Respect and cooperation in social dilemmas

De Cremer, D.

Published in:
Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin

Publication date:
2002

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
De Cremer, D. (2002). Respect and cooperation in social dilemmas: The importance of feeling included.
Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28(10), 1335-1341.

Respect and Cooperation in Social Dilemmas: The Importance of Feeling Included

David De Cremer
Maastricht University

The present research examined the effect of respect communicated by fellow group members on one's willingness to contribute to the group's welfare. Based on the procedural justice literature, it was expected that respect would communicate important relational information, consequently enhancing people's motivation to promote the group's welfare. Using a public good dilemma, it was found that respect indeed motivated group members to contribute more to the group's welfare and that this was most pronounced among group members who felt least included (i.e., peripheral members) relative to group members who felt included (i.e., core members). These findings illustrate the importance of decision makers' concerns about viable and positive intragroup relationships in their decision to cooperate or not.

Many social interactions take the form of a social dilemma, that is, an interdependence situation in which personal and collective interests are at odds (Komorita & Parks, 1994; Messick & Brewer, 1983). For example, the existence of public goods or services (e.g., community centers, charity) depend on the willingness of people to contribute time, effort, or money to enhance the well-being of the group or larger collective. From a self-interested perspective, it is rational to enhance personal well-being by contributing nothing or very little of one's own resources to the public good. However, if all group members act in an individually rational manner, public goods or services will not be provided. In contrast, if all or most group members were to act in a collectively rational manner (i.e., all or most would make substantial contributions), all individuals would probably profit from the public good or services made possible by these contributions.

At first sight, decisions in social dilemmas seem to be guided solely by a concern for outcomes as exemplified by people's general tendencies to free ride, maximize joint outcomes, and restore inequality in outcomes (e.g., Kerr, 1983; Van Lange, 1999). However, social dilemma situations also may involve a concern about creating viable and enjoyable long-term relationships with those involved in the social conflict—relational concerns that are not related to outcome concerns at all (e.g., Tyler & Dawes, 1993). Indeed, when confronted with the choice of enhancing own versus collective welfare, one's relationships with the own collective or community may determine to a large extent which option will be pursued (e.g., De Cremer & Van Vugt, 1999; Kramer & Brewer, 1984). Also, people's search for establishing social bonds, referred to as the need to belong, represents a fundamental motive that should drive behavior (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Deci & Ryan, 2000). Therefore, in the present research, it is argued that cooperation in social dilemmas also may be influenced by the quality of relationship one has with the own collective or group that is confronted with the social dilemma. More specifically, in the present article, it will be examined to what extent feelings of respect, communicated by the group, will satisfy needs of inclusiveness and consequently influence cooperation. In doing this, I wish to advance the hypothesis that in addition to outcome concerns, specific relational concerns may also determine one's willingness to further the interest of the collective.

Respect and Cooperation

Experimental evidence exists that people's social connections to their group or collective influences levels of

cooperation. Several social dilemma studies have demonstrated that in the context of maintaining common resources or establishing public goods, level of identification with the group matters considerably. That is, when individuals define themselves in terms of their group membership, they are found to be more willing to take less from common resources and to contribute more toward the public good (e.g., Brewer & Kramer, 1986; De Cremer & Van Dijk, in press; De Cremer & Van Vugt, 1999; Kramer & Brewer, 1984). Such a strong level of group identification is usually accompanied by positive evaluations of other group members in terms of trustworthiness and cooperativeness (Brewer, 1979; Wit & Wilke, 1992), thereby suggesting that the extent to which one feels included in the own group or collective influences how constructive intragroup relations will be.

Another psychological construct that captures the identity aspects of such intragroup dynamics is the extent to which people feel respected by the group and its members (Smith & Tyler, 1997; Tyler & Smith, 1999). The suggestion that the construct of respect is related to people's social identification is derived from the procedural justice literature and, more specifically, the group-value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Lind, 1992). This model emphasizes individuals' concerns about their relationship with the social group they are a part of. It assumes that people wish to be included in social groups and establish long-term relationships with those groups as they provide valued self-relevant information (i.e., contributes to their social identity and self-worth; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). To ensure that positive self-information is derived, people assess the fairness of the treatment by the group authorities. Fair treatment by these authorities communicates specific information about one's group membership, that is, whether one is respected and accepted by the group and its members. In turn, such feelings of respect are believed to promote one's personal self-worth and consequently group-oriented behavior (Smith & Tyler, 1997; Tyler & Smith, 1999).

Although prior procedural justice research has focused solely on the importance of respect for understanding the relationship between group authority and group members, recently, Smith and Tyler (1997) provided correlational evidence that the same psychological process may occur in intragroup relationships without an authority (see also Tyler & Smith, 1999). In this respect, I wish to define respect as a social construct that is derived from the opinions of the group as a whole and that is symbolic of one's position within the group. Thus, in the present article, respect is not something that people assess themselves (see the membership subscale of Luhtanen & Crocker's [1992] collective self-esteem scale) but is communicated by other group members.

How may respect be related to contributions in social dilemmas?

As argued earlier, recent theories on needs and motives assume that people have a strong wish to establish social links with others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Deci & Ryan, 2000). In other words, people have a need to be included and to experience feelings of relatedness to others (not only to authorities). Therefore, if levels of belongingness are relatively low, the motivation to feel included will increase, consequently motivating people to monitor within-group relations for information about their inclusiveness in the group (cf. Leary & Baumeister, 2000; sociometer theory). Based on the present definition of respect, it follows that feeling respected by other group members seems to communicate such social information of inclusiveness. As a result, if people feel respected by the others in their group, this may satisfy their belongingness need and consequently will increase their motivation to reciprocate this positive relational information by acting more in favor of the group's interest (cf. Brewer, 1991; Tyler & Smith, 1999).

To date, according to my knowledge, no experimental studies have been conducted to examine the direct effect of respect manipulations on contribution behavior in social dilemmas. Only two social dilemma studies have revealed some indirect evidence for this effect of respect. First, a correlational study by Tyler and Degoey (1995) showed that the use of fair procedures enhanced support for and effectiveness of the authority to restrain people's water use during a water shortage, particularly when their community identification was strong. Second, a laboratory study using a public good dilemma paradigm by Van Vugt and De Cremer (1999) illustrated that a group leader who was trusting and supportive of the other group members was equally effective in promoting contributions as a leader who punished the least contributing group member, particularly when participants exhibited strong group identification. Both findings were explained by referring to people's need to create positive and viable social relationships with their authorities. These two studies, however, examined the role of relational concerns in the context of authority relationships and did not directly manipulate respect. Therefore, in the present study, a direct manipulation of respect will be introduced.

In addition, following Baumeister and Leary (1995), the need to belong and its behavioral consequences should particularly be evident when one feels less socially accepted. Therefore, it is necessary to examine which group members would be most responsive toward relational information such as respect. Research on intergroup relations has shown that group members who match ingroup prototypes less and as such have not included the group as an important aspect of their self-

concept, that is, peripheral group members (vs. core group members), may have a stronger need to gain acceptance by the rest of the group, particularly when that ingroup is considered to be desirable (Noel, Wann, & Branscombe, 1995). More specifically, Noel et al. (1995) demonstrated that peripheral group members, in their search for ingroup inclusiveness, engaged in outgroup derogation to show that one is highly motivated to be included by the ingroup. In support of the assumption that peripheral group members do, indeed, experience a lack of inclusiveness and acceptance by the group, research on the relational model of justice illustrated that the more respect is given the less outgroup derogation is displayed (Smith & Tyler, 1997; Tyler & Smith, 1999). As such, peripheral group members, relative to core group members, can be assumed to experience an unsatisfactory low level of inclusiveness, making them more responsive toward relational within-group information such as respect. How may this influence contribution decisions?

According to Optimal Distinctiveness Theory (Brewer, 1991), people's level of group identification is optimal when both the need for inclusion and distinctiveness are in balance. In line with this assumption, peripheral group members (relative to core group members) are then expected to be less motivated to identify with their group and consequently to exhibit cooperation (e.g., Kramer & Brewer, 1984) because their need for inclusion is not satisfied. However, due to their stronger attention to relational information, respect given by the group will reveal a more optimal social identification (as their need for inclusion is met) and as such will lead to greater contributions. Thus, peripheral group members' contributions are expected to be a function of the degree of respect given by the group. In contrast, core group members' contributions are expected not to be influenced by respect information because they feel socially accepted and, therefore, are less likely to search and monitor for relational within-group information.

This interaction between respect and membership inclusiveness on contributions will be examined in an experimental public good dilemma. It is predicted that contributions will be higher when respect is given than when no respect is given (Hypothesis 1). Second, based on research showing that contributions are enhanced when people are motivated to identify with their group (e.g., De Cremer & Van Vugt, 1999), it is predicted that core members, overall, will exhibit higher levels of contributions than will peripheral members (Hypothesis 2). Finally, as argued earlier, it is expected that peripheral members' contributions (relative to those of core members) will vary most as a function of the degree of respect given by the group (Hypothesis 3).

METHOD

Participants. Eighty-one undergraduate students (60 women and 21 men) participated voluntarily in the present study. They were each paid 10 Dutch Guilders (approximately U.S.$4). The independent variables were respect (respect vs. no-respect) and membership inclusiveness (peripheral vs. core).

Procedure

Participants arrived at the laboratory in groups of three persons. They were not able to see one another and each participant was seated in a separate cubicle that contained a computer, a table, and a chair. All instructions were given via the computer.

Introduction to the public good dilemma. Before starting with this study, participants were required to fill out a questionnaire assessing different personality types (Type O or Type P personality). It was explained to the participants that their responses would help us to validate this questionnaire.

After filling out the questionnaire, the public good dilemma was explained. Participants were first told about the nature of the task, which was referred to as a group decision-making task. It was introduced as an investment task in which people could earn money for themselves and for their group.

More specifically, it was told that at the beginning of the group task, each participant received an endowment of 300 cents (approximately U.S.$1.2). Each participant was free to choose any amount they wanted to contribute (ranging from 0 to 300 cents). It was explained that the total amount contributed by the group would be multiplied by 2 and then divided equally among all group members, regardless of their contribution. The amount one decided not to contribute would accrue totally 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 for 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 & 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 examples were given to illustrate the properties of the decision situation and the possible outcomes.

Membership inclusiveness manipulation. This manipulation was closely modeled after Noel et al. (1995). After the explanation of the public good dilemma, participants were told that on the basis of their responses they

had been classified as a Type O or Type P personality. Participants were informed that they would receive a brief description of the personality type under which they had been classified. They were told that the members in their group were all classified as Personality P types. The Type P personality was positively described as caring, honest, consistent, and confident. Also, it was said that the type P persons tend to be more socially skilled than Type O persons. Thus, the Type P personality was made relatively attractive (compared to the Type O personality) because I assumed that people would be more motivated to gain acceptance by desired groups (see Noel et al., 1995, p. 130). As a consequence, typical P personalities were expected not to worry about their inclusion in the group anymore (and as such would not evaluate future information about group-based respect heavily), whereas those who were less typical were expected to look for additional inclusiveness information from this relatively attractive group (debriefing interviews indicated that I was successful in this).

At the end of the description, participants were informed about their position within that group of Type P personalities. In the peripheral membership condition, participants were told that their questionnaire responses placed them just inside the Type P category. If they had responded slightly different, they would not have been a Type P personality but an O personality. Participants in the core membership condition were told that their responses were clear examples of a core member of the type P category. That is, they could be considered as a near perfect example of a person with a Type P personality.

Respect manipulation. Before starting with this task, it was explained to participants that we would like them to get an idea about the composition of their group. They were told that the computer would randomly select two people from the group and ask their opinion about working together in small groups similar to the one they were part of. After they would have given their opinion, a summarized message of these opinions would be sent to all group members via an e-mail message. In reality, participants were always told that the computer had selected the other two group members (who were also informed about the personality results) and were therefore asked to wait for the summarizing message to get an idea about their group members.

The content of this summarizing message included information that communicated either respect from the group (i.e., the two members) or disrespect from the group. In this study, I attempted to operationalize respect by using self-identified criteria in the interactional justice scale of Moorman (1991). More specifically, based on this scale, I made sure that the summarizing message included a reference to the extent that

(a) the group would accept feedback or not about group decisions and its implications, (b) the viewpoint of others would be considered or not, and (c) others would be treated in a friendly and kind way or not. These three criteria can be assumed to represent the degree of acceptance communicated by the within-group relationships.

In the respect condition, participants were told that the group, overall, considered

> it useful in small group tasks to discuss the performance of the group. This way, the group would understand the decisions and actions of others in a better way. Consideration of one another is very important and therefore they will pursue this. Furthermore, they would appreciate the opinion of others about one's own decisions, as this would only benefit the group. Finally, although this small-group task is mainly concerned with the group performance, it would still be more enjoyable that the group would try to get along as well.

In the no-respect condition, participants read

> that the group considered it not necessary in small group tasks to discuss the performance of the group. It would not be necessary to understand one another in a better way. Consideration of one another is not important and therefore they do not wish to pursue this. Furthermore, they did not find it useful to show an appreciative attitude toward the opinions of others about one's own decisions. Finally, since this small-group task is concerned with group performance it does not seem necessary to try to get along with one another as well.

After receiving this information, participants were told that the group would start with the group-decision task. Before actually starting with the task, however, a few questions needed to be answered.

Dependent measures. All questions were answered on 7-point scales (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *very much so*). To assess the effectiveness of the membership inclusiveness manipulation, participants were asked how typical of their group they perceived themselves to be. Furthermore, to assess the effectiveness of the respect manipulation, participants were asked to what extent they felt the group respected them. Moreover, to measure whether feelings of inclusiveness were influenced by the manipulations, participants were asked to what extent they felt they belonged to this group and to what extent they were full members of this group. These two items were combined to form an average inclusiveness score ($r = .58$).

Finally, after answering these questions, participants were told that the investment situation would be introduced. They were asked how much of their endowment of 300 cents they were willing to contribute toward the group (ranging from 0 to 300 cents).

Dependent Variable	Respect	Membership Inclusiveness	
		Peripheral	Core
Inclusiveness	Respect	4.57$_c$ (0.72)	4.35$_{b, c}$ (0.54)
	No respect	2.97$_a$ (0.75)	4.15$_b$ (0.72)
Contributions	Respect	145.23$_c$ (21.37)	128.05$_{b, c}$ (20.11)
	No respect	83.00$_a$ (21.15)	119.95$_b$ (19.66)

NOTE: Mean inclusiveness scores are on 7-point scales, with higher values indicating higher feelings of inclusiveness. Mean contributions are cents contributed to the public good (ranging from 0 to 300 cents). Entries within parentheses are standard deviations. Means with a different subscript differ significantly, $p < .05$.

Debriefing. After participants answered these questions, the experiment was interrupted. The experimenter took people away from their cubicles and they were each explained the purpose of the study and the processes examined. Participants were then paid, thanked for their help, and dismissed.

RESULTS

Manipulation checks. A 2 (respect) × 2 (membership inclusiveness) ANOVA on the typicality question showed that participants in the core condition felt more typical of their group category P than those in the peripheral condition (Ms = 5.00 vs. 3.39, SDs = 3.38 and 1.32, respectively), $F(1, 77) = 8.05$, $p < .01$, $\omega^2 = .08$. No significant effects were found for respect, $F(1, 77) < 1$, $\omega^2 = .001$, and Respect × Membership Inclusiveness, $F(1, 77) = 2.84$, $p = .10$, $\omega^2 = .02$.

To check whether the respect manipulation worked successfully, a two-way ANOVA on the respect question showed that participants felt more respected in the respect than in the no-respect condition (Ms = 4.65 vs. 3.02, SDs = 1.08 and 0.94, respectively), $F(1, 77) = 51.11$, $p < .001$, $\omega^2 = .40$. No significant effects were found for membership inclusiveness, $F(1, 77) < 1$, $\omega^2 = .006$, and Respect × Membership Inclusiveness, $F(1, 77) = 1.01$, $p = .31$, $\omega^2 = .0001$.

Finally, a two-way ANOVA on the average inclusiveness score showed a main effect of respect, $F(1, 77) = 34.00$, $p < .001$, $\omega^2 = .23$, a main effect of membership inclusiveness, $F(1, 77) = 9.58$, $p < .005$, $\omega^2 = .06$, and a significant interaction, $F(1, 77) = 20.54$, $p < .001$, $\omega^2 = .14$; the pattern of means are shown in Table 1. Simple effects analyses showed that peripheral group members felt more included when respect rather than no respect was given, $F(1, 79) = 48.44$, $p < .001$, but this was not the case among core group members, $F(1, 79) < 1$. Taken together, all of these findings show that the manipulations were successful.

Contributions. A two-way ANOVA on the contribution score showed a main effect of respect (Hypothesis 1), $F(1, 77) = 59.00$, $p < .001$, $\omega^2 = .33$, a main effect of membership inclusiveness (Hypothesis 2), $F(1, 77) = 4.65$, $p < .05$, $\omega^2 = .02$, and a significant interaction (Hypothesis 3), $F(1, 77) = 34.95$, $p < .001$, $\omega^2 = .19$; the pattern of means are shown in Table 1. Simple effect analyses showed that participants in the peripheral member condition contributed significantly more when respect was given than when no respect was given, $F(1, 79) = 88.15$, $p < .001$, whereas for those in the core member condition this difference was not significant, $F(1, 79) < 1$.

DISCUSSION

Taken together, the present findings show that respect communicated by the group as a whole motivates individual group members to contribute more to the group's welfare. This effect seems to be explained by the process of feeling more included and accepted by the group when respect is shown than when no respect is shown. Indeed, respect influenced contributions significantly among peripheral group members but not among core group members. In the following paragraphs, the theoretical implications of the present findings will be discussed.

The fact that simply communicating respect may represent a means to promote contributions in an interdependence situation such as social dilemmas is intuitively challenging. Previous social dilemma research has shown that individuals' decisions are primarily guided by a specific concern for outcomes. That is, outcome concerns may take different forms such as maximizing personal outcomes by free riding on the contributions of others (e.g., Kerr, 1983), maximizing joint outcomes, or enhancing equality in outcomes (e.g., Van Lange, 1999); these are all concerns that influence decisions in social dilemmas. However, the present findings indicate that these decisions also may be dictated (at least under certain circumstances) by purely relational concerns such as the respect received by others—concerns that have no relationship to outcome concerns whatsoever.

In line with recent need theories (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Deci & Ryan, 2000), it was argued that a consideration of belongingness needs might reveal positive behavioral consequences that favor the group's interest. The present results, indeed, showed that respect communicated information about one's inclusiveness and connectedness and, in turn, influenced contributions significantly, but only among those individuals who were most sensitive toward belongingness information, that is, peripheral group members. Core group members, in contrast, seem to have incorporated the group as an important aspect of one's self and do not search for additional acceptance and relatedness information. As a

result, respect did not influence their contributions. Why exactly may respect be such a powerful social determinant of cooperation among those who are in need of belongingness information, that is, peripheral group members?

For those individuals in the peripheral group condition relative to those in the core group condition, levels of belongingness were below threshold and, as such, they were more attentive to relational information communicating their degree of inclusiveness. Following from the procedural fairness literature (Smith & Tyler, 1997; Tyler & Lind, 1992), respect was considered to communicate a symbolic message about one's acceptance by and position within the group. Therefore, in the conditions in which no group-based respect was provided, their need for inclusion was not satisfied and, as such, in terms of optimal distinctiveness theory, did not achieve an optimal level of social identification (i.e., the group was not incorporated sufficiently into one's self-concept), consequently yielding relatively low levels of contributions (De Cremer & Van Vugt, 1999). However, when group-based respect was provided, individuals were more motivated to incorporate the group as an important aspect of the self, resulting in an increase of contributions (De Cremer & Van Vugt, 1999; Tyler & Smith, 1999). Of interest, the present findings showed that peripheral group members who received respect contributed even more than core group members (although the difference was only significant compared to core members receiving no respect). This result seems to suggest that feeling respected if the need to belong is high enhances cooperation even more than if one feels initially included in the group. However, future research is required to examine the specific processes underlying this trend. Nevertheless, what seems clear is that contributions vary most as a function of respect when one is in need of inclusiveness.

With respect to the manipulation of membership inclusiveness (core vs. peripheral), it is also interesting to note that this manipulation, originally used by Noel et al. (1995) in the intergroup arena to motivate outgroup derogation or not, revealed similar results in a within-group situation by demonstrating that the extent to which one feels included influences both sensitivity toward relational information and group-oriented behavior. This translation of findings from the intergroup context to the context of social dilemmas is from a theoretical and practical point of view an important strength of the present study.

This study was designed as a first step toward understanding the effect of respect as a means to promote feelings of inclusiveness and, consequently, contributions in social dilemmas. In the present research, I attempted to manipulate respect by relying on a scale assessing interactional justice feelings (Moorman, 1991). This choice was motivated by the knowledge that the interactional justice literature (e.g., Bies & Moag, 1986) assumes that the effects of fair procedures and treatments are a function of how caring, polite, and sensitive the authority or group is considered to be—all aspects that communicate a degree of respect. Thus, in this approach, respect was perceived in terms of the valence of the treatment (positive in terms of consideration or not) received by the group.

Although the manipulation checks showed that this respect manipulation was successful, it has to be noted that focusing on the valence of the treatment might as such have confounded liking with respect. Consequently, the process that may have been at work may well have been more closely related to experiencing positive versus negative feelings rather than respect versus no respect. In addition, the present manipulation may therefore have manipulated inclusion, which then led to a sense of feeling respected. These potential limitations suggest that future research is needed to specify the exact properties of the concept "respect." This seems a valid claim, because recently, Miller (2001) noted that "it is often difficult, even for those involved, to specify precisely what constitutes respectful treatment in a given situation" (p. 532). Of course, with a complex and multidimensional concept such as 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. This study represents such a first attempt.

In conclusion, the present findings are important because they show that by establishing inclusive and positive relationships, an exchange situation can be created in which the fulfillment of the need to belong leads under certain circumstances (i.e., peripheral group membership) to a reinforced willingness to further the group's interest.

REFERENCES

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497-529.
Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal group intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 307-324.
Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: One being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17*, 475-482.
Brewer, M. B., & Kramer R. M. (1986). Choice behavior in social dilemmas: effects of social identity, group size and decision faming. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 543-549.

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

De Cremer, D., & Van Dijk, E. (in press). Reactions to group success and failure as a function of group identification: A test of the goal-transformation hypothesis in social dilemmas. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.*

De Cremer, D., & Van Vugt, M. (1999). Social identification effects in social dilemmas: A transformation of motives. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29,* 871-893.

Kerr, N. L. (1983). Motivation loss in small groups: A social dilemma analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45,* 819-828.

Komorita, S. S., & Parks, C. D. (1994). *Social dilemmas.* Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.

Kramer, R. M., & Brewer, M. B. (1984). Effects of group identity on resource use in a simulated commons dilemma. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 1044-1057.

Leary, M. R., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 32,* 1-62.

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice.* New York: Plenum.

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18,* 302-318.

Messick, D. M., & Brewer, M. B. (1983). Solving social dilemmas. In L. Wheeler & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 11-44). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Miller, D. T. (2001). Disrespect and the experience of injustice. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 527-553.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 845-855.

Noel, J. G., Wann, B. L., & Branscombe, N. R. (1995). Peripheral ingroup membership status and public negativity toward outgroups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68,* 127-137.

Olson, M. (1965). *The logic of collective action.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Smith, H. J., & Tyler, T. R. (1997). Choosing the right pond: The impact of group membership on self-esteem and group-oriented behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33,* 146-170.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel (Ed.), *Psychology of intergroup relations.* Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Tyler, T. R., & Dawes, R. M. (1993). Fairness in groups: Comparing the self-interest and social identity perspectives. In B. A. Melkers & J. Baron (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on justice: Theory and applications* (pp. 87-108). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Tyler, T. R., & Degoey, P. (1995). Collective restraint in social dilemmas: Procedural justice and social identification effects on supports of authorities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 482-497.

Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 115-191). New York: Academic Press.

Tyler, T. R., & Smith, H. J. (1999). Justice, social identity, and group processes. In T. R. Tyler, R. M. Kramer, & O. P. John (Eds.), *The psychology of the social self* (pp. 223-264). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Van Lange, P. A. M. (1999). The pursuit of joint outcomes an equality in outcomes: An integrative model of social value orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77,* 337-349.

Van Vugt, M., & De Cremer, D. (1999). Leadership in social dilemmas: The effects of group identification on collective actions to provide public goods. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 587-599.

Wit, A. P., & Wilke, H. A. M. (1992). The effect of social categorization on cooperation in three types of social dilemmas. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 13,* 135-151.