

# UC Santa Cruz

## UC Santa Cruz Previously Published Works

**Title**

Advances in Relative Deprivation Theory and Research

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/11z5c3nq>

**Journal**

Social Justice Research, 28(1)

**ISSN**

0885-7466

**Authors**

Smith, Heather J  
Pettigrew, Thomas F

**Publication Date**

2015-03-01

**DOI**

10.1007/s11211-014-0231-5

Peer reviewed

## PAPER REVIEW

I am a bit unsure as to what I am reviewing here. I do not know the new journal and what they expect (Is it British – given your spelling of “behaviour”?) And I assume this is a rough first draft (a lot of spaces between words are missing). So first I’ll give my overall reaction and then list minor suggestions.

I like the first part on relative deprivation very much. You make a few points I missed in the two manuscripts I attached to you on RD. But the second and shorter part on policy I think needs more work – which I gather is the focus of this new journal. First, I have attached in my e-mail the following article:

Pettigrew, T. F. Toward sustainable psychological interventions for change. *Peace and Conflict*, 2011, 17 (2), 179-192. DOI: 10.1080/10781919.2010.536758.

In it, you will see I try to make a forceful case against *the single process fallacy* which I think is involved here when you make a policy point on page 14 as if RD were the only psychological process involved. You made the good point earlier (p. 12) that GRD can act as a buffer to IRD ill-effects. As it stands on p. 14, this point is forgotten and you make a case for group segregation (but what about intergroup contact, etc.).

The problem where the IRD comparison effects are important is when the less advantaged group is small in number. The problem with the housing program you mentioned (often only one Black family placed at a time) and school desegregation cases like Little Rock in 1957 (only 9 kids!) is the small numbers involved without GRD to buffer. So I think the major work for you and Yuen on the revision is on the policy implications.

Small points by page number:

p. 2 – line 9 – “...appears to affect adversely...”  
lines 12 – 13 – “unable to address effectively...”

p. 4 – As best I understand it, the Yitzhaki index does not test RD as an individual variable (as I argue in my attached articles). Macro-variables can never measure RD as an individual variable. Those who think so (like Gurr in WHY MEN REVEL?), have given RD a bad name in sociology; psychologists working with RD as an individual variable as Stouffer intended have had much more success.

P. 9 - I am confused by the top paragraph. Didn't we have more than 9 studies that tested anger with behavioral intentions?

- I like the possibility of systemic change (borrowed I guess from SIT) brought to bear on RD.

- Isn't that Iain Walker in the reference - who is no political scientist.

p. 13 - first line, ; should be a ,

- 7<sup>th</sup> line - remove "be"

p. 14 - top paragraph - it is this part that I take exception to as noted earlier.

Hope this helps....tom