who are close or not so close to him, in strictly pragmatic ways. The New Russians’ “rejection of traditional cultural norms is also to be seen in what are perceived as their cynical attitudes toward basic cultural values and institutions such as friendship, love, marriage, and family. For them, the concept of unselfish friendship simply does not exist at all” (Zarubina, 2008, p. 89).

Zarubina (2008) further argued that categories of people formerly classified among the elite or the top strata, such as scientists, performers, college and university professors, engineers, military officers, now find themselves, “according to the criteria of material prosperity and consumption, in the lower class or in fact on the brink of poverty” (p. 93). Class mobility and changing stratification has resulted in feelings of mutual hatred, mixed with a feeling of superiority. Increasing jokes about the New Russians demonstrate how language is rapidly falling into degradation. One nineteenth-century Russian comedy that ridiculed the gaps between the social ambitions and the plebeian roots of the merchant class employed the characters in the play to speak using a deliberately colloquial language, in which characters mispronounced foreign words and used them incorrectly. The characters in the jokes about the New Russians spoke in a grotesque jargon, using the “language of blat” from the world of crime and corruption. Characters also habitually and disrespectfully used inappropriate vocabulary, immersing the audience into the culture of the “antiworld,” which also directly revealed the criminal roots of the new bosses of life (p. 90 – 91). Conclusively, while Zarubina’s own argument was framed within a cultural construct and bias, additional research must be framed by a cultural construct to ensure accuracy and authenticity in further accounts.

Conclusion

Based on research and evidence, social status does seem to impact interaction individually and in groups. However, the extent of impact needs further investigation in terms of circumstances, group dynamics, individual characteristics, cultural construct, and resulting interaction. Beginning with pre-school aged children and ending with senior citizens, the realm of study is almost limitless. Many unanswered questions remain regarding relationships between daily social interaction and psychological well-being (Nezlek, 2002, p. 70). Moreover, researchers have indicated that results from present studies “strongly suggest that studying naturally occurring groups and their interactions will provide valuable insights into the dynamics and effects of social identity” (Nezlek & Smith, 2005, p. 259). For sociology students conducting further investigation into these insights, this particular field of study seems wide open and ready for advanced theory.

Terms & Concepts

Social Class: A social class is the hierarchical level within which individual and generational mobility is easy and typical.

Social Competence: Social competence can be defined as the ability to develop social relationships in adolescence which extends to adulthood.

Social Identity: Part of an individual’s self concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the emotional significance attached to that membership (Tajfel, 1981, p. 255).

Social Interaction: Social interaction can be described as an interchangeable sequence of dynamic social exchanges through which individuals can attach meaning, interpret, and respond.

Social Mobility: Social mobility can be defined as the potential for breaking through the boundaries of social classes.

Social Status: Social status can be defined as the rank or placement of an individual in society.

Socio-Emotional Selectivity Theory: Socio-emotional Selectivity Theory can be defined as the potential for regulating emotions during social interactions, selecting specific close others for interaction, and limiting the size of social networks.

Bibliography

- Baumgardner, A. H. (1990). To know oneself is to like oneself: Self-certainty and self-affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58 (6), 1062–1072. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=22569237&site=ehost-live>
- Beckman, L. (1981). Effects of social interaction and children's relative inputs on older women's psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41(6), 1075–1086. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=16689336&site=ehost-live>
- Biernat, M., Vescio, T., & Green, M. (1996). Selective self-stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(6), 1194 – 1209. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=9712074103&site=ehost-live>
- Brennan, K. A., & Morris, K. A. (1997). Attachment styles, self-esteem, and patterns of seeking feedback from romantic partners. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 23–31.
- Brown, J. D., & Dutton, K. A. (1995). Truth and consequences: The costs and benefits of accurate self-knowledge. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 1288–1296.
- Campbell, J. D., & Lavalley, L. F. (1993). Who am I? The role of self-concept confusion in understanding the behavior of people with low self-esteem. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Self-esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard*. (3–20). New York: Plenum Press.
- Carstensen, L. (1995). Evidence for a life-span theory of socioemotional selectivity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4, 151–156. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=11512261&site=ehost-live>
- Cillessen, A. H., Bukowski, W. M., & Haselager, G. J. (2000). Stability of sociometric categories. In A. H. Cillessen & W. M. Bukowski (Eds.), *Recent advances in the measurement of acceptance and rejection in the peer system* (75-93). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coie, J. D., Dodge, K. A., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (1990). Peer group behavior and social status. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), *Peer rejection in childhood* (17-59). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Diekmann, K. A., Sondak, H. & Barsness, Z. I. (2007). Does fairness matter more to some than to others? The moderating role of workplace status on the relationship between procedural fairness perceptions and job satisfaction. *Social Justice Research*, 20(2), 161 – 180. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=25449244&site=ehost-live>
- Diener, E., & Diener, M. (1995). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 653–663. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=9504261460&site=ehost-live>
- Doosje, B., Spears, R., & Ellemers, N. (2002). Social identity as both cause and effect: The development of group identification in response to anticipated and actual changes in the intergroup status hierarchy. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 57 – 76.
- Downey, G., & Feldman, S. I. (1996). Implications of rejection sensitivity for intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(6), 1327–1343. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=9607014986&site=ehost-live>
- Fox, M., & Gooding, B. (1998). Physical mobility and social integration: Their relationship to the well-being of older Canadians. *Canadian Journal on Aging*, 17, 372–383.
- Harasty, A. S. (1997). The interpersonal nature of social stereotypes: Differential discussion patterns about in-groups and out-groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 270 – 284.
- Harter, S., Stocker, C., & Robinson, N. S. (1996). The liabilities of a looking glass self orientation among young adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 6, 285–308. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=18278241&site=ehost-live>

- Heimpel, S. A., Wood, J. V., Marshall, M. A., & Brown, J. (2002). Do people with low self-esteem really want to feel better? Self-esteem differences in motivation to repair negative moods. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 128–147.
- Hewstone, M., Ruben, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 575 – 604.
- Hobfoll, S. E., Nadler, A., & Leiberman, J. (1986). Satisfaction with social support during crisis: Intimacy and self-esteem as critical determinants. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 296–304.
- Insko, C. A., & Schopler, J. (1998). Differential distrust of groups and individuals. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler, & C. A. Insko (Eds.), *Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior* (75 – 107). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Ishii-Kuntz, M. (1990). Social interaction and psychological well-being: Comparison across stages of adulthood. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 30*, 15–36.
- Kupersmidt, J. B., Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1990). Predicting disorder from peer social problems. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), *Peer rejection in childhood* (274-305). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1993). The Interaction Anxiousness Scale: Construct and criterion-related validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 61*, 136–146. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=6378947&site=ehost-live>
- Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 518–530.
- Leary, M. R., Haupt, A. L., Strausser, K. S., & Chokel, J. T. (1998). Calibrating the sociometer: The relationship between interpersonal appraisals and state self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1290–1299.
- Leary, M. R., Gallagher, B., Fors, E., Buttermore, N., Baldwin, E., Kennedy, K., & Mills, A. (2003). The invalidity of disclaimers about the effects of social feedback on self-esteem. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 623–636.
- Levin, I., & Stokes, J. P. (1986). An examination of the relation of individual difference variables to loneliness. *Journal of Personality, 54*, 717–733.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. New York: Plenum.
- McDonough, M., & Munz, D. (1994). General well-being and perceived adult friendship behaviors. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 9*, 743–752.
- Mullins, L., & Dugan, E. (1990). The influence of depression, and family and friendship relations, on residents' loneliness in congregate housing. *The Gerontologist, 30*, 377–384.
- Murray, S. L., Holmes, J. G., & Griffin, D. W. (2000). Self-esteem and the quest for felt security: How perceived regard regulates attachment processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 478–498.
- Nesbit, T. (2006). What's the matter with social class? *Adult Education Quarterly, 56*(3), 171 – 187. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=20517691&site=ehost-live>
- Nezlek, J. (1999). Body image and day-to-day social interaction. *Journal of Personality, 67*(5), 793 – 817. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=2417503&site=ehost-live>
- Nezlek, J. & Smith, C.V. (2005). Social identity in daily social interaction. *Self & Identity, 4* (3), 243-261.
- Nezlek, J. B., Kowalski, R. M., Leary, M. R., Blevins, T., & Holgate, S. (1997). Personality moderators of reactions to interpersonal rejection: Depression and trait self-esteem. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 1235–1244.
- Nezlek, J. B., Richardson, D. S., Green, L. R., & Schatten-Jones, E. C. (2002). Psychological well-being and day-to-day social interaction among older adults. *Personal Relationships, 9*, 57 – 71. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=10454545&site=ehost-live>
- O'Connor, B. (1995). Family and friend relationships among older and younger adults: Interaction motivation, mood, and quality. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 40*, 9–29.

- Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low accepted children 'at risk'? *Psychological Bulletin*, *102*, 357-389.
- Rudich, E., Sedikides, C., & Gregg, A. (2006). Self-esteem moderates preferences for accepting versus rejecting interaction partners. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *37*, 955 – 967. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=26500137&site=ehost-live>
- Sedikides, C., & Strube, M. J. (1997). Self-evaluation: To thine own self be good, to thine own self be sure, to thine own self be true, and to thine own self be better. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *29*, 209–269. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Schuetz, A. (1998). Autobiographical narratives of good and bad deeds: Defensive and favorable self-description moderated by trait self-esteem. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *17*, 466–475.
- Schuetz, A., & DePaulo, B. M. (1996). Self-esteem and evaluative reactions: Letting people speak for themselves. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *30*, 137–156.
- Smith, K. (2007). Operationalizing Max Weber's probability concept of class situation: The concept of social class. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *58*(1), 87 – 104. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=24219708&site=ehost-live>
- Smith, C. V. & Nezlek, J. B. (2005). Social identity in daily social interaction. *Self and Identity*, *4*, 243 – 261. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=17267386&site=ehost-live>
- Sommer, K. L., & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Self-evaluation, persistence, and performance following implicit rejection: The role of trait self-esteem. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 926–938.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London, UK: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *1*, 149 – 178.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. 7 – 24. Chicago, IL: Nelson Hall.
- Tice, D. M. (1993). The social motivations of people with low self-esteem. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Self-Esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group-value model. *J. Personality Sociology Psychology*, *57*, 830–838.
- Tyler, T. R. (1994). Psychological models of the justice motive: Antecedents of distributive and procedural justice. *J. Personality Sociology Psychology*, *67*, 850–863.
- Tyler, T. R., and Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In Zanna, M. (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *25*, Academic Press, New York, 115–192.
- Van Prooijen, J. W., Van den Bos, K., and Wilke, H. A. M. (2002). Procedural justice and status: Status salience as an antecedent of the fair process effect. *Journal of Personality Sociology Psychology*, *83*, 1353–1361.
- Ward, R., Sherman, S., & LaGlory, M. (1984). Subjective network assessments and subjective well-being. *Journal of Gerontology*, *39*, 93–101.
- Weber, M. (1978) [1920] *Economy and Society*, in two volumes, Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press. [Previously published in 1920].
- Wheeler, L., & Nezlek, J. (1977). Sex differences in social participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 742–754.
- Wolf, J. P. (2007). Sociological theories of poverty in urban America. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, *16*(1/2), 41 – 56. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=30035668&site=ehost-live>
- Zarubina, N. N. (2008). The culture of laughter as a factor of tolerance toward new social groups in Russian society. *Sociological Research*, *47*(1), 81 – 100. Retrieved July 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=31198269&site=ehost-live>

Suggested Reading

Andersen, M., & Collins, P. H. (2004). *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). *Social identity*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Haslam, S. A. (2001). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tyler, T. R., and Blader, S. L. (2000). *Cooperation in Groups: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Behavioral Engagement*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Essay by Sharon Link, Ph.D.

Dr. Sharon Link is an educator, presenter, and mother of a child with autism. She has worked extensively in public education and has researched education and its relationship to autism disorders and other disabilities for the last ten years. Dr. Link currently is the Executive Director for Autism Disorders Leadership Center, a non-profit research center and is co-founder of Asperger Interventions & Support, Inc. a professional development center. Both organizations are education and research centers seeking to improve education by creating a system of diversity and inclusion in America's schools. To learn more, visit: Asperger Help at <http://aspergerhelp.net>.

Copyright of *Social Status & Social Interaction* is the property of Great Neck Publishing and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

Copyright of *Social Status & Social Interaction* is the property of Great Neck Publishing and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.