ADVANCES IN GROUP PROCESSES

Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler

ADVANCES IN GROUP PROCESSES

VOLUME 38

ADVANCES IN GROUP PROCESSES

ADVANCES IN GROUP PROCESSES

Editors: Shane R. Thye
Department of Sociology
University of South Carolina

Edward J. Lawler
School of Industrial and Labor Relations, and
Department of Sociology
Cornell University
Series Coeditors: Edward J. Lawler and Shane R. Thye

Recent Volumes

Volumes 1–17:	Edited by Edward J. Lawler
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
Volume 34:	Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler
Volume 35:	Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler
Volume 36:	Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler
Volume 37:	Edited by Shane R. Thye and Edward J. Lawler

This page intentionally left blank

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

This page intentionally left blank

ADVANCES IN GROUP PROCESSES, VOLUME 38

ADVANCES IN GROUP PROCESSES

EDITED BY

SHANE R. THYE
University of South Carolina, USA

And

EDWARD J. LAWLER
Cornell University, USA

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

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

First edition 2021

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-80071-678-0 (Print)
ISBN: 978-1-80071-677-3 (Online)
ISBN: 978-1-80071-679-7 (Epub)

ISSN: 0882-6145 (Series)

CONTENTS

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Daniel Burrill	Department of Sociology, Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA
Valentino E. Chai	Department of Psychology, National University of Singapore, Singapore
Patricia Chen	Department of Psychology, National University of Singapore, Singapore
Stephen M. Garcia	Graduate School of Management, University of California, Davis, CA, USA
Richard Gonzalez	Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA
Matthew O. Hunt	Department of Sociology, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA
Zbigniew Karpiński	Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland & European Commission, Joint Research Centre Seville, Spain
Adam Kęska	Institute of Political Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland
Emily Maloney	Department of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA
Jessica Pfaffendorf	Department of Sociology and Anthropology, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA
Kayla D. R. Pierce	Department of Sociology, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA
Dariusz Przybysz	Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland
Ashley V. Reichelmann	Department of Sociology, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA, USA

Kimberly B. Rogers Department of Sociology, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH, USA

John Skvoretz Department of Sociology, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA

Lynn Smith-Lovin Department of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA

PREFACE

Advances in Group Processes is a peer-reviewed annual volume that publishes theoretical analyses, reviews, and theory-based empirical chapters 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, heuristics, 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.

Several years ago, we added an editorial board to the series to broaden the review process and draw upon the collective expertise of some of the top scholars in the discipline. That board consists of Jessica Collett, Joseph Dippong, Ashley Harrell, Karen Hegtvedt, Will Kalkhoff, Jeff Lucas, Jennifer McLeer, 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 three papers that add to theory and research on emotions and emotional phenomena. First, Emily Maloney and Lynn Smith-Lovin examine how occupational class impacts both general and specific emotions in "The Emotional Implications of Occupational Deference Structures." Using affect control theory simulations, they reveal the emotions associated with four occupational classes and compare these predictions to data from the 1996 emotions module from the General Social Survey. They find that the theoretical predictions are partially supported. Overall, this line of work promises to shed light on the mechanisms that underlay health disparities across occupational strata. Next, Kimberly B. Rogers uses affect control theory to examine the micro-level mechanisms that undergird categorical inequalities in "Separate and Unequal: Predicting Intergroup Behavior and Emotions from Social Identity Meanings." Drawing upon data from 55 undergraduates, she examines whether inequality is reflected in the sentiments associated with social groups, whether these categories differ in terms of social treatment and normative behavior, and if social interactions produce variant emotions across categorical membership. In general, this research adds to our understanding of how inequality is reproduced and sustained. Finally, Ashley V. Reichelmann and Matthew O. Hunt explore the affective underpinnings of racial threat in "The Multi-Dimensionality of Racial Threat: A Consideration of its Affective Dimension." They offer a conceptualization of threat's affective dimension and develop new survey items to measure this construct. Using factor analysis and regression techniques they conclusively

demonstrate that affect is distinct from perceived racial competition. This finding coheres with Blumer's theory regarding racial prejudice and resentment. All three papers make a significant contribution to our understanding of affect and emotion.

The next three papers address issues of status, influence, and response latency. First, Daniel Burrill asks if high status actors are more likely to ignore new status information that contradicts their position in the status hierarchy in "Sticky Expectations." A laboratory experiment is used to introduce status information to participants that contradicts a previously established status position. He finds that contradictory information is less likely to impact high status actors in terms of their resistance to influence and response latency. This finding coheres with prior work on status hierarchies and suggests high status actors are resistant to status decline. He concludes by exploring several mechanisms that may account for these effects. Next, Kayla D. R. Pierce investigates the impact of a partner's response latency in "Are They High Status or Just Assertive? Response Latency in Task Groups." Specifically, she asks how a partner's response latency affects behavioral influence, the participants' own response latency, and perceptions of assertiveness. Importantly, she conducts follow-up interviews to determine how participants interpret their partner's response latency. She finds that response latency has a significant effect on participants' own response latency and their perceptions of the partner's assertiveness. For the last paper in this trio, Jessica Pfaffendorf offers a fresh look on status-based disadvantages in "The Double Disadvantage: Using Status and Stigma Processes to Understand Race, Criminal Record, and Moral Expectations in Employment." She applies and integrates theories of stigma and status seeking to better understand how race and criminal record combine for individuals seeking employment in the labor market. Importantly, her analysis focuses on two underlying mechanisms that could, jointly or independently, produce disadvantage – those being moral expectations and performance expectations. The results of a laboratory experiment where subjects evaluate mock job applicants indicate that race and criminal record heavily disadvantage black applicants and that the key mechanism producing this disadvantage is lowered moral expectations. Together, these papers represent important contributions to theory and research on the formation of status hierarchies in groups.

Next, Patricia Chen, Stephen M. Garcia, Valentino E. Chai, and Richard Gonzalez develop a dual process model that links comparison process to competitive motivation in "Comparing and Being Compared: A Dual Process Framework of Competition." They assert that comparing another and being compared are mutually related and that each can propel the other. An important contribution of this work is to integrate and synthesize literatures that have previously been distinct. Finally, Zbigniew Karpiński, John Skvoretz, Adam Kęska, and Dariusz Przybysz examine macro models of intergroup association in "The Big Tent: Integrating Macro Models for Intergroup Association with Experimental Data on Exchange Relations in a Minimal Group Setting." This

paper uses biased net theory to model homophily in complete networks. Along the way they link models of repulsion and attraction to a standard model of logistic regression. These models are used to examine exchange data collected in a small group laboratory setting. This paper will surely interest scholars of networks, homophily, and the underpinnings of social exchange relations.

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

This page intentionally left blank

THE EMOTIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF OCCUPATIONAL DEFERENCE STRUCTURES

Emily Maloney and Lynn Smith-Lovin

ABSTRACT

Purpose: *We examine how one's occupational class affects emotional experience. To do this, we look at both general affective outcomes (job satisfaction, respect at work, and life happiness) and the experience of specific positive emotions (overjoyed, proud, and excited) during the week.*

Methodology/Approach: *Using affect control theory simulations, we find the characteristic emotions of four occupational classes, derived from Maloney's (2020) block model analysis: everyday specialists, service-to-society occupations, the disagreeably powerful, and the actively revered. Using these characteristic emotions, we make predictions about how likely it is that individuals in these occupational classes will report workplace affective experiences: job satisfaction and respect at work, and broader affective experience: general happiness in the prior year. Lastly, we generate and test predictions about everyday emotional experience of positive emotions.*

Findings: *We find mixed results for our hypotheses. In general, our predictions regarding the actively revered as the highest status block in Maloney (2020) are supported for general happiness, job satisfaction, and daily emotional experience. However, we find higher probabilities of happiness and job satisfaction for the disagreeably powerful, a lower evaluation but higher power block, than were expected.*

Research Limitations: *The current analysis uses only 268 occupations out of the 650 occupational titles in the US Census three-digit occupational codes. An analysis that includes the entire occupational structure would be more definitive. Additionally, it would be preferable to have emotion-dependent*

Advances in Group Processes, Volume 38, 1–21

ISSN: 0882-6145/doi:10.1108/S0882-614520210000038001

variables that were specifically tied to work, rather than broader emotional experience, to have a cleaner test of our hypotheses about occupational identities.

Practical and Social Implications: *Prior research has shown how the emotional experiences associated with different identity labels can explain mental health outcomes, workplace anger, and broader patterns of inequality (Foy, Freeland, Miles, Rogers, & Smith-Lovin, 2014; Kroska & Harkness, 2008, 2016; Lively & Powell, 2016). Understanding how occupational class elicits certain types of emotions in everyday interactions may help scholars explain differences in health and overall life satisfaction across occupations that are not explained by material resource differentiation.*

Keywords: Status; occupations; emotions; affect control theory; occupational class; inequality

Recent work refining the measurement of occupational status has incorporated formal social psychological theory (Freeland & Hoey, 2018; Maloney, 2020). In particular, Maloney (2020) uses affect control theory (Heise, 2007; Robinson & Smith-Lovin, 2018) and the theoretically predicted deference patterns analyzed by Freeland and Hoey (2018) to develop a set of occupational classes using block models (McFarland, Messing, Nowak, & Westwood, 2010). The classes are formed by linking occupational identities that have the same predicted deference relationships to other occupations. In network terms, these occupations are structurally equivalent.

Here, we move beyond the deference structure to examine what these occupational classes imply emotionally for the people who occupy them. We ask two interrelated questions. First, we use affect control theory (in the form of INTERACT simulations) to predict what the emotional experience in work interactions would be for a person in these occupational classes. We use the theory to generate hypotheses about each occupational class and its typical emotional experiences. Second, we use the theoretical results to predict how belonging to one occupational class versus another affects an individual's experience of emotions in their daily lives. Here, we use representative survey data from the General Social Survey (GSS) with Maloney's (2020) occupational blocks to explore these predicted relationships.

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AND AFFECT CONTROL THEORY

Classic (Weber, 1978; Weber, Gerth, & Wright Mills, 1946) and modern (Ridgeway, 2014) treatments of status argue that it is a basis of influence that is at least somewhat independent (and separable) from material position. The symbolic social power that comes from cultural assessments of esteem, worthiness, and value to society is not synonymous with control over economic

or political resources. However, modern measurements of occupational status have focused on ratings of "social standing" that are largely viewed as imperfect subjective measures of concrete occupational rewards (Featherman & Hauser, 1976). As such, the conventional measurement of "occupational prestige" in the past few decades became disengaged from its distinct conceptual standing as an independent sociocultural basis of influence and deference.

Freeland and Hoey (2018) addressed this problem by uniting the concept of occupational status with affect control theory. Affect control theory is a formal, mathematical model of social interaction (Heise, 2007). It describes how people use the cultural meanings associated with identity labels to anticipate what people will do and to react to events that occur. Therefore, the theory can be used to predict which occupation is culturally expected to defer to which other occupations. In this context, the ability of the theory to make precise, numerical predictions of how unlikely an event is was key to Freeland and Hoey's (2018) development of a new "deference score" for occupational titles.

Affect Control Theory

Affect control theory makes these predictions about deference based on three features. First, it uses a very specific conceptualization of cultural meaning, measuring fundamental cultural sentiments in three dimensions (evaluation – good vs bad, potency – powerful vs powerless, and activity – lively vs quiet) (EPA, hereafter). Prior research has shown that these three dimensions encompass the majority of cultural meaning of identities, behaviors, and emotions (Scholl, 2013). Measurements are obtained by surveying participants of the target culture to rate terms on these three dimensions on a scale from −4.3 (extremely bad, weak, inactive) to +4.3 (extremely good, powerful, active). The average response is used as the point estimate of the cultural meaning on each dimension. In this way, labels for people and actions are located within a three-dimensional cultural space. One of affect control theory's primary axioms is that individuals endeavor to act in ways that maintain these fundamental meanings of labels. This means that they try to enact behaviors or create situations in which the meaning of a label remains in the same area of the three-dimensional cultural space.

This leads to the second feature: affect control theory uses simple event descriptions (an actor does a behavior to an object person [ABO hereafter]) to estimate parameters about how transient impressions are formed in the context of social interactions. Equations have been derived which can calculate how much the terms of an event (ABO) have moved in EPA space as a consequence of an event. For example, when an event follows cultural sentiments – e.g., a Mother Loves Child, the transient impressions of the three elements (Mother, Loves, and Child) are very close in EPA space to their corresponding fundamental sentiments. On the other hand, given a situation of Mother Hits Child, the transient impressions of these elements will move further away from the fundamental sentiments because Mothers, who are very good, quite powerful, and somewhat active (3.05, 2.66, 0.76), are not expected to do a bad, powerful action like Hit (−2.66, 1.3, 2.12) to a good, powerless, active Child (1.89, −1.14, 1.87) (all examples come from the 2015

US Student Dictionary [Smith-Lovin et al., 2016], which is a set of cultural sentiments collected recently from participants at two large Southern universities in the United States).

Lastly, the third feature of affect control theory is the formalization of cultural unexpectedness. By calculating the sum of squared differences following an event between each element's fundamental sentiment and transient impression on the three EPA dimensions, the deflection of the event is computed. The deflection is an indicator of how culturally dissonant a situation is: how much it disturbs cultural meanings. The control process of affect control theory states that people act in ways to keep deflection low or to reduce deflection after a high deflection event.

Bringing these three features together, affect control theory helps to explain how a stable social order is sustained: it is because these sentiments are widely shared, and people in general try to maintain them. The theory also allows people to respond to odd events in creative ways that tend to restore cultural meanings when they have been disturbed. (A complete description of affect control theory is beyond the scope of this paper, but Heise [2007] and Robinson and Smith-Lovin [2018] offer more complete overviews for the interested reader.)

Freeland and Hoey (2018) make use of a new generalization of affect control theory (called BayesACT) in their analyses (Hoey & Schröder, 2015; Schröder, Hoey, & Rogers, 2016). BayesACT relaxes the assumption that every identity has a single point location in the three-dimensional evaluation-potency-activity space. It instead uses Bayesian logic to model the assumption that social actors come into an interaction with a general understanding of who they are in the situation and who they are dealing with (their "priors"), but they then use interactions to update those understandings to develop a firmer view of the situation.

A DEFERENCE MATRIX AND DEFERENCE SCORES

Freeland and Hoey (2018) use BayesACT to calculate a matrix of theoretical predictions about which occupational identities are likely to defer to which other occupational identities. To be concrete, imagine a (very small) occupational matrix of a surgeon, a secretary, and a garbage collector. This matrix would be a 3×3 matrix, and in each cell would be a number. That number would be the theoretically computed deflection of the event occupation i defers to occupation j. For instance, in cell 2, 3 would be the deflection of "secretary defers to garbage collector." This number can be interpreted as an indicator of how unlikely it would be for someone who occupied one occupational identity to defer to the other. On the diagonal would be the quantities for intraoccupational deference (e.g., how much would it dislocate cultural sentiments for a surgeon to defer to another surgeon). Cells that are off the diagonal represent the asymmetric (i.e., directional) expectations about how likely one occupation is to defer to another (e.g., how likely is a surgeon to defer to a secretary? Or how likely is a secretary to defer to a surgeon?). (For details about the calculation of these cell values, refer to the original article [Freeland & Hoey, 2018].)

Arguing that status is based on a deference order, Freeland and Hoey (2018) posit that these deflections can be thought of as a measurement of status – it should be more deflecting for higher status occupations defer to others, and vice versa. To create a single measure of an occupation's status, Freeland and Hoey (2018) averaged across the rows of the deference matrix. They created a summary measure, which they called a "deference score" that says how likely occupational identity x is to be deferred to by all of the other occupations in their analysis (which included 268 occupation codes). They viewed this score as a theoretically motivated reconceptualization of occupational prestige and presented compelling evidence that it has construct and criterion validity.

USING THE INFORMATION LEFT BEHIND

Maloney (2020) noted that Freeland and Hoey (2018) discarded a great deal of information in the creation of their deference scores. Creating a single status score for each occupational identity is extremely useful for mapping into conventional survey analyses: occupations are used in most survey analyses as an individual-level variable and are therefore conveniently construed as a unidimensional, interval level measure of some type of social status. However, the deference matrix also includes a great deal of (theoretical) information about who defers to whom. Patterned deference relations reveal structural positions within the occupational landscape.

Maloney (2020) made use of this additional information to ask the question: are there classes of occupations that defer to and are deferred to by the same other occupations? In other words, are there occupations that have the same patterns of deference vis a vis the other occupations? Her analysis made use of the information that Freeland and Hoey (2018) eliminated when they averaged over the rows of their deference matrix.

Maloney (2020) did a block model of the complete deference matrix to find what network researchers call "structurally equivalent" sets of social positions (McFarland et al., 2010). These social positions are occupational occupants who have the same patterns of (theoretically predicted) relationships to each other. Note that this is very unlike a community detection or clustering analysis, where the researcher is looking for sets of actors who are likely to *interact* with each other and unlikely to interact with others. While clustering analysis reveals cliques of nodes that like each other or interact frequently, block modeling uncovers similar positions within a network across local community structure. In this way, nodes that serve a similar role within a network can be identified as a position within the larger structure.

Maloney (2020)'s analysis resulted in four structural positions within the occupational identity deference network. Block 1, the Everyday Specialists, includes occupational identities that are respected for their technical skills, but for whom esteem might not extend far beyond the work domain. Bricklayer and baker are two examples which are very close to the average EPA profile for the block. Block 2, occupations characterized by their Service-to-Society contributions,

contains occupational identities with somewhat higher evaluation and activity. Several of these identities are more artistic in nature, including decorator and musician. They also have a somewhat female character, including active but low potency identities like hostess and beautician. Block 3 has a corresponding male nature, with higher potency but lower evaluation. Maloney calls these identities the disagreeably powerful. They include enforcement identities like bailiff and auditor general, as well as some jobs that have power in heavily male industries like foreman and crane operator. Block 4 has the highest EPA of all the new classes of occupations and represents those who are most esteemed and deferred to in the occupational structure (the Actively Revered). They include not the highest paid occupations, but the ones that we accord the highest status, like nurse and firefighter.

The argument that Maloney (2020) made is that these blocks of structurally equivalent occupations constitute classes of occupations in which people have shared deference experiences. To the extent that other people (1) operate to maintain cultural sentiments and (2) avoid relationships in which those sentiments are difficult to maintain, these blocks of occupations represent a form of theoretically shared experience. Our core purpose in this paper is to explore the emotional dimensions of that shared experience.

THE QUESTIONS MOTIVATING THIS PAPER

We explore two aspects of the occupational blocks (called classes, hereafter, since that is how Maloney [2020] conceptualized them). The first is theoretical. Affect control theory not only predicts behaviors like deference. It also predicts emotional responses to social interactions. In particular, there are three types of emotional responses that are importantly related to social positions.

Characteristic emotions are the emotions that we expect someone to experience in a social position when s/he is perfectly maintaining the cultural sentiments associated with that position (Lively & Heise, 2004; MacKinnon, 1994). So, if a surgeon is in a hospital setting that locks her into that identity and is perfectly maintaining it, she should go through her work day experiencing something like the characteristic emotion associated with the identity "surgeon."

But surgeons do not exist alone in their hospital environment. In enacting his surgeon role, a surgeon might interact with a patient, a nurse, an orderly, and a maintenance worker. In these interactions, under affect control theory, there would be multiple cultural signals operating in the situation. Both the surgeon and the other person would be trying to maintain their own identities. However, they also would both be trying to maintain the other's identity. The emotion (theoretically) created when maintaining an identity in the context of a role relationship with a particular type of alter is called a *structural emotion*. So, the emotions that affect control theory predicts under various circumstances (e.g., a surgeon interacting with another surgeon as opposed to a surgeon interacting with a maintenance worker) might be somewhat different. *Situational emotions* that are experienced in nonroutine, counter-normative interactions are also

predicted by the theory.We will examine them in the context of the deference relationships that motivate Maloney's (2020) analysis. Specifically, we will look at the emotions that might be produced when someone defers (or fails to defer) unexpectedly to another.

The second question that we explore in this paper is empirical. Do the characteristic emotions predicted by the theory indicate how occupants of occupational positions respond to survey questions about affective experience? If surgeons actually experience more pleasant and potent characteristic emotions than maintenance workers (as predicted by the theory), one would expect that they would answer standard survey questions like "Do I generally feel respected at work?" differently. We analyze three questions from the GSS that were used by Freeland and Hoey (2018) to assess these ideas.

The third question we ask is how one's occupational class might affect *daily* emotional experience. We use the GSS 1996 emotions module to test whether certain blocks are more likely to experience very good and active emotions on a daily basis than other blocks.

THEORETICAL METHODS

To address our theoretical interest in characteristic, structural, and situational emotions, we use INTERACT, the simulation program developed by David Heise (2007). INTERACT represents the current operationalization of affect control theory. In INTERACT, events between individuals occupying specified identities can be simulated to predict post-situation behaviors, deflection, and emotional experience, according to the validated equations that formalize affect control theory. In addition to calculating deflection after a simulated event, INTERACT has several different functionalities, including a calculation of what emotion an interactant will feel upon confirming their identity (characteristic emotion) and upon completion of an interaction within a role relationship (structural emotion). This function of INTERACT is what we make use of for the following analysis. Further explanation of the calculation of these emotions can be found below.

Like Freeland and Hoey (2018) and Maloney (2020), we use the 2015 US Student Dictionary (Smith-Lovin et al., 2016) collected from participants at two large Southern US universities. To represent each occupational class identified by Maloney (2020), we use the EPA profile that most closely represents that block. Therefore, Maloney's (2020) class of everyday specialists (her Block 1) is represented in our analyses by an $E = 1.357$, $P = 0.924$, and $A = 0.263$. Clearly, reducing an occupational class to one EPA profile is a simplification. Table 1 (adapted from Maloney's [2020] Table 2) presents the blocks that we use in our theoretical simulations, along with their average EPA profile.

Characteristic Emotions

In affect control theory, emotions are the product of two elements: the deflection, or how different transient impressions are from the fundamental sentiments, and

Table 1. Evaluation, Potency, and Activity for Four Occupational Blocks.

	Mean *E*	Mean *P*	Mean *A*	Count of Occupations
Block 1: Everyday Specialists	1.357	0.924	0.263	126
Block 2: Service-to-Society	1.645	1.078	0.849	55
Block 3: Disagreeably powerful	0.743	1.269	0.260	109
Block 4: Actively Revered	1.909	1.442	1.438	13

Table 2. Characteristic Emotions for Four Occupational Classes.

	EPA of Characteristic Emotion			Closest Words
Block 1: Everyday Specialists	1.88	1.48	0.68	Charmed, trusting, light-hearted
Block 2: Service-to-Society	2.14	1.44	1.06	Aroused, amused, inquisitive
Block 3: Disagreeably powerful	1.56	1.96	0.70	Amorous, alert, aroused
Block 4: Actively Revered	2.36	1.68	1.44	Aroused, enthralled, amused

the transient impression of the actor or object in question (Averett & Heise, 1987; MacKinnon, 1994; Robinson & Smith-Lovin, 2018). A helpful (although slightly simplified) version of the equations for the prediction of emotions is

$$\text{Emotion Evaluation} = (2t - f) = t + (t - f)$$

$$\text{Emotion Potency and Activity} = (1.5t - f) = 0.5t + (t - f)$$

where t is the transient impression and f is the fundamental sentiment.

When analyzing emotions that are characteristic of an identity, when it is being perfectly maintained, we effectively set the transient impressions equal to the fundamental sentiments. In INTERACT, this can be accomplished by using the Interactions Menu, after inputting the EPA profiles as new sentiments for identities labeled Block 1 through 4. The characteristic emotion for the new class identity appears as a three-number profile below the picture of the emotion on a stylized face. For our four classes of occupations, the characteristic emotions are shown in Table 2. (We determined the emotion labels by using the Find A Concept Menu in INTERACT to search for the closest matches to the characteristic emotion's EPA profile for each class. The Find A Concept menu allows the user to input an EPA profile and it provides the closest measured terms in the ACT dictionary being used.)

First, we see that all of the characteristic emotions are quite positive. Enacting and maintaining the cultural meaning of routine, institutionalized occupational identities is not predicted to be distressing for any occupational class. Similarly,