Tilburg University

Am I respected or not?

De Cremer, D.; Tyler, T.R.

Published in:
Social Justice Research

Publication date:
2005

Citation for published version (APA):
De Cremer, D., & Tyler, T. R. (2005). Am I respected or not? Inclusion and reputation as issues in group membership. *Social Justice Research*, *18*(2), 121-153.

Am I Respected or Not?: Inclusion and Reputation as Issues in Group Membership

David de Cremer[1,3] **and Tom R. Tyler**[2]

Six studies examined why and when respect vs. disrespect influences people's emotions, self-worth, and behavior. Following relational models of justice, we argued that people use groups to derive information about the social self and as such value respect information because it indicates (a) whether or not they are accepted, and (b) how their status within the group is evaluated. These two identity concerns were operationalized by means of reinforcing people's desire to belong (i.e., the identity concern of acceptance) and concern for reputation (i.e., the identity concern of one's status evaluation). In line with predictions, the first three studies demonstrated that respect matters only among those whose concerns to belong are made salient. Studies 4–6 further showed that respect only influenced reactions among those who have strong concerns for reputation. It is concluded that respect communicates information relevant to people's identity concerns—i.e., inclusion and reputation.

Fiona is a newcomer in a middle-sized company and often feels disrespected by her colleagues, so she begins wondering whether she is "in" or "out." After being appointed as the new student representative, Chris notices that his ideas are frequently made fun of, which makes him seriously worry about whether he is accepted or not. These situations point out a concern that most people have experienced, asking "Do others respect me or not?" Throughout our society (e.g., organizations, teams, close relationships, customer relationships, etc.) there is an increasing demand for respect (Hill, 2000; O'Connell, 2000; Tyler and Lind,

[1]Tilburg University, The Netherlands.
[2]New York University, USA.
[3]All correspondence should be addressed to David de Cremer, Department of Social Psychology, Tilburg University, P.O. Box 90153, 5000-LE Tilburg, the Netherlands; e-mail: d.decremer@uvt.nl.

1992), leading people to ever greater concerns about whether such respect has been granted.

The present research aims to examine whether variations in respect people feel in groups indeed influences their reactions to others in group settings and, if so, why. To provide an answer to these questions, we argue that not all group members are equally concerned about issues of respect. Our hypothesis is that the extent to which people incorporate the group and their relationships with its members into their self-concept determines how much impact the degree to which they are treated with respect has on their reactions to respect-related information. If people draw more of their identity from the group, they are more strongly influenced by whether others in the group treat them with respect.

Drawing upon relational perspectives on the connection between people and groups (Tyler and Blader, 2000; Tyler and Smith, 1999), our analysis is based upon the argument that people use the group as a basis to help define their social self. To do so they must determine both (1) whether they are included within groups—i.e., inclusion, and (2) how they are evaluated within the groups to which they belong—i.e., reputation. To the extent that people are using the group for self-definitional purposes, they care about both of these issues.

These two identity concerns will be operationalized in two separate ways in the present research. Issues of inclusion will be operationalized by the salience of people's desire to belong—which motivates them to ask whether they are included in groups. People's concerns about their position or standing in the group will be operationalized by their concern about their reputation. The core argument tested here is that identity concerns (i.e., belongingness and reputation) moderate the impact of quality of treatment upon people's attitudes, feelings, and behaviors, with those whose identity concerns are stronger being more strongly influenced by whether or not they are treated with respect.

Respect and Social Justice

The importance of respect is widely recognized. One of the basic premises of many moral philosophies is that people have a moral duty to treat others respectfully (Hill, 2000; Kant, 1996; Rawls, 1971). As Hill (2000, p. 59) argues, "respect is . . . something to which we should presume every human being has a claim, namely full recognition as a person, with same basic moral worth as any other." Receiving respect is thus regarded as an element of social justice (Miller, 2001), and "justice and respect are powerfully and inseparably linked" (Miller, 2001, p. 545). Indeed, research on interactional justice (Bies and Moag, 1986), for example, suggests that people perceive a lack of respect from others as being unjust (Bies, 2001). Studies find that people react strongly to perceptions of disrespect in legal/political settings (Anderson, 1999; Emler and Reicher, 1995; Kennedy and Forde, 1999; Tyler and Huo, 2002), as well as in work organizations (Tyler and Blader, 2000).

In fact, justice researchers approach the importance of respect from several perspectives, noting, for example, that respect promotes the chance of obtaining good resources (cf. Thibaut and Walker, 1975). However, the relationship between respect and social justice is supported and elaborated in most detail in the group-value model (Lind and Tyler, 1988), the relational model of authority (Tyler and Lind, 1992), and the group engagement model of cooperation (Tyler and Blader, 2000). These models all assume that people consider the nature of their relationship to the group and others in it when defining their sense of self (e.g., Sedikides and Gregg, 2003; Tyler and Smith, 1999), above and beyond their concerns about the resources that groups supply. One specific type of information that indicates one's position and status within the group, and as such influences one's self-definition, is whether one feels *respected* by others in the groups (e.g., Simon and Stürmer, 2003).

Thus, the core argument of the relational model of authority is that people use groups to define an important part of themselves—their social or collective self (Sedikides and Brewer, 2001; Tyler and Smith, 1999). As a result, groups shape self-definitions and judgments of self-worth (Baumeister, 1998; Leary, 2001); this is an issue that has been addressed by social identity theory (SIT; Hogg and Abrams, 1988; Tajfel and Turner, 1986) and self-expansion theory (see Aron and McLaughin-Volpe, 2001 for a recent review and its applications to group settings). SIT, for example, argues explicitly that groups constitute an integral part of people's definitions of their social selves, and self-expansion theory assumes that due to a central human motivation people in important and close relationships include others in the self.

Taken together, group memberships and relationships with group members can thus be seen as an important means to tell people (a) who they are (i.e., whether they are an included member or not), and (b) whether they are respected by the others within the group (i.e., their position/standing within the group). Because the relational model of authority (Tyler and Lind, 1992) argues that respect is an identity-relevant dimension (Tyler, 1999), it follows that the two identity concerns—inclusion and reputation—should influence whether people care about respect or not. As such, in the present research, we propose that motives related to these two identity concerns should moderate information about (dis)respectful treatment, or, in other words, that respect should matter to people, but particularly so for those in strong need to obtain information about their level of inclusiveness and reputation.

The second aspect of the relational argument focuses on the type of information that people use to make determinations of inclusion and reputation. Justice researchers recognize that people look to information about groups to reduce their uncertainty about the risks involved in group membership (Van den Bos and Lind, 2002). According to Tyler and colleagues (Tyler, 1999; 2001; Tyler and Smith, 1999) the relational argument is that whether people feel that they are treated with respect by others shapes their judgments about their acceptance within their

group (inclusion) and about the evaluation of their status within the group (reputation). Thus, respect is not something that people simply intuit by themselves. It is rather a judgment that emerges from the received treatment from others (see also Smith and Tyler, 1997). In the present paper, the degree of how respectful one experiences one's own treatment to be refers to how worthy and recognized one feels (see our earlier definition of Hill, 2000), and therefore, it is expected to communicate information about belongingness and reputation.

Identity Concerns as Moderators of Respect: Salience of Concerns to Belong and Concerns for Reputation

Which fundamental human motives are related to the identity concerns? First, central to the effort of self-definition is evaluating belongingness or inclusiveness to groups. The first identity concern expected to moderate respect is related to this fundamental motivation of belonging to groups (Baumeister and Leary, 1995). Research on the need to belong demonstrates that people are fundamentally motivated to belong to valued groups and relationships (e.g., Baumeister and Leary, 1995; Gardner et al., 2000b; Twenge et al., 2001, 2002). As a result of this motive, people are very attentive to any type of relational information, but particularly so when their need to belong is unfulfilled (i.e., when they have a high need to belong). The importance and pervasiveness of this need to belong is reflected well in research showing that a lack of positive and inclusive social relationships influences mental well-being negatively, reinforces selective memory for socially relevant information, and undermines intrinsic motivation (e.g., Berscheid and Reis, 1998; Deci and Ryan, 2000; Gardner et al., 2000a, b). Thus, reinforcing people's desire to belong should be expected to serve as an important moderator of the influence of respect.

People's need to belong has been linked to justice concerns. First, Cropanzano et al. (2001, p. 177) concluded that "the need for belonging could serve as one mechanism for the relational model" of authority (Tyler and Lind, 1992). Second, in a recent commentary, Lind (2001) also argued that one reason why people value fair procedures is because they affirm their sense of belongingness to the group or organization at hand. In other words, the key assumption of these relational models of justice "focuses on messages of inclusion" (Lind, 2001, p. 224). Finally, a recent study by De Cremer (2002) showed that group members used the degree of respect received by the other ingroup members as a reference point for their decision to cooperate or not in a public good dilemma, but only when they were considered to be peripheral rather than core group members. De Cremer explained this effect by arguing that peripheral group members experienced a strong desire to be included, making them very sensitive to respect information. What is missing, however, is direct empirical evidence showing that respect communicates information relevant to people's desire to belong.

The second identity concern relates to how people use the group and their relationships within the group to derive information about whether they are respected by others. This concern is closely related to Tyler's (2001) notion of the *reputational social self*. This distinct aspect of the social self refers to people's concern about their position and reputation within the group (Tyler and Smith, 1999). As early as James (1890), researchers on the self have noted that the self does not only refer to the physical appearance and one's mental state, but that people's sense of self also includes reputations. Our definition of respect specifically notes that respect is a judgment related to one's status within the group and relationship at hand, a definition that converges with the notion of *social reputation* as used in the literature on delinquency and street culture in inner cities (Anderson, 1994; Emler and Hopkins, 1990; Emler and Reicher, 1995). For example, Anderson (1994) notes that young men in inner city communities have such a strong need for respect by the other community members, because it represents a social evaluation about their position within that community, thus, their social reputation (see also Emler and Hopkins, 1990). This focus on reputation suggests that respect can be considered as a psychological construct that captures people's views of their reputations as communicated by others. Therefore, we expect that people's concerns about reputation should also moderate the effects of whether people are treated with respect.

These two concerns—need to belong and concern about reputation—are thus both seen as important to people's social self-concepts (Sedikides, 2002). As such, due to their connection to identity issues, both concerns are strongly related to one another. The literature on the need to belong (Baumeister and Leary, 1995), for example, argues that if the motive to belong is not being met, people are very sensitive about how they are being evaluated by others, because it may indicate the extent to which they are accepted or not by others. Research thus suggests that the desire to belong and concern for reputation share common ground. Indeed, although both motives have been shown to be related but distinct, people's lack of social connections (e.g., being abandoned by others, being a peripheral member of society, etc.) and their feelings of having a deprived status, that is, a low social reputation, often seem to go hand in hand when negatively influencing people's mental well-being, emotions, cognitions and actions (e.g., Baumeister, 1991; Baumeister and Leary, 1995). For example, youngsters lacking social bonds frequently join gangs to feel included, just as they join them to get a positive social reputation from those gangs (Jankowski, 1991). All of this suggests that a lack of belongingness and a poor social reputation or deprived social status often go together, making people focus more on relational information like respect (e.g., Forsyth, 1991). If people have a positive reputation, they are most likely to be fulfilled in their need to belong as well, and as such will not be as attentive to relational information.

Because empirical evidence is first needed that respect communicates information relevant to concerns about belongingness and reputation, the aim of the

present research should not be to test how belongingness and reputation influence one another and which direction this influence may take, but rather to demonstrate first that concerns about belongingness and reputation moderate the effect of respectful treatment. Such an approach suggests that the psychological effect of an interactional feature like respect depends on how people interpret the situation, and such different interpretations may vary as a function of people's concerns, in this case, belongingness and reputation (cf. Snyder and Cantor, 1998). Thus, by examining the moderating effect of belongingness and reputation, the present approach enhances our insight in the type of information (belongingness and reputation) a respectful treatment actually communicates.

The Present Research

In the following line of studies, we will examine whether the salience of the desire to belong (Studies 1–3) and concerns about one's reputation (Studies 4–6) moderate the influence of whether one is treated with respect on people's emotions, self-esteem, and behavior. The following predictions are thus tested:

Hypothesis 1: It is expected that people will exhibit and display more positive emotions, self-esteem and behavior when they are treated respectfully rather than disrespectfully.

Hypothesis 2: The effect of respect (as predicted in Hypothesis 1) is expected to be more pronounced when people's concerns about belongingness and reputation are made salient.

In the present studies respect will be communicated both by participants' fellow group members in the context of equal-power relationships and authorities in hierarchical relationships. Although the group-value model (Lind and Tyler, 1988) and the relational model of authority (Tyler and Lind, 1992) address the effect of respect in hierarchical social relationships, examining respect in equal-power relationships has not received that much attention (for an exception see De Cremer, 2002; Simon and Stürmer, 2003). In fact, this non-hierarchical perspective fits well with recent suggestions by social justice researchers. For example, Smith and Tyler (1997) reasoned that "respect is an important aspect of group membership even when there is no clear authority structure" (p. 157). More recently, Lind (2001, p. 222), in discussing the importance of feelings of inclusiveness and belongingness in fair process effects, mentioned that "the . . . threat of exclusion (i.e., not belonging) manifests itself very starkly in hierarchical contexts . . . but it can be just as strong in close equal-power relations."

Further, Tyler (2001, p. 160) argues "The reputational social self . . . should motivate diverse and unique behaviors, all motivated by the desire to benefit the group." Therefore, the present research will use as dependent measures a variety of human reactions considered to be important to one's own development within social interactions: reported self-esteem, emotional reactions, exit behavior, and cooperation.

STUDY 1

Study 1 is the first test of the hypothesis that treatment with respect versus disrespect will influence people's reactions in social relationships if belonging-ness concerns are reinforced. For this first test both (dis)respectful treatment and the salience of the desire to belong are manipulated by means of accessibility techniques. That is, to manipulate treatment with respect, participants were asked to recall a situation in which they felt respected versus disrespected. To make salient people's desires to belong, we used an existing manipulation that activates the self-construal "I" or the self-construal "We" (see Stapel and Koomen, 2001).

We assumed that the level of the activated self-construal should determine the extent to which belongingness needs are made more salient: People's desire to belong should be less fulfilled if an idiosyncratic and personal identity is activated rather than an encompassing and collective identity (i.e., the latter is assumed to satisfy a desire for inclusiveness).

Finally, we examined this interaction hypothesis between respect and salience of desire to belong on emotional reactions. Recent research shows that if people feel that they are excluded from groups and relationships, emotional reactions are easily elicited (see Bourgeois and Leary, 2001; Leary *et al*., 1998). For example, people may feel less happy and even hurt, consequently making people think that the others do not value them as important or positive (Leary *et al*., 1998).

Although there is an abundance of evidence indicating that feelings of ex-clusion or rejection elicit negative emotions, little evidence exists that relational information concerning respect influences people's positive emotional reactions. Because the literature on emotions has convincingly shown that in addition to neg-ative emotions positive emotions also need to be assessed to fully understand the effect of social cues on emotions (Watson *et al*., 1988), we focus on the experience of positive emotions in Study 1. Thus, we start from the assumption that people should experience positive emotions when they perceive themselves as valued by the others. Taken together, it is predicted that variations in respect will influence the experience of positive emotions, but only among those whose desire to belong is reinforced.

Method

Participants and Design

Seventy-three Dutch undergraduate students participated voluntarily and were each paid 15 DFL (approximately 7 US dollars). The design was a 2 (Quality of remembered treatment: Respected vs. disrespected) × 2 (Priming: I vs. WE) between-subjects design. Participants were allocated randomly to the experimental conditions.

Procedure

Participants arrived at the laboratory in groups of four people. Each participant was seated in a separate cubicle. After completing in an unrelated study, participants were presented a paper and pencil task. The total session lasted about 45 min.

As a first part of the study, they were asked to recall a situation in their department in which they felt respected versus disrespected. They were asked to write a short story about this specific situation (most stories described situations of respect or disrespect in the classroom). Thereafter, the priming manipulation was introduced (see also Stapel and Koomen, 2001). In the "I priming condition," participants were asked to write a story about themselves, describing themselves in neutral descriptive terms. Furthermore, they were instructed that every sentence they wrote should include one of the following words: I, me, myself, and mine. In the "We priming condition," participants were asked to write a story about "who we are," using the words we, our, ourselves, and ours.

Thereafter, the dependent measures of Study 1 were solicited. All questions were answered on 7-point scales (ranging from not at all [1] to very much so [7]). Because it is important to examine people's emotional reactions toward relational information (Tyler and Smith, 1998), and because recent research on procedural fairness has also started to assess positive affect (e.g. Van den Bos and Spruijt, 2002), we assessed the following positive emotions by asking them to what extent do you "feel positive toward others in your department," "feel happy in your department," "feel comfortable in your department," "feel cheerful in your department," and "feel good in you department." These items were combined to form one average emotion score (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$).

Results

Manipulation Check

Two judges coded whether the participants wrote down responses related to feeling respected vs. disrespected. As expected, the two judges confirmed independently that the large majority of participants' responses in the respect condition were describing events of positive and respectful relationships with others, whereas participants in the disrespect condition described events of negative and disrespectful relationships with others. This suggests that the priming manipulation of remembered respect was successful.

Positive Emotions

A 2 × 2 ANOVA on the average emotion score revealed a significant main effect of priming, $F(1, 69) = 4.69$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .06$, showing that participants

Table I. Means and Standard Deviations of Positive Emotions as a Function of Respect and Priming (Study 1)

Respect	Priming	
	"I"	"We"
Respect	5.58 (0.63)	5.55 (0.68)
Disrespect	4.61 (1.69)	5.63 (0.86)

Note. Entries are means on 7-point scales, with higher values indicating higher ratings of positive emotions, respectively; entries within parentheses are standard deviations.

in the WE-condition experienced more positive emotional reactions than those in the I-condition ($Ms = 5.59$ vs. 5.09, SDs $= 0.76$ and 1.20, respectively). Also, a marginally significant main effect of Respect was found, $F(1, 69) = 3.75$, $p < .06$, $\eta^2 = .05$: Participants experienced more positive emotional reactions when they received respect than when they received disrespect ($Ms = 5.56$ vs. 5.12, SDs $= 0.65$ and 1.33, respectively). Finally, a significant interaction between Respect and Priming emerged with positive emotions, $F(1, 69) = 5.21$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .07$ (see Table I).

As expected, the respect effect was stronger when participants were primed with an I prime, relative to a WE-prime. The respect effect was significant in the I-prime condition, $F(1, 71) = 5.63$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .07$, but not in the WE-prime condition, $F(1, 71) < 1$, $\eta^2 = .00$. Further, priming revealed a significant effect within the disrespect conditions, $F(1, 71) = 6.63$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .08$, but not within the respect conditions, $F(1, 71) < 1$, $\eta^2 = .00$.

Discussion

The findings of Study 1 support our predictions: Variations in respect influenced emotional reactions positively, but only among those whose desire to belong was reinforced (as manipulated by the "I" prime). This suggests that cues of variations in respect communicate important belongingness information, and those whose desire to belong is reinforced will react most strongly toward variations in treatment with respect.

Before drawing strong conclusions, however, it is important to replicate this interaction effect. In Study 1, we reinforced this desire to belong by means of activating personal ("I") versus collective-based ("We") self-construals. Of course, one could argue that such a manipulation does not directly make salient concerns related to belongingness, because these types of self-construals can be considered complex in terms of cognitive and motivational dimensions (e.g., Cross *et al.*, 2000). Therefore, in Study 2, we made use of an accessibility manipulation aimed to directly reinforce concerns for belongingness or not by asking participants to

recall a recent situation in which they (1) felt excluded from the group (i.e., high need) or (2) felt they were truly a part of the group (i.e., low need).

In Study 2, we also expanded the dependent variable by measuring a key behavioral option in ongoing social relationships—willingness to leave the group. One way of solving negative relationships with others is to make use of the strategy of exit (e.g., leaving the group). Further, research links exit behavior to group fairness (Olson-Buchanan, 1996). Therefore, we predict an interaction between the salience to care about belongingness and treatment with respect to their impact on exit behavior, hypothesizing that for those with a salient desire to belong variations in respectful treatment will influence people's decisions to exit. Conversely, for those whose desire to belong is less salient, no impact of the respect manipulation on exit behavior is expected.

STUDY 2

Method

Participants and Design

Seventy-three Dutch undergraduate students participated voluntarily and were each paid 15 DFL. The design was a 2 (Respect: Respect vs. disrespect) × 2 (Priming: High salience vs. low salience of belongingness concerns) between-subjects design. Participants were allocated randomly to the experimental conditions.

Procedure

Participants arrived in groups of six at the laboratory, and each participant was placed in a separate experimental cubicle, containing a table, a chair and a computer. Most instructions were communicated on the computer screen, except for the respect manipulation, which was provided by the experimenter (see below).

Participants were first told that two groups consisting of three persons each would be formed. Each participant was assigned an identification number. Although participants (six per session) believed that they were assigned different numbers, they were all given the number 3. Then, it was communicated to them that they were part of a group consisting of the numbers 2, 3, and 5.

After this, participants were told that both groups had to complete a survival task. In this task, participants had to read a scenario describing a survival situation and to rank order the importance of 15 items that, according to them, would be most relevant to their survival. More specifically, each member would first individually complete this task. Then, for each group, the experimenter would collect all three

completed tasks. Once collected, the computer would then randomly select two group members who would check the three tasks and generate one group response from it (this response would be compared to the response of the other group). The selected members were always numbers 2 and 5, so none of the participants was ever selected. It was told to participants that once these two group members finished generating the group response, they would write a short note to the third group member indicating what they thought about the way this person (i.e., the participant) completed the survival task. This note would be delivered by the experimenter and constituted the respect manipulation.

While waiting for the note from the other two group members, participants were asked to recall a situation (for about three minutes) in which they felt they were either excluded (i.e., *salient desire to belong*) or were really part of a group (i.e., *no salient desire to belong*), and to write this situation down on a piece of paper. When they finished this need for belongingness manipulation, the experimenter waited for another minute and then went to the cubicle of the participant to deliver the note (supposedly) written by the other two group members.

The experimenter thus gave participants a note from the other two group members, which communicated either respect or a lack of respect. This method has successfully been used in prior research (see De Cremer, 2002), and operationalizes respect by using self-identified criteria in the interactional justice scale of Moorman (1991), which closely reflects our notion of respect. More specifically, based on this scale we made sure that the note included a reference to the extent that the other two group members would (a) accept the way the other completed the task, (b) consider the viewpoint of the other or not, and (c) treat the other in a friendly and kind way or not. These three criteria are generally assumed to represent information relevant to determining one's position with the group.

In the *respect* condition, this note said: "We think that your rank order of items is very much in line with our own decisions and thinking. It seems like we share the same values and norms. Therefore, we have decided that your completed task fits well with our completed tasks and as such your responses will be very helpful to the group."

In the *disrespect* condition, this note said: "We think that your rank order of items is not very much in line with our own decisions and thinking. We think that you may endorse other values and norms than we do. Therefore, we have decided that your completed task does not fit well with our completed tasks and as such we will not use your responses."

Then, the dependent measures of Study 2 were solicited. All questions were answered on 7-point scales (ranging from not at all [1] to very much so [7]). To check the effectiveness of our respect manipulation, participants were asked to what extent they felt the others respected them. Then, to measure intention to exit, participants were asked to what extent they would like to leave the group.

Results

Manipulation Checks

A 2 (Respect) × 2 (Priming) ANOVA on the manipulation check question revealed only a significant main effect of Respect, $F(1, 69) = 107.49$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .61$. Participants in the respect condition felt more respected than those in the disrespect condition (Ms = 5.73 vs. 2.72, SDs = 1.28 and 1.16, respectively).

Priming Responses

Two judges coded whether the participants wrote down responses related to feeling excluded from a group or feeling part of a group. As expected, the two judges confirmed independently that the large majority of participants' responses in the high need for belongingness condition were describing events of exclusion, whereas participants in the low need for belongingness condition described events of inclusion. This suggests that the priming manipulation of belongingness needs was successful.

Exit

A 2 × 2 ANOVA on the exit score revealed a significant main effect of Priming, $F(1, 69) = 4.24$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .06$, showing that participants with a salient desire to belong were less willing to leave the group than were those with no salient desire to belong (Ms = 2.94 vs. 3.73, SDs = 1.71 and 1.74, respectively). Also, a significant main effect of Respect was found, $F(1, 69) = 5.35$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .07$. Participants who received disrespect were more willing to leave the group than were those who received respect (Ms = 3.77 vs. 2.89, SDs = 1.66 and 1.77, respectively). Finally, an interaction effect between Respect and Priming emerged, $F(1, 69) = 5.53$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .07$ (see Table II).

As expected, the respect effect was significant when the desire to belong was salient, $F(1, 71) = 10.41$, $p < .005$, $\eta^2 = .13$, but not when this desire was

Table II. Means and Standard Deviations of Exit as a Function of Respect and Priming (Study 2)

Respect	Priming	
	Salient desire to belong	No salient desire to belong
Respect	3.73 (1.82)	2.05 (1.26)
Disrespect	3.72 (1.71)	3.83 (1.65)

Note. Entries are means on 7-point scales, with higher values indicating higher ratings of willingness to leave; entries within parentheses are standard deviations.

not salient, $F(1, 71) < 1$, $\eta^2 = .00$. Furthermore, salience of the desire to belong had a significant effect within the respect conditions, $F(1, 71) = 9.16$, $p < .005$, $\eta^2 = .11$, but not within the disrespect conditions, $F(1, 71) < 1$, $\eta^2 = .00$.

Discussion

The findings of Study 2 again provide evidence that variations in respect matter only when the desire to belong is reinforced. In Study 2, we manipulated participants' salience to belong by means of a direct priming measure. In addition, we manipulated the degree of respect by providing participants with direct feedback concerning the extent to which the other group members evaluated the participant's performance. The success of this respect manipulation also clearly demonstrates that respect is indeed a salient and important relational ingredient in social interactions (Tyler and Smith, 1999). Although these findings support our line of reasoning, we replicated this finding to provide further support for this interactive effect.

A third experiment was conducted that included some changes compared to Study 2. The first difference is that in Study 3 we use a different measure of belongingness needs. Finding similar effects and using different measures of belongingness needs will enhance our belief in the robustness and validity of the effect. In Study 3 we employ an established and reliable measure to assess belongingness needs. This measure is the need to belong scale developed by Leary *et al.* (2001b), and its development is in line with Baumeister and Leary's (1995) argument that although this need should be pervasive among most people, "naturally one would expect there to be individual differences in strength and intensity" (p. 499). Moreover, across a series of studies, this scale has shown to be reliable and predictive of people's reactions toward social and relational information (see also De Cremer and Leonardelli, 2003; De Cremer and Alberts, 2004). Thus, it is predicted that those classified as high in the need to belong will respond strongly toward variations in treatment with respect, whereas this is not expected to be the case among those classified as low in the need to belong.

Furthermore, in Study 3, we will also make use of a different treatment with respect manipulation—one that focuses on respect from others in the group. Because respect is an important relational component, it is necessary that we test for different operationalizations to ensure the validity of this concept. As De Cremer (2002, p. 1340) argued: "Of course, with a complex and multidimensional concept like respect, virtually every possible manipulation of the construct will be confounded with other concepts. The only way to solve this problem is to study the idea with a diversity of manipulations and operationalizations" (see also Miller, 2001, for a discussion about the difficulty of defining the concept of respect). In line with this, it thus seems useful to use a variety of manipulations constituting a respectful vs. disrespectful treatment. In Study 3, another respect manipulation

is used. In this study participants receive a note that summarizes the scores of the other group members on a respect questionnaire. A high score denotes a strong general tendency to give respect to others, whereas a low score denotes a weak general tendency to give respect to others.

Finally, to provide further evidence for the robustness of our predicted interaction between the need to belong and respect, we use another behavioral dependent measure—cooperative behavior. As we mentioned earlier, respect is expected to influence people's internal values and motives, consequently leading to group-oriented behavior (Tyler, 2001; Tyler and Blader, 2000; Tyler and Smith, 1999). One important variable related to group outcomes is cooperative behavior, because cooperation contributes positively to the effectiveness of groups (Smith *et al.*, 1995). To assess level of cooperation, we will use the public good paradigm (see Komorita and Parks, 1994).

STUDY 3

Method

Participants and Design

Ninety-six Dutch undergraduate students participated voluntarily and were each paid 5 euros (approximately 5 US dollars). The design was a 2 (Respect: Respect vs. disrespect) × 2 (Need to belong: High vs. low) between-subjects design. Participants were allocated randomly to the respect conditions.

Experimental Procedure

Upon arrival in the laboratory, participants were placed in an experimental cubicle containing a computer, a table, and a chair. Participants were led to believe that all interactions would take place via the computer, which was supposedly connected to the University server.

Participants were told that they would first participate in a study validating questionnaires. In this study they were required to fill out the 10-item need to belong scale of Leary *et al.* (2001b). This scale includes items such as "If other people don't seem to accept me, I don't let it bother me," and "I do not like being alone" (Cronbach's $\alpha = .73$). All items were answered on a 5-point scale ($1 = not\ at\ all\ characteristic\ of\ me$, $5 = extremely\ characteristic\ of\ me$). To classify participants as high versus low in the need to belong, a median split was used (Median $= 3.50$, SD $= 0.55$). But, to avoid ambiguity concerning some participants and to report ANOVAs because the data of Studies 1, 2, and 6 were analyzed with ANOVAs (due to fact that all variables were manipulated), we excluded those participants responding with the median score from the analyses ($N = 7$). This

classification system left us with a total of 89 participants. The distribution of high and low need to belong participants was not significantly different between the respect (40% vs. 60%, respectively) and disrespect conditions (58% vs. 42%), $\chi^2(1, 89) = 2.54$, $p = .11$.

After filling out this questionnaire, an ostensibly second study was introduced by means of a group decision-making task. The task was introduced as an investment task in which people could earn money for themselves and for their group. Before starting with the task, each participant was given a participant number; each participant was given the number 3.

More specifically, participants were told that at the beginning of the group task, each participant would receive an endowment of 100 chips. Each chip was said to be worth 0.10 euro cents (thus participants were aware that they could earn money). Each participant was free to choose any amount they wanted to contribute (ranging from 0 to 100 chips). It was explained that the total amount contributed by the group would be multiplied by two and then divided equally amongst all group members, regardless of their contribution. The amount one decided not to contribute would accrue entirely to oneself. Thus, if each member of the group contributed a large portion of their endowment, group members would, in the end, receive more; yet everyone would receive an equal part, regardless of their contribution. This situation is specific to a public good dilemma, as it is characterized by an *impossibility of exclusion* in a way that once the contributed money is collected anyone can enjoy it, regardless of whether he or she contributed (Komorita and Parks, 1994; Olson, 1965). This property creates a temptation for participants to *free ride*, that is, to profit from the contributions of others without making a contribution oneself. After this was made clear, several questions were asked to see whether participants understood correctly the decision-making task (all participants did).

Then, the respect manipulation was introduced. It was said that in order to have an impression about the other group members who were involved, those people were asked at an earlier stage to respond to a questionnaire. The scores on this questionnaire were put in a file and this file, including a note with the scores, was given to participants. In the *respect* condition, this note communicated the average score that each of the two other group members received on the respect scale for others (this scale included four items and they were given to the participant as additional information). The first group member scored 9.0 and the second group member scored 8.7. As such, participants were told that their group members had on average a high score and therefore could be considered as people who would give respect to others.

In the *disrespect* condition, this note also communicated the average score that each of the two other group members received on the respect scale for others. The first group member scored 5.0 and the second group member scored 4.6. As such, participants were told that their group members had on average a low score and therefore could not be considered as people who would give respect to others.

Table III. Means and Standard Deviations of Cooperation
as a Function of Respect and Priming (Study 3)

	Need to belong	
Respect	High	Low
Respect	56.02 (28.65)	40.96 (27.95)
Disrespect	32.87 (21.00)	44.52 (26.41)

Note. Entries are means, with higher values indicating
higher levels of contributions; entries within parentheses
are standard deviations.

Then, the dependent measures were solicited. All questions were answered
on 7-point scales (ranging from not at all [1] to very much so [7]). To check the
effectiveness of our respect manipulation, participants were asked to what extent
they thought the other two group members respected the group, and to what extent
the others respected them ($r = .91$, $p < .001$). Further, to measure contributions,
participants engaged in two contribution sessions in which they were asked each
time how much they wished to contribute (ranging from 0 to 100 fiches). These
two contribution sessions were averaged to form one contribution score ($r = .93$,
$p < .001$).

Results

Manipulation Checks

A 2 (Respect) × 2 (Need for belongingness) ANOVA on the average respect
score revealed only a significant main effect of Respect, $F(1, 85) = 159.89$, $p <
.001$, $\eta^2 = .65$. Participants in the respect condition felt more respected than did
those in the disrespect condition ($Ms = 5.47$ vs. 2.72, $SDs = 1.09$ and 0.92,
respectively).

Contributions

A 2 × 2 ANOVA on the average contribution[4] score yielded the predicted sig-
nificant interaction effect between Respect and Need to Belong, $F(1, 85) = 5.72$,
$p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .06$ (see Table III). As expected, the respect effect was significant
among those with a high need to belong, $F(1, 87) = 8.43$, $p = .005$, $\eta^2 = .09$,
but not among those with a low need to belong, $F(1, 87) < 1$, $\eta^2 = .00$. Further,
belongingness need had a marginally significant effect within the disrespect con-
ditions, $F(1, 87) = 2.78$, $p < .10$, $\eta^2 = .03$, and no significant effect within the
respect conditions, $F(1, 87) = 2.42$, $p = .12$, $\eta^2 = .00$.

---

[4]A simple slope analysis (including all the participants) showed the same pattern as the ANOVA
concerning the planned comparisons. Among those high in need to belong (1 SD above the mean)
respect was significantly related to average contribution $\beta = .35$, $p < .05$, but not when need to
belong was low (1 SD below the mean), $\beta = .14$, $p < .32$.

Discussion

The findings of Study 3 are again supportive of our line of reasoning. If the desire to belong is salient (this time assessed by how strongly an individual's need to belong was), they respond significantly to variations in respect from others in the group. In contrast, when this desire is less salient, variations in respect from others in the group do not influence people's reactions. Furthermore, the fact that we used a different operationalization of belongingness needs and respect makes us even more confident that our predicted interaction between respect and belongingness is a valid effect.

The results of our first three studies thus show convincingly that the effect of respect is a function of how salient the desire to belong is to people. In line with earlier suggestions (De Cremer, 2002; Lind, 2001), these findings indeed illustrate that respect communicates important identity information regarding the extent to which one is included in the group or not and that this information is relevant to how one defines his or her social self (Sedikides, 2002; Tyler, 2001). As discussed in the introduction, another identity concern expected to moderate the effect of respect is how people are evaluated within the group. We argue that this type of identity dimension should be related to people's concern for reputation (i.e., the reputational social self, Tyler, 2001). Therefore, we also wanted to demonstrate that if people are concerned about their reputations in the group, they will focus more on how respectfully they are treated. Thus, concerns about one's reputation should show the same interaction pattern as demonstrated in our first line of studies (Study 1–3). This prediction will be tested across a variety of dependent measures.

STUDY 4

Method

Participants and Design

Fifty-two Dutch undergraduate students participated voluntarily and were paid 2 euros (approximately 2 US dollars). The design was a 2 (Respect from others: Respect vs. disrespect) × 2 (Concern about reputation: High vs. low) between-subjects factorial design. Participants were randomly assigned to the respect conditions.

Experimental Procedure

Participants were approached by a research assistant and asked whether they were willing to participate in a paper-and-pencil study. When students agreed they were given the materials and were seated at a table.

To assess participants' concern for reputation, they were required to fill out the recently developed concern for reputation scale (on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 = *not at all characteristic for me*, to 5 = *extremely characteristic for me*). This scale consists of seven items: "I am rarely concerned about my reputation," "I do not consider what others say about me," "I wish to have a good reputation," "If my reputation is not good, I feel very bad," "I find it important that others consider my reputation as a serious matter," "I try hard to work on my reputation (in my relationships with others)," and "I find it difficult if others paint an incorrect image of me." A factor analysis on these items revealed one factor with an eigenvalue of 3.36, accounting for 48% of the variance. Factor loadings ranged from .61 to .77. These items were combined to form an average "reputational concerns" scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .83$). The higher the score the stronger one's reputational concerns.

To classify participants as high versus low in concerns for reputation, a median split was used (Median = 3.28, SD = 0.67). But, to avoid ambiguity concerning some participants and to conduct ANOVAs in order to remain consistent in presentation across the studies, we excluded those participants responding with the median score from the analyses ($N = 1$). This classification system left us with a total of 51 participants. The distributions of high and low in concerns for reputation was not significantly different among the respect conditions (53% vs. 47%, respectively) and the disrespect conditions (36% vs. 64%), $\chi^2(1, 51) = 1.61$, $p = .20$.

The respect manipulation was then introduced. As in Study 1, participants were first asked to recall a situation in their department in which they felt respected or disrespected. They were asked to write a short story about this specific situation (most stories described situations of respect or disrespect in the classroom).

Thereafter, the dependent measures of Study 4 were solicited. All questions were answered on 7-point scales (ranging from not at all [1] to very much so [7]). To assess reported self-esteem (taken from Leary *et al.*, 2001a), participants were asked to what extent they felt "they were valued by the persons in their department," and "sad about themselves by the treatment of their department" (reverse-scored) ($r = .36$, $p < .01$).

Results

Manipulation Check

Two judges coded whether the participants wrote down responses related to feeling respect vs. disrespect. As expected, the two judges confirmed independently that the large majority of participants' responses in the respect condition were describing events of positive and respectful relationships with others, whereas participants in the disrespect condition described events of negative and

Table IV. Means and Standard Deviations of Self-Esteem as a Function of Respect and Concern for Reputation (Study 4)

Respect	Concern for reputation	
	High	Low
Respect	5.72 (0.56)	5.46 (1.05)
Disrespect	3.50 (1.59)	4.81 (1.45)

Note. Entries are means on a 7-point scale, with higher values indicating higher ratings of self-esteem; entries within parentheses are standard deviations.

disrespectful relationships with others. This suggests that the priming manipulation of respect was successful.

Self-Esteem

A 2 (Respect) $\times$ 2 (Reputation) ANOVA on the average self-evaluation score revealed, first of all, a significant main effect of Respect, $F(1, 48) = 17.72$, $p < .001$. Participants made a more positive self-evaluation when they received respect rather than disrespect from others ($Ms = 5.59$ vs. 4.15, respectively). In addition, a significant interaction emerged, $F(1, 48) = 5.31$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .09$ (see Table IV).

As expected, the respect effect was stronger when participants experienced high concern for reputation, relative to low concern for reputation. The respect effect was significant among those high in concern for reputation, $F(1, 50) = 20.99$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .29$, but not among those low in concern for reputation, $F(1, 50) = 1.84$, $p < .19$, $\eta^2 = .03$. In the conditions of disrespect, the effect of concern for reputation was significant, $F(1, 50) = 7.14$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .12$, but not in the conditions of respect, $F(1, 50) < 1$, ns, $\eta^2 = .00$.

Discussion

The findings of Study 4 demonstrated that variations in respect matters most when people have strong concerns about their reputation in the group. Participants' self-esteem was influenced most among those with a high concern for reputation. This result supports the hypothesis that respect is a communicative signal indicating how one is perceived and evaluated by others (cf. Sedikides and Gregg, 2003). Such social evaluation is often linked to matters of reputation. To enhance the robustness and generalizability of this finding, replication is needed, preferably on a broader range of reactions.

Study 5 differed from Study 4 in several respects. First, as in Study 1, Study 4 made use of a recall technique to activate feelings of respect vs. disrespect. In

Study 5, we manipulated respect by explicitly communicating to participants whether they were respected or not. Second, we included a more comprehensive scale of self-esteem in Study 5. Finally, Study 5 will also use emotional reactions as dependent measures. As argued in Study 1, feelings of exclusion or inclusion are powerful determinants of emotional reactions, and therefore it is important to assess such emotions. As in Study 1, positive and negative emotions were assessed.

STUDY 5

Method

Participants and Design

Seventy Dutch undergraduate students participated voluntarily and were each paid 2 euros. The design was a 2 (Reputation: High concern vs. low concern) × 2 (Respect: Respect vs. disrespect) between-subjects factorial design.

Experimental Procedure

Participants were approached by a research assistant and asked whether they were willing to participate in a paper-and-pencil study. When students agreed they were given the materials and were seated at a table.

As in Study 5, participants' reputational concerns were assessed again by means of the reputation scale. These items were combined to form one average reputational concerns scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .73$). The higher the score the stronger one's reputational concerns. As in Studies 3 and 4, we used a median split (Median $= 3.57$, SD $= 0.55$), and deleted all participants scoring the median score ($N = 6$), leaving us with a total of 64 participants. The distributions of high and low in concern for reputation was not significantly different among the respect conditions (53% vs. 47%, respectively) and the disrespect conditions (36% vs. 64%), $\chi^2(1, 70) = 1.51$, $p = .22$.

After filling out this scale, students read a scenario and were asked to imagine as if they recently had experienced the described situation. The scenario read as follows:

> You are a member of a workforce that is responsible for discussing and evaluating the quality of proposals aimed at improving the efficiency of the company where you work. This workforce meets at regular times to listen to each other's ideas and opinions. During one of these meetings, you have introduced some of your suggestions.

This was followed by the manipulation of respect. Participants in the *disrespect* condition read: "Immediately you notice that the other members show

disrespect for you and your ideas." Participants in the *respect* condition read: "Immediately you notice that the other members show respect for you and your ideas."

Thereafter, the dependent measures of Study 5 were solicited. All questions were answered on 7-point scales (ranging from not at all [1] to very much so [7]). First, to check whether our respect manipulation was successful, participants were asked to what extent the others gave them respect. Second, to assess participants' self-esteem (taken from Leary *et al.*, 2001a, b), participants were asked to what extent they felt "positive about themselves," "proud of themselves," and "bad about themselves" (reverse-scored) (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$). Then, participants' emotional reactions were measured. With respect to positive emotions, participants were asked to what extent they felt "satisfied" and "cheerful" ($r = .86$, $p < .001$). With respect to negative emotions, participants were asked to what extent they felt "disappointed" and "sad" ($r = .76$, $p < .001$).

Results

Manipulation Check

A 2 (Reputation) $\times$ 2 (Respect) ANOVA on the respect score revealed only a significant main effect of Respect, $F(1, 60) = 129.90$, $p < .001$: participants reported receiving more respect in the respect rather than disrespect conditions ($Ms = 5.73$ vs. 2.34, respectively).

Self-Esteem

A 2 (Reputation) $\times$ 2 (Respect) ANOVA on the average self-esteem score revealed, first of all, a significant main effect of Respect, $F(1, 60) = 129.05$, $p < .001$: participants reported higher self-esteem when they received respect rather than disrespect ($Ms = 5.71$ vs. 2.89, respectively). Also, a significant main effect of Reputation was found, $F(1, 60) = 6.08$, $p < .05$, indicating that people with low concern for reputation experienced higher self-esteem than those with high concern for reputation ($Ms = 4.61$ vs. 3.99, respectively). Finally, a significant interaction emerged, $F(1, 60) = 12.96$, $p = .001$ (see Table V).

As expected, the respect effect was stronger when participants felt a high concern for their reputation in the group. The respect effect was significant among those high in concern for reputation, $F(1, 62) = 65.65$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .51$, and more so than among those low in concern for reputation, $F(1, 62) = 11.65$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .15$. No significant difference of concerns for reputation in the disrespect conditions, $F(1, 62) = 1.98$, $p < .17$, $\eta^2 = .03$, or the respect conditions, $F(1, 62) = .94$, $p < .34$, $\eta^2 = .01$, was found.

Table V. Means and Standard Deviations of Self-Esteem, Positive and Negative
Emotions as a Function of Respect and Concern for Reputation (Study 5)

Dependent variables	Respect	Concern for reputation	
		High	Low
Self-Esteem	Respect	5.86 (0.68)	5.57 (0.82)
	Disrespect	2.13 (0.52)	3.64 (1.46)
Positive emotions	Respect	5.97 (0.79)	5.43 (0.53)
	Disrespect	2.08 (0.66)	3.05 (1.14)
Negative emotions	Respect	2.26 (1.24)	2.10 (1.03)
	Disrespect	5.29 (0.78)	3.86 (1.55)

Note. Entries are means on 7-point scales, with higher values indicating higher
ratings of self-esteem, negative and positive emotions, respectively; entries
within parentheses are standard deviations.

Positive Emotions

A 2 (Reputation) × 2 (Respect) ANOVA on the average positive emotion[5]
score revealed, first of all, a significant main effect of Respect, $F(1, 60) = 214.67$,
$p < .001$: participants reported higher positive emotions when they received re-
spect rather than disrespect ($Ms = 5.70$ vs. 2.56, respectively). Also, a significant
interaction emerged, $F(1, 60) = 12.50$, $p = .001$ (see Table V)

As expected, the respect effect was stronger when participants felt a high con-
cern for their reputation. The respect effect was significant among those high in
concern for reputation, $F(1, 62) = 78.67$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .55$, and more strongly
so than among those low in concern for reputation, $F(1, 62) = 18.93$, $p < .001$,
$\eta^2 = .23$. No significant effects of concern for reputation were observed in the dis-
respect conditions, $F(1, 62) = 2.06$, $p < .16$, $\eta^2 = .03$, or the respect conditions,
$F(1, 62) < 1$, ns, $\eta^2 = .00$.

Negative Emotions

A 2 (Reputation) × 2 (Respect) ANOVA on the average negative emo-
tion[6] score revealed, first of all, a significant main effect of Respect, $F(1, 60) =$
58.96, $p < .001$: participants reported more negative emotions when they re-
ceived disrespect rather than respect ($Ms = 4.57$ vs. 2.18, respectively). Also,
a significant main effect of Reputation was found, $F(1, 60) = 6.52$, $p < .05$,

---

[5]A simple slope analysis (including all the participants) showed the same pattern as the ANOVA
concerning the planned comparisons. Among those high in concern for reputation (1 SD above the
mean) respect was significantly more strongly related to positive emotions, $\beta = 1.05$, $p < .001$, than
when concern for reputation was low (1 SD below the mean), $\beta = .68$, $p < .001$.
[6]A simple slope analysis (including all the participants) showed the same pattern as the ANOVA
concerning the planned comparisons. Among those high in concern for reputation (1 SD above the
mean) respect was significantly more strongly related to negative emotions, $\beta = -.86$, $p < .001$,
than when concern for reputation was low (1 SD below the mean), $\beta = -.55$, $p < .001$.

showing that those with high concerns for reputation reported more negative emotions than those with low concerns for reputation ($Ms = 3.77$ vs. 2.98, respectively). Finally, a significant interaction emerged, $F(1, 60) = 4.12$, $p < .05$ (see Table V).

As expected, the respect effect was stronger when participants felt a high concern for their reputation. The respect effect was significant among those high in concern for reputation, $F(1, 62) = 30.91$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .33$, and more strongly so than among those low in concern for reputation, $F(1, 62) = 9.36$, $p < .005$, $\eta^2 = .13$. No significant effects of concern for reputation were observed in the disrespect, $F(1, 62) = 2.13$, $p = .15$, $\eta^2 = .03$, or respect conditions, $F(1, 62) < 1$, ns, $\eta^2 = .00$.

Discussion

The findings of Studies 4 and 5 clearly show that reactions toward variations in respect involve a component of concern about one's own reputation in the group. However, these studies operationalized concern about one's own reputation by means of a self-developed individual difference scale. Therefore, because of ambiguities concerning causality, it is also necessary to demonstrate similar effects across a variety of human reactions under situations in which concern for reputation is manipulated.

In the social psychology literature, concerns about reputation are often linked to the concept of accountability. Thus, a manipulation of accountability—as used in the social psychology literature—should then be expected to reveal similar results to those of studies 4 and 5, in which concern for reputation was assessed by means of an individual difference variable. In addition, such a manipulation would provide us with much - needed causal evidence regarding the relationship between concern for reputation and respectful versus disrespectful treatment (as suggested by the relational models of justice). In fact, the literature on accountability is very relevant to the present research, because it specifically addresses how social situations or interactions can influence how individuals feel and behave (Lerner and Tetlock, 1999; Sedikides *et al.*, 2002). Moreover, regarding our interest in concerns about reputation, this literature specifically shows that when individuals feel accountable (i.e., actions are identifiable and others know about one's own actions and decisions), they are concerned about how the others view their actions and decisions. That is, accountability is assumed to activate concerns about one's public self-image or social reputation (Lerner and Tetlock, 1999). Because people seek approval and respect from others for many reasons (e.g., self-esteem maintenance, promoting social identity, Baumeister, 1993; Tyler and Lind, 1992), being accountable toward others is therefore assumed to activate self-presentational concerns like caring about one's reputation (Baumeister and Hutton, 1987).

Because accountability is assumed to be a multidimensional construct (Lerner and Tetlock, 1999, p. 255), recent research has revealed that one specific component that is most responsible for the effects of accountability is identifiability (see Sedikides *et al*., 2002). If the way you are evaluated or how you act is identifiable to others, people become concerned about conforming to normative social influences (Deutsch and Gerard, 1955), and as a consequence are more concerned about their social reputation. For example, if people are evaluated negatively and others are aware of this, those under scrutiny will fear for their social reputation. Therefore, it is hypothesized that increasing identifiability should increase concerns about one's reputation. As a result, those who are identifiable should react more strongly toward variations in respect, whereas those who are not identifiable should not react to such variations. Study 6 tests this hypothesis.

STUDY 6

Method

Participants and Design

Eighty-four Dutch undergraduate students participated voluntarily and were each paid 2 euros. Participants were randomly allocated to a 2 (Respect: Respect vs. disrespect) × 2 (Identifiability: Yes vs. no) between-subjects factorial design.

Procedure

Participants were approached by a research assistant and asked whether they were willing to participate in a study concerning evaluations and decisions. When students agreed, they were seated at a table and were given a scenario. Participants were asked to imagine that the following story actually happened to them. To enhance the validity and commitment to the task at hand, participants were also asked to first summarize for themselves what the content of their proposal (as described in the scenario below) would be. Doing this should make participants very much personally involved when the proposal was evaluated.

After this information was given, participants read the following: "You are a member of a workforce that is responsible for discussing and evaluating proposals aimed at improving the student facilities at your University. This workforce meets at regular times and during these meetings formulates proposals, which are then mailed to the University council. During the last meeting of this workforce, you have launched a new proposal that you will personally defend next week in front of the University council." As mentioned earlier, participants now had to summarize briefly for themselves the content of this proposal.

Then, the manipulation of respect was introduced. In the *disrespect* condition, the scenario read as follows: "During this meeting with the University council you do not get any respect from the members of this council regarding your proposal." In the *respect* condition, the scenario said: "During this meeting with the University council you do get a lot of respect from the members of this council regarding your proposal."

Thereafter, the identifiability manipulation was introduced. In the *identifiability* condition, the scenario said: "After this meeting, the University community (other students, etc.) is informed about whether you personally received respect or not, and you will also have to provide an explanation about this to the others." In the *no identifiability* condition, the scenario said: "After this meeting, the University community (other students, etc.) is not informed about whether you personally received respect or not, and you will not have to provide an explanation about this to the others."

Then, the dependent measures of Study 6 were solicited. All questions were answered on a 7-point scale (1 = not at all, 7 = very much so). First, to test the effectiveness of the respect manipulation, participants were asked to what extent they felt respected by the members of the University council. To check for the effectiveness of the identifiability manipulation, participants were asked to what extent the others will know that they are respected or not by the members of the University council. Furthermore, positive emotional reactions were assessed by asking participants "how much satisfaction they would experience in this situation," and "how sad they would feel in this situation" (reversed-scored) ($r = .72$, $p < .001$). Finally, participants' self-esteem was assessed by asking participants "how positive they felt about themselves," and "how much they felt valued" ($r = .72$, $p < .001$).

Results

Manipulation Check

A 2 (Identifiability) $\times$ 2 (Respect) ANOVA on the respect score revealed a significant main effect of Respect, $F(1, 80) = 113.32$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .58$: participants reported receiving more respect in the respect rather than disrespect conditions ($Ms = 5.05$ vs. 1.72, $SDs = 1.75$ and 1.23, respectively). Also, a significant main effect of Identifiability, $F(1, 80) = 7.81$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .08$, was found (althought the effect sizes indicate that the effect of respect is significantly stronger): Participants in the identifiability condition experienced more respect than did those in the no identifiability condition ($Ms = 3.83$ vs. 2.95, $SDs = 2.26$ and 2.16, respectively). No significant interaction was found, $F(1, 80) = 2.62$, $p < .11$.

A 2 (Identifiability) $\times$ 2 (Respect) ANOVA on the identifiability check question revealed a significant main effect of Identifiability, $F(1, 80) = 85.53$,

$p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .51$: Participants in the identifiability condition felt to a stronger extent that others would know whether they were respected or not than did those in the no identifiability condition (Ms = 5.32 vs. 2.37, SDs = 1.32 and 1.62, respectively). No significant effects for Respect, $F(1, 80) = 1.92$, $p < .17$, or for the interaction, $F(1, 80) = 2.36$, $p < .13$, were obtained.

Positive Emotions

A 2 (Identifiability) × 2 (Respect) ANOVA on the average emotion score revealed, first of all, a significant main effect of Respect, $F(1, 80) = 50.88$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .38$: participants reported being more satisfied and less sad when they received respect rather than disrespect (Ms = 4.86 vs. 2.95, SDs = 1.57 and 1.10, respectively). Also, a main effect of Identifiability was found, $F(1, 80) = 15.39$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .16$, indicating that participants in the identifiability condition were more satisfied and less sad than were those in the no identifiability conditions (Ms = 4.43 vs. 3.38, SDs = 1.65 and 1.48, respectively). Finally, a significant interaction emerged, $F(1, 80) = 3.72$, $p = .057$, $\eta^2 = .04$ (see Table VI)

As expected, the respect effect was stronger for participants in the identifiability condition compared to those in the no identifiability condition. The respect effect was significantly stronger in the identifiability conditions, $F(1, 82) = 29.47$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .26$, than in the no identifiability conditions, $F(1, 82) = 8.91$, $p < .005$, $\eta^2 = .10$. A significant effect for identifiability was found in the respect conditions, $F(1, 82) = 10.55$, $p < .005$, $\eta^2 = .11$, but not in the disrespect conditions, $F(1, 82) = 1.02$, $p < .32$, $\eta^2 = .01$.

Self-Esteem

A 2 (Identifiability) × 2 (Respect) ANOVA on the average self-esteem score revealed, first of all, a significant main effect of Respect, $F(1, 80) = 56.94$,

Table VI. Means and Standard Deviations of Self-Esteem and Emotions as a Function of Respect and Identifiability (Study 6)

Dependent variables	Respect	Identifiability	
		High	Low
Emotions	Respect	5.65 (0.98)	4.07 (1.69)
	Disrespect	3.21 (1.23)	2.68 (0.89)
Self-Esteem	Respect	5.37 (1.16)	4.15 (1.64)
	Disrespect	2.67 (1.01)	2.79 (1.06)

Note. Entries are means on 7-point scales, with higher values indicating higher ratings of positive emotions and self-esteem, respectively; entries within parentheses are standard deviations.

$p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .41$: participants reported higher self-esteem when they received respect rather than disrespect ($Ms = 4.76$ vs. 2.73, SDs = 1.59 and 1.03, respectively). Also, a significant main effect of Identifiability was found, $F(1, 80) = 4.13$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$, indicating that participants in the identifiability condition reported higher self-esteem than did those in the no identifiability conditions ($Ms = 4.02$ vs. 3.47, SDs = 1.73 and 1.51, respectively). Finally, a significant interaction emerged, $F(1, 80) = 6.18$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .07$ (see Table VI)

As expected the respect effect was stronger for participants in the identifiability condition compared to those in the no identifiability condition. The respect effect was significantly stronger in the identifiability conditions, $F(1, 82) = 42.19$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .34$, than in the no identifiability conditions, $F(1, 82) = 8.04$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .09$. A significant effect for identifiability was found in the respect conditions, $F(1, 82) = 6.24$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .07$, but not in the disrespect conditions, $F(1, 82) = .11$, $p < .75$, $\eta^2 = .00$.

Discussion

The findings of Study 6 are again supportive of our line of reasoning. If people are especially concerned about their reputations, they respond significantly more strongly to variations in respect from others in the group. In contrast, when people do not care as much about their reputations, variations in respect from others in the group do not influence people's reactions to the same degree.

CONCLUSION

Recent research on procedural justice suggests that within groups and interpersonal relationships the interpersonal concept of respect is an important determinant of people's reported self-esteem, emotional reactions, and cooperation (Bies, 2001; Miller, 2001; Tyler, 1999). That is, feeling respected communicates important social consequences for the social self. In the present paper, we proposed that a reason why these effects occur is because respectful treatment addresses two important identity concerns. That is, people use information from the group to derive information about how they should identify themselves and about how they are evaluated.

We proposed that these two identity concerns relate to the desire to belong and to concern for reputation. In line with the moderating effect of belongingness, Studies 1–3 indeed showed that variations in respect influenced a variety of reactions, but only when people's desire to belong was reinforced. Furthermore, Studies 4–6 demonstrated that the effect of respect was indeed moderated by people's concerns about their reputation (i.e., the reputation social self; Tyler, 1999, 2001). These findings have several important theoretical implications.

The first major conclusion from our research is that respect matters more when the fundamental human desire to belong is made salient. That is, three studies showed that people with a reinforced desire to belong became more sensitive to variations in respect and used this identity information as a kind of reference point to evaluate their self-esteem, emotions, and behavioral reactions. These findings support our argument that information derived from the group is used to define oneself. That is, people wanting to belong should be particularly sensitive toward identity information like respect because feeling included enables them to define themselves as group members. Furthermore, this finding supports the recent argument by Cropanzano *et al*. (2001) that the important role of identity concerns, like respect, in predicting procedural fairness effects may be explained by the need to belong (see also De Cremer, 2002, and Lind, 2001, for a similar argument).

It is important (and interesting) to note that no empirical evidence to date, however, exists demonstrating the importance of salience of belongingness needs in explaining the effect of respect from others. As such, by using a moderator approach our studies are the first to empirically demonstrate that respect indeed communicates important identity information regarding the extent to which people feel included (Lind, 2001; Tyler and Blader, 2000), and that as a result respect becomes more important when belongingness needs are made salient or activated.

The second important contribution of our findings is that the influence of respect is related to identity concerns in that people in groups are concerned about how they are evaluated. This self-evaluative concern was measured by the extent to which people care about their reputation among others in the group, and thus is in line with Tyler's (1999, 2001) argument that identity information, such as that conveyed by one's reputation, has a major impact on people's reactions when their reputational social self is salient.

The concept of the reputational social self is used to reflect people's concerns about their standing within groups, and assumes that once this reputational social self is salient, people are particularly sensitive toward any identity relevant information such as that which communicates new information about reputation, position, or standing within the group. According to Tyler (2001; Tyler and Blader, 2000), one important source of such information is the treatment one experiences from others in the group. As we hypothesized, the results indeed show that people react strongly to variations in respect from others, but only when their concern for reputation was high. This was true both when that concern was manipulated, and when it was assessed.

As we argued in our introduction, issues of inclusion and reputation are of central importance to the social self. Theories of the self emphasize that people are frequently involved in the process of evaluating themselves (e.g., Higgins, 1987; Leary and Baumeister, 2000; Sedikides and Strube, 1997; Steele, 1999; Tesser, 1988). Because of this self-evaluative function, people are likely to make use of the relational information that is available when changing their self-esteem (Leary,

2001). Our results indeed consistently show that respect from others influenced reported state self-esteem. However, that effect was not unconditional. It was linked to salience of belongingness needs and concern for reputation. It is only when people want information about whether they are included in a group and/or their position in that group that people are influenced by their treatment by others. When people's social identities are clear to them, they are less influenced by relational information, such as the respect of others. These findings as such may be seen as supportive of the fact that self-esteem is a reflection of the extent to which one is accepted by others and the reputation one receives from others (see also sociometer theory; Leary and Baumeister, 2000).

Another dependent measure that we frequently used across our studies was emotional reactions. Ample evidence exists that when people do not feel valued or included by their interaction partners, negative feelings like hurt and sadness may be elicited (Leary *et al.*, 1998). In a similar vein, feeling accepted and valued is likely to elicit positive affective responses (Bourgeois and Leary, 2001). This line of thinking fits well with the affective component of sociometer theory, which proposes that information about belongingness will influence state self-esteem via the mechanisms of affective arousal (i.e., an important aspect of self-esteem is believed to be affective in nature, Baumeister, 1998).

A final type of dependent measure that we used was behavioral reactions such as cooperation. In the procedural justice literature not much attention has been devoted yet to understand the role of relational concerns in explaining fair process effects on cooperation. Exceptions include Tyler and Blader's (2000) work on the group-engagement model, which explains why procedural fairness impacts cooperative behavior in work settings (respect was one of the most important underlying concerns), and De Cremer's (2002) demonstration that contributions to a public good were strongly influenced by the degree of respect received, especially when group members did not feel included.

Our research complements and extends this research line by demonstrating that respect not only influences cooperation, but also non-cooperative behaviors such as leaving the group. Future research may want to include a broader range of behavioral measures. In addition, future researchers may also want to vary the degree of interdependence (e.g. Kelley and Thibaut, 1978), because Lind (2001) recently argued that procedures and the associated relational concerns have a stronger impact when people are interdependent with one another. Thus, it is necessary to examine whether the influence of respect as a function of concerns for belongingness and reputation varies when level of interdependence is high vs. low.

The present findings also have implications with respect to the concept of belongingness needs. More specifically, the present research supports the validity of the underlying premise that people differ in the extent to which they desire to strengthen their connections with others (Baumeister and Leary, 1995), as such opening possibilities to more directly examine the role of belongingness needs in

cognitive and motivational aspects of social relationships (see Berscheid and Reis, 1998; Deci and Ryan, 2000; Gardner *et al.*, 2000a,b).

In the present research, we manipulated the salience of people's desire to belong by means of one existing accessibility method whereby self-construals are activated (see Stapel and Koomen, 2001), and one new accessibility method whereby participants have to recall situations of exclusion versus inclusion. In addition, we also assessed individual differences in need to belong by means of the recently developed need to belong scale (see Leary *et al.*, 2001a,b). It is our hope that future researchers may develop a wider array of cognitive and motivational techniques aimed at reinforcing the fundamental motive of belongingness, as this may help us in further unravelling the psychology of respect (Tyler, 2001).

Before closing, some limitations and strengths need to be mentioned. A potential limitation is that we only manipulated concerns for reputation in an indirect manner. That is, we manipulated the extent to which people were identifiable to others when receiving respect versus disrespect. The social psychology literature notes that when people know that they will be evaluated by others, concerns for reputation increases (Lerner and Tetlock, 1999). Future research may be needed to find out how concerns for reputation may be manipulated in a more direct manner.

An important strength of our approach is that we were able to demonstrate the effect of respect as a function of concerns about belongingness and reputation in equal-status relationships. According to Lind (2001), there should be no difference between hierarchical and equal-status situations regarding the effects of fair procedures and treatment, and our results indeed show that respect (particularly as a function of concerns for reputation and belongingness) influenced cooperation in equal-status situations.

The most important strength of our approach, however, is that the present research is the first to provide experimental data demonstrating that people care about respect for identity-based reasons. Over the last decade or two, procedural justice research has devoted considerable attention to the importance of treatment with respect in shaping fair process effects (see e.g. the group-value model; Lind and Tyler, 1988; Tyler and Lind, 1992). However, to date, little is known about the psychology of these effects. The studies described here provide a clear link between respect and identity-based concerns. The insights of the present research are important as they help us to understand why exactly respect should matter in influencing people's reactions. As it stands now, we can confidently say that respect matters because it communicates information relevant to people's identity concerns: "Do I belong and where do I stand?"

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

research is part of research conducted by the Center of Experimental Organizational Behavior.

REFERENCES

Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the Streets: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. Norton, New York.

Aron, A., and Aron, N. E. (1986). *Love as the Expansion of Self: Understanding Attraction and Satisfaction*. Hemisphere, New York.

Aron, A., and McLaughin-Volpe, T. (2001). Including others in the self: Extensions to own and partner's group memberships. In Sedikides, C., and Brewer, M. B. (eds.), *Individual Self, Relational Self, Collective Self*, Psychology Press, Philadelphia, PA, pp. 89–108.

Baumeister, R. F. (1991). *Meanings of Life*. Guilford Press, New York.

Baumeister, R. F. (1993). *Self-Esteem: The Puzzle of Low Self-Regard*. Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.

Baumeister, R. F., and Hutton, D. G. (1987). Self-presentation theory: Self-construction and audience pleading. In Mullen, B., and Goethals, G. R. (eds.), *Theories of Group Behavior*, Springer-Verlag, New York.

Baumeister, R. F. (1998). The self. In Gilbert, D. T., Fiske, S. T., and Lindzey, G. (eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 4th ed., pp. 680–740.

Baumeister, R. F., and Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychol. Bull.* 117: 497–529.

Berscheid, E., and Reis, H. T. (1998). Attraction and close relationships. In Gilbert, D. T., Fiske, S. T., Lindzey, G. (eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 193–281.

Bies, R. J., and Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In Lewicki, R. J., Sheppard, B. H., and Bazerman, M. H. (eds.), *Research on Negotiations in Organizations*, JAI, Greenwich, CT, pp. 43–55.

Bies, R. J. (2001). Interaction (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. In Greenberg, J., and Cropanzano, R. (eds.), *Advances in Organizational Justice*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, pp. 89–118.

Bourgeois, K. S., and Leary, M. R. (2001). Coping with rejection: Derogating those who choose us last. *Motiv. Emotion* 25: 101–111.

Brockner, J., and Wiesenfeld, B. M. (1996). An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: Interactive effects of outcomes and procedures. *Psychol. Bull.* 120: 189–208.

Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z. S., Bobocel, D. R., and Rupp, D. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 58: 164–209.

Cross, S. E., Bacon, P. L., and Morris, M. L. (2000). The relational-interdependent self-construal and relationships. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 78: 791–808.

Deci, E. L., and Ryan, R. M. (2000). The what and why of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychol. Inq.* 11: 227–268.

De Cremer, D. (2002). Respect and cooperation in social dilemmas: The importance of feeling included. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 28: 1335–1341.

De Cremer, D., and Alberts, H. (2004). When procedural fairness does not influence how positive I feel: The effects of voice and leader selection as a function of belongingness needs. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 34: 333–344.

De Cremer, D., and Leonardelli, G. (2003). Individual Differences in Need to Belong and Cooperation in Social Dilemmas: The Moderating Effect of Group Size. *Group Dyn. Theor. Res. Pract.* 7: 168–174.

Deutsch, M., and Gerard, H. B. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgment. *J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol.* 51: 629–636.

Emler, N., and Hopkins, N. (1990). Reputation, social identity, and the self. In Abrams, D., and Hogg, M. A. (eds.), *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances*, Springer-Verlag, New York.

Emler, N., and Reicher, S. (1995). *Adolescence and Delinquency*. Blackwell, Oxford, England.

Folger, R., and Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational Justice and Human Resource Management*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.

Forsyth, D. R. (1991). Change in therapeutic groups. In Snyder, C. R., and Forsyth, D. R. (eds.), *Handbook of Social and Clinical Psychology*, Pergamon Press, New York, pp. 664–680.

Gardner, W. L., Gabriel, S., and Diekman, A. (2000a). Interpersonal processes. In Tassinary, L., Cacioppo, J., and Berntson, G. (eds.), *The Handbook of Psychophysiology*, Cambridge Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 643–664.

Gardner, W. L., Pickett, C. L., and Brewer, M. B. (2000b). Social exclusion and selective memory: How the need to belong influences memory for social events. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 26: 486–496.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychol. Rev.* 94: 319–340.

Hill, T. E., Jr. (2000). Respect, pluralism, and justice. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hogg, M. A., and Abrams, D. (1988). *Social Identifications: A Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations and Group Processes*. Routledge, London & New York.

James, W. (1890). *The Principles of Psychology*. Holt, New York, NY.

Jankowski, M. S. (1991). *Islands in the Street: Gangs and American Urban Society*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Kant, I. (1996). *The Metaphysics of Morals*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kelley, H. H., and Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal Relations: A Theory of Interdependence*. Wiley, New York.

Kennedy, L. W., and Forde, D. R. (1999). *When Push Comes to Shove*. State University of New York Press, Albany.

Komorita, S. S., and Parks, C. D. (1994). *Social Dilemmas*. Brown and Benchmark, Dubuque, IA.

Leary, M. (2001). The self as a source of relational difficulties. *Self and Identity* 1: 137–142.

Leary, M. R., and Baumeister, R. F. (2000). The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. *Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* 32: 1–62.

Leary, M. R., Cottrell, C. A., and Phillips, M. (2001a). Deconfounding the effects of dominance and social acceptance on self-esteem. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 81: 898–909.

Leary, M. R., Kelly, K. M., Cottrell, C. A., and Schreindorfer, L. S. (2001b). *Individual Differences in the Need to Belong*. Unpublished manuscript, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC.

Leary, M. R., Springer, C., Negel, L., Ansell, E., and Evens, K. (1998). The causes, phenomenology, and consequences of hurt feelings. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 74: 1225–1237.

Lerner, J. S., and Tetlock, P. E. (1999). Accounting for the effects of accountability. *Psychol. Bull.* 125: 255–275.

Lind, E. A. (2001). Thinking critically about justice judgments. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 58: 220–226.

Lind, E. A., and Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. Plenum Press, New York.

Miller, D. T. (2001). Disrespect and the experience of injustice. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 52: 527–553.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *J. Appl. Psychol.* 76: 845–855.

O'Connell, L. J. (2000). The worlds of religion and psychiatry: Bioethics as arbiter of mutual respect. In Boehnlein, J. K. (ed.), *Psychiatry and Religion: The Convergence of Mind and Spirit*, American Psychiatric Press, Inc., Washington, DC, pp. 145–157.

Olson, M. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Olson-Buchanan, J. B. (1996). Voicing discontent: What happens to the grievance filter after the grievance? *J. Appl. Psychol.* 81: 52–63.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge Massachusetts.

Reis, H. T., Collins, W. A., and Berscheid, E. (2000). The relationship context of human behavior and development. *Psychol. Bull.* 126: 844–872.

Sedikides, C. (2002). Putting our selves together: Integrative themes and lingering questions. In Forgas, J. P., and Willimas, K. D. (eds.), *The Social Self: Cognitive, Interpersonal, and Intergroup Perspectives*, Psychology Press, New York, pp. 365–380.

Sedikides, C., and Brewer, M. B. (2001). *Individual Self, Relational Self, Collective Self*. Psychology Press, Philadelphia, PA.

Sedikides, C., and Gregg, A. (2003). Portraits of the self. In Hogg, M. A., and Cooper, J. (eds.), *Sage Handbook of Social Psychology*, Sage Publications, London.

Sedikides, C., Herbst, K. C., Hardin, D. P., and Dardis, G. J. (2002). Accountability as a deterrent to self-enhancement: The search for mechanisms. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 83: 592–605.

Sedikides, C., and 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 Zanna, M. P. (ed.), *Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol.*, Academic Press, New York, Vol. 29, pp. 209–269.

Simon, B., and Stürmer, S. (2003). Respect for group members: Intragroup determinants of collective identification and group-serving behavior. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 29: 183–193.

Smith, H. J., and Tyler, T. R. (1997). Choosing the right pond: The impact of group membership on self-esteem and group-oriented behavior. *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* 33: 146–170.

Smith, K. G., Carroll, S. J., and Ashford, S. J., (1995). Intra- and interorganizational cooperation: Toward a research agenda. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 7–23.

Snyder, M., and Cantor, N. (1998). Understanding personality and social behavior: A functionalist strategy. In Gilbert, D., Fiske, S., and Lindzey, G. (eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, McGraw-Hill, New York, Vol. 1, pp. 635–679.

Stapel, D. A., and Koomen, W. (2001). I, we, and the effects of others on me: How self-construal level moderates social comparison effects. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 80: 766–781.

Steele, C. M. (1988). The psychology of self-affirmation: Sustaining the integrity of the self. In Berkowitz, L. (ed.), *Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol.*, Academic Press, New York, Vol. 21, pp. 261–302.

Tajfel, H., and Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In Worchel, S. (ed.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Nelson Hall, Chicago.

Tesser, A. (1988). Toward a self-evaluation model of social behavior. In Berkowitz, L. (ed.), *Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol.*, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, Vol. 21, pp. 181–227.

Thibaut, J., and Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.

Twenge, J. M., Baumeister, R. F., Tice, D. M., and Stucke, T. S. (2001). If you can't join them, beat them: Effects of social exclusion on aggressive behavior. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 81: 1058–1069.

Twenge, J. M., Catanese, K. R., and Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Social exclusion and self-defeating behavior. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 83: 606–615.

Tyler, T. R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group value model. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 57: 333–344.

Tyler, T. R. (1999). Why people cooperate with organizations: An identity-based perspective. *Res. Organ. Behav.* 21: 201–246.

Tyler, T. R. (2001). Cooperation in organizations: A social identity perspective. In Hogg, M. A., and Terry, D. J. (eds.), *Social Identity Processes in Organizational Contexts*, Psychology Press, Philadelphia, PA, pp. 149–166.

Tyler, T. R., and Blader, S. (2000). *Cooperation in Groups: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Behavioral Engagement*. Taylor & Francis, Philadelphia.

Tyler, T. R., Degoey, P., and Smith, H. (1996). Understanding why the justice of group procedures matter: A test of the psychological dynamics of the group-value model. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 70: 913–930.

Tyler, T. R., and Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the Law*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Tyler, T. R., and Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In Zanna, M. (ed.), *Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol.*, Academic Press, New York, Vol. 25, pp. 115–191.

Tyler, T. R., and Smith, H. J. (1998). Social justice and social movements. In Gilbert, D. T., Fiske, S. T., and Lindzey, G. (eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 4th ed., pp. 595–632.

Tyler, T. R., and Smith, H. J. (1999). Justice, social identity, and group processes. In Tyler, T. R., Kramer, R. M., and John, O. P. (eds.), *The Psychology of the Social Self*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Mahaw, New Jersey, pp. 223–264.

Van den Bos, K., and Lind, E. A. (2002). Uncertainty management by means of fairness judgments. In Zanna, M. P. (ed.), *Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol.*, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, Vol. 34, pp. 1–60.

Van den Bos, K., and Spruijt, N. (2002). Appropriateness of decisions as a moderator of the psychology of voice. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 32: 57–72.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., and Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 54: 1063–1070.