



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Determinants of fairness-based and favorability-based reactions to authorities' decisions

Ståhl, T.

Citation

Ståhl, T. (2006, June 1). *Determinants of fairness-based and favorability-based reactions to authorities' decisions*. *Dissertatiereeks Kurt Lewin Instituut*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4472>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4472>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Chapter 1

Introduction

Many resources of importance for human existence and well-being are limited (e.g., water, food supplies, oil, medicine, and money). In addition, a majority of these resources are expected to become increasingly scarce. This is a major societal problem, as resource scarcity can lead to group conflict (e.g., Kramer, 1990; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961), and because strivings for personal gains (i.e., self-interest) have been proposed as fundamental for human motivation (e.g., Tyler & Dawes, 1993). It is therefore not surprising that researchers from different disciplines have paid considerable attention to various aspects of scarce resource management. As an example, one major research area within psychology as well as economics is the study of how people choose to distribute and harvest scarce resources (e.g., Dawes, 1980; Messick & Brewer, 1983). An important aim of this line of research is to find out when and why individuals choose to disregard their short-term self-interests to the long-term benefit of the community by demonstrating personal restraint in their use of resources.

A related area of research directs attention towards how people react to *authorities'* resource distributions, rather than on individual usage of resources. A primary aim of this research is to identify factors that determine whether or not people are willing to accept allocation decisions, and from a psychological perspective, to understand the psychological processes that lead to decision acceptance. A central theme within this tradition has been to investigate when and why people's reactions are determined by the perceived *fairness* of outcomes and decision-making procedures rather than by personal self-interest (i.e., favorability of treatment). Notably, this line of work has demonstrated that people's willingness to accept allocation decisions, as well as their evaluations of the authorities making such decisions, are strongly affected by perceptions of fairness (for overviews, see Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Lind, 1992; Tyler & Smith, 1998). However, several studies also indicate that the extent to which fairness (vs. favorability) guides reactions to decisions may be dependent on the recipient's relationship to the authority. For example, what guides reactions to decisions may depend on whether the authority is from the same group (i.e., an ingroup) or from a different group (i.e., an outgroup) than the recipient, and on to what extent the recipient is psychologically committed to the group the authority represents. People's reactions may primarily be determined by fairness in situations where the allocating authority is from an important ingroup (e.g., Huo, 2003; Huo, Smith, Tyler & Lind, 1996; Smith, Tyler, Huo, Ortiz, & Lind, 1998; cf. De Cremer, 2002). By contrast, however, when the authority is from a group that is less relevant for the recipient's social identity (e.g., from an outgroup), reactions may primarily be guided by the favorability of treatment (e.g., Huo et al., 1996).

In a world where group membership is a fundamental part of life, and where members of different groups are bound to interact on a regular basis, the possibility that

reactions to allocation decisions may become increasingly self-serving when authorities are from less social identity relevant groups is alarming. This is particularly true as societies and groups are becoming increasingly diverse and inter-connected. In the future, social interactions should even more frequently cross group boundaries based on nationality, ethnicity, religion, gender and corporate affiliation to mention just a few. From a societal perspective, then, knowledge about how people react to allocation decisions across group boundaries is needed.

In response to this, the aim of the present thesis is to carefully examine the causal role of the recipient's relationship to the authority in reactions to allocation decisions. To this end I report a series of experiments investigating the effects of the authority's group membership on reactions to allocation decisions. In addition, psychological processes that may contribute to these effects will be examined. Notably, the psychology of reactions to authorities from social identity relevant authorities, such as ingroup authorities, has received substantial attention in the past (e.g., Tyler & Lind, 1992). However, the psychological processes guiding reactions to less social identity relevant authorities, such as outgroup authorities, has received very little attention. Because such situations may be particularly challenging, a primary aim of the present thesis is to examine the psychology of reactions to outgroup authorities' decisions.

Below the most relevant theory and research on reactions to allocation decisions is introduced. This review is by no means exhaustive, but should provide sufficient knowledge about the field for the present purposes. Having done that, the aims of the present research and the content of each chapter will be described in detail.

Reactions to Allocation Decisions

In the late 1940's social psychologists demonstrated that satisfaction with an outcome is not a straightforward function of its objective value. Instead satisfaction seemed to be determined to a large extent by prior expectations, social comparisons and by feelings of entitlement (Stouffer, Suchman, DeVinney, Star, & Williams, 1949). Findings such as these initiated research on factors that influence the choice of reference-point used for social comparisons (e.g., Festinger, 1954; Sherif, 1953), as well as on antecedents of feelings of entitlement (for an overview, see Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith, & Huo, 1997).

An important step forward was made with the formulation of equity theory (Adams, 1965; Walster, Berscheid, & Walster, 1973). This theory addressed how people decide whether an outcome distribution is fair or not, an area labelled the psychology of *distributive justice*. Equity theory postulated that evaluations of outcomes depend on the perceived match between outcomes and inputs. Specifically, it was proposed that people compare their input-outcome ratio with input-outcome ratios of relevant others. When ratios match, people are expected to be satisfied and to perceive the distribution as fair. When ratios do not match, people are expected to perceive the outcome as unfair and to experience feelings of distress. More specifically, a disproportionately large outcome

should lead to feelings of guilt, whereas a disproportionately small outcome was expected to generate feelings of anger.

It should be noted that although equity theory proposes a general preference for fair (i.e., equitable) outcomes, an underlying assumption of the theory is that fairness concerns ultimately stem from self-interest (see Tyler & Dawes, 1993). According to the theory, self-interest is restrained only by convictions that distributions in accordance with the equity principle should yield the most favorable outcomes in the long run. As a result, people are expected to react more negatively to unfavorable inequity than to favorable inequity. Furthermore, people are expected to change their preferences should another allocation principle turn out to be more favorable in the long run. Although equity theory has received strong support (Walster et al., 1973), additional research has shown that other principles (e.g., equality, need) are frequently used to decide whether a distribution is fair or not (Leventhal, 1980; Törnblom, 1992). Several factors, such as distribution goal (Kazemi, Eek, & Gärling, 2005; Leventhal, 1980), outcome valence and resource type (Törnblom, 1992) have been suggested to influence what principle is used to evaluate distributive fairness.

More recent research has demonstrated that judgments of the fairness of decision-making procedures frequently have even stronger impact on reactions to decisions and on evaluations of authorities than judgments of distributive justice (e.g., Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Tyler & Lind, 1992). This research area is usually referred to as the psychology of *procedural justice* (e.g., Tyler & Lind, 1992). Leventhal (1980) proposed a set of procedural rules that should be followed to promote perceptions of procedural fairness: (1) the authority should suppress bias, (2) procedures should be consistent between parties as well as over time, (3) all parties should be represented in the decision-making process, (4) the decision should be based on all relevant (i.e., accurate) information, (5) decisions should be correctable, and (6) procedures should be in line with ethical values. Notably, most empirical research has focused on and confirmed the importance of the representativeness rule, typically operationalized as an opportunity to voice one's opinion in the decision-making process (e.g., Folger, 1977). Support has also been obtained for the influence of accuracy (e.g., Vermunt et al., 1996) and consistency over time on perceived procedural fairness (e.g., Van den Bos, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1996).

Several models have been put forward to account for the influence of procedural fairness on reactions to allocation decisions. The first explanation was presented by Thibaut and Walker (1975). In line with equity theory, it is assumed that people strive to maximize their outcomes. According to Thibaut and Walker, the value of procedures is due to the fact that they are a means to ensure that decision outcomes are in line with personal preferences. Thus, procedures that provide control over the outcome (decision-control) or at least some influence over the decision-making process (process-control) are preferred, and perceived as fair. Because Thibaut and Walker argue that procedural fairness concerns are ultimately about control over outcomes, their model has been referred to as an *instrumental* model of procedural justice (e.g., Tyler et al., 1997).

A different explanation was proposed within Lind and Tyler's group-value model of procedural justice (1988) and was further developed in the relational model of authority (Tyler & Lind, 1992). These models are based on the assumption that people have a

fundamental need to belong to valued groups (cf. Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Moreover, it is proposed that people need to feel respected and appreciated in the groups they belong to. But how do people evaluate whether they are respected group members or not? Because authorities are generally seen as representatives of the group (Tyler & Lind, 1992), the relational model proposes that people frequently use authority treatment for this purpose. Specifically, fair treatment is suggested to be a strong indicator of respect and inclusion, that one has relatively high status in the group and that the authority is neutral and trustworthy (Tyler & Lind, 1992). Such information, in turn, is expected to have positive effects on feelings of self-worth (Koper, Van Knippenberg, Bouhuijs, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1993; Smith et al., 1998). Thus, according to the relational model, concerns about procedural justice are not primarily attributable to instrumental concerns, as suggested by previous research (Thibaut & Walker, 1975), but to concerns about relations to valued groups (Tyler, 1994). These concerns are referred to as *relational* procedural justice concerns. To this date, the relational model has received strong support (e.g., Huo, 2003; Huo et al., 1996; Lind, Kanfer, & Earley, 1990; Sleebos, Ellemers, & De Gilder, 2005; Smith et al., 1998; Tyler, 1987, 1989, 1994; Tyler & Degoey, 1995, 1996; Tyler, Degoey, & Smith, 1996), and few reported findings are contrary to what would be predicted by the relational model (but see Brockner et al., 1998).

Recently, a social-cognitive explanation of procedural fairness effects has been proposed. According to the uncertainty management model (Lind & Van den Bos, 2002; Van den Bos & Lind, 2002), people use information about the fairness of treatment as a heuristic substitute when they are uncertain about important issues in their lives. It should be noted that the founders of the uncertainty management model talk about uncertainty in a relatively general sense. However, empirical findings suggest that procedural fairness may help people to reduce uncertainty about relational issues as well as more outcome-oriented issues. For instance, when people do not know whether an authority can be trusted (a relational issue), procedural fairness information can be used as a heuristic substitute for trust information (Van den Bos, Wilke, & Lind, 1998). In addition, when people are uncertain about whether or not an outcome they have received is fair, information about procedural fairness can be used as a heuristic for more relevant (but unavailable) outcome information (Van den Bos, Lind, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1997). Thus, to the extent that concerns about outcome fairness are related to instrumental concerns (Walster et al., 1973), and concerns about trust are related to relational concerns (Tyler & Lind, 1992), I argue here that it seems plausible that uncertainty management processes may play a role in instrumental procedural justice effects as well as in relational procedural justice effects.

Authority Relations and Procedural Fairness Effects

Several studies indicate that the relationship one has to an authority affects the influence of procedural fairness on reactions to the authority's allocation decisions. For example, Huo, Tyler and their colleagues have demonstrated that procedural fairness is more strongly associated with decision acceptance among people who identify strongly

(vs. weakly) with the group the authority represents (Huo, 2003; Huo et al., 1996; cf. Tyler & DeGoeij, 1995, 1996). In addition, experimental studies have shown that perceptions of respect, and to some extent feelings of self-worth, are more strongly affected by procedural fairness when the authority is from an ingroup (vs. outgroup, Smith et al., 1998). From a relational perspective, these findings make perfect sense. According to the relational model, procedural fairness effects are attributable to concerns about one's relationship to the group the authority represents. Such relational concerns should be stronger in encounters with an authority from a group with which one identifies, than in encounters with an authority from a group with which one does not identify. In a similar vein, relational concerns should be stronger when faced with an ingroup authority than when faced with an outgroup authority. Thus, to the extent that procedural fairness effects are attributable to relational concerns (e.g., Tyler, 1994), procedural fairness should be more important in encounters with social identity relevant ingroup authorities than in encounters with less social identity relevant authorities.

Notably however, aside from the work by Smith et al. (1998), no studies have established that the relationship to the authority has a *causal* role in reactions to procedural fairness, as studies on this topic have typically been based on correlational studies. In fact, available experimental evidence only supports the notion that the authority's group membership moderates procedural fairness effects on perceptions of respect and feelings of self-worth (Smith et al., 1998). However, no studies have demonstrated conclusively that authority's group membership, or the recipient's level of identification with the group, moderates the effect of procedural fairness on behavioral reactions to decisions, such as decision acceptance or intentions to protest. This is one of the objectives of the present thesis: To investigate whether the authority's group membership moderates the effect of procedural fairness on reactions to authorities' decisions. In order to examine this thoroughly, an experimental approach will be used in which the group membership of the authority as well as the fairness of treatment will be experimentally manipulated. To check the robustness and generalizability of the effects obtained, responses to hypothetical scenarios as well as to situations in which participants are actually immersed will be examined. Furthermore, responses will be investigated in experimentally created ad hoc groups as well as in natural group settings.

Authority Relations and Outcome Favorability Effects

Several studies indicate that the relationship to the authority might moderate the impact of outcome favorability on reactions to allocation decisions as well. For example, Huo et al. (1996) found that outcome favorability is more strongly associated with decision acceptance when ingroup identification is weak (vs. strong). Moreover, recent research indicates that outcome favorability affects perceived fairness to a larger extent in encounters with outgroup authorities than in encounters with ingroup authorities (Duck & Fielding, 2003). Such findings seem to imply that, when people interact with authorities from outgroups or from groups with which they do not identify, compliance with decisions might to a large extent be based on the favorability of their outcomes. However,

to date no studies have examined this possibility directly. Huo and her colleagues used a correlational approach, which does not provide a conclusive test of causal relationships. Although Duck and Fielding used an experimental approach to demonstrate that the authority's group membership moderated effects of outcome favorability, they focused on perceived fairness rather than decision acceptance. As a result, it is yet unknown whether these findings generalize to actual behavioral responses. This is a second aim of the present research: To examine whether the relationship to the authority determines the influence of treatment favorability on decision acceptance and evaluations of the authority. To investigate this, the group membership of the authority, favorability of treatment and fairness of treatment will be experimentally manipulated in a series of studies. This approach allows careful examination of the influence of fairness and favorability on authority evaluations and decision acceptance in encounters with ingroup authorities versus outgroup authorities.

Explaining Reactions to Outgroup Authorities' Decisions

Substantial effort has been made, particularly from the perspective of the relational model, to explain *why* acceptance of decisions is influenced by procedural fairness (e.g., Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 1994; Tyler & Lind, 1992), and why procedural fairness concerns might be stronger in encounters with ingroup authorities than in encounters with outgroup authorities (e.g., Huo et al., 1996; Smith et al., 1998). By contrast, little attention has been paid to the question of why people's willingness to accept authorities' decisions is affected by the favorability of outcomes. This is the case even though such instrumentally based compliance may have detrimental consequences – particularly for authorities. When acceptance of decisions is dependent on whether or not outcomes are favorable, a leader's ability to exercise authority is seriously constrained (Tyler & Lind, 1992). After all, whenever subordinates receive an outcome that is less favorable than preferred, their acceptance of the decision comes into question. Needless to say, this problem is particularly pressing in times of resource scarcity, as favorable outcomes become increasingly difficult for authorities to provide.

Given such negative consequences of instrumentally based compliance, it may seem relatively surprising that social justice researchers have not paid more attention to the psychological mechanisms behind outcome favorability effects. A plausible explanation is that, within several scientific disciplines, self-interest has been assumed as fundamental for human motivation (see Miller & Ratner, 1998; Tyler & Dawes, 1993). Presumably, findings in line with this assumption have therefore not been seen as particularly puzzling, and hence inspired little further examination. From this perspective, what needs explanation is not the "fact" that people pursue self-interest, but findings suggesting that they do not. Notably, a similar assumption about the role of self-interest in human motivation is endorsed outside of the scientific community as well. For example, Miller and Ratner (1998) demonstrated that people generally expect others' attitudes and behavior to be guided by self-interest in various different situations. Interestingly, however, these studies also suggest that the actual influence of self-interest is frequently far weaker than people expect. Moreover, Tyler, Huo and Lind (1999) demonstrated that

people generally expect *themselves* to react positively to allocation procedures that promise the most material gains. However, their post-experience evaluations are primarily influenced by fairness of treatment. Such discrepancies between actual and expected influence of self-interest on attitudes, evaluations and behavior have been attributed to a pervasive cultural *myth of self-interest* (Miller & Ratner, 1996). In the light of such findings, it is not too surprising that effects of outcome favorability on reactions to decisions have eluded more careful scrutiny.

In any case, the time seems ripe to examine the psychological processes that determine to what extent outcome favorability affects decision acceptance. Previous research suggests that outcome favorability effects are primarily prevalent in encounters with outgroup authorities (e.g., Duck & Fielding, 2003; Huo et al., 1996). Therefore, in the present thesis, psychological processes that may account for the accentuated influence of outcome favorability in encounters with outgroup authorities will be investigated. In doing so, arguments of the relational model will be integrated with insights from research on intergroup perception and self-categorization (Brewer, 1979; Doosje, Ellemers, & Spears, 1995; Duck & Fielding, 1999; Harinck & Ellemers, submitted; Horwitz & Rabbie, 1989; Kramer, Shah, & Woerner, 1995; Moy & Ng, 1996; Vivian & Berkowitz, 1992). Based on this literature it is proposed that reactions to outgroup authorities are driven by category-based perceptions and expectations of outgroup members as untrustworthy, uncooperative, and biased. Such perceptions and expectations, it is argued, lead people to focus on information about outcome favorability to make sure that their worst expectations are not confirmed (Duck & Fielding, 2003), and to ensure they are not being discriminated against based on their group membership. These ideas will be tested in several studies in which expectations of outgroup members are inferred from other measures as well as manipulated directly, and the role of such expectations in reactions to variations in treatment by an authority will be examined.

Examination of Assumed Operating Motives

At the core of the line of reasoning outlined above, as well as of the relational model, is the assumption that people are affected by the fairness of treatment primarily when they are concerned about their relations to the group the authority represents (Tyler & Lind, 1992). By contrast, people are assumed to react more strongly to the favorability of treatment when they are concerned about material gains and losses (e.g., Duck & Fielding, 2003; Huo et al., 1996). Although previous findings are consistent with these assumptions, no studies to date have actually tested them directly. Instead, the influence of relational versus instrumental motives has primarily been *inferred* based on effects of other manipulations or measures. To illustrate, researchers have assumed that relational motives operate to a larger extent among people who identify strongly (vs. weakly) with the group (Huo, 2003, Tyler & Degoey, 1995, 1996), and in encounters with ingroup (vs. outgroup) authorities (e.g., Smith et al., 1998). However, relational or instrumental concerns were never measured or manipulated in these studies. As a result, it is unknown whether variation in these motives indeed accounts for the effects obtained. For example,

it has not been established whether people's feelings of respect are more strongly affected by fairness of treatment in encounters with ingroup (vs. outgroup) authorities because relational concerns are stronger, or as a result of any other unknown variable.

Notably, there are several studies in which relational and instrumental concerns have been measured and their relations to procedural fairness judgments have been examined (e.g., Tyler, 1989, 1994). Unfortunately, however, these studies have consistently used a correlational approach. As a result, it is yet unknown whether the associations observed represent the causal relations proposed by the relational model. For example, the fact that self-reported relational concerns are strongly associated with self-reported procedural fairness (e.g., Tyler, 1994) does not reveal whether relational concerns influence perceived procedural fairness, whether perceived procedural fairness influences relational concerns, or whether both depend on a third factor. A final aim of the present research is therefore to test these assumptions directly. Specifically, the present research will examine (1) whether increased relational concerns accentuate the influence of fairness of treatment, and (2) whether increased instrumental concerns accentuate the influence of favorability of treatment on reactions to authorities' decisions. In order to do so, salience of instrumental and relational concerns as well as fairness and favorability of treatment by an authority will be experimentally manipulated, and the effects of these manipulations on evaluations of the authority and behavioral intentions in response to the treatment received will be examined.

Overview of Chapters

Below follows a brief description of the subsequent chapters of the thesis. It should be noted that, while the empirical chapters clearly build upon each other, they are written in the form of separate research reports. This implies that parts of the chapters overlap. At the same time, each empirical chapter can be read independently of the others.

Chapter 2

Chapter 2 examines whether the authority's group membership has a causal role in reactions to variations in authority treatment. The main hypotheses tested in this chapter are that people generally react more strongly to fairness of treatment and less strongly to favorability of treatment when faced with ingroup authorities (vs. outgroup authorities). However, it is argued that people sometimes do react strongly to fairness of treatment also in encounters with an outgroup authority. Previous research suggests that people frequently use procedural fairness information to evaluate outcomes when available outcome information is ambiguous (Van den Bos et al., 1997). Because people are expected to be strongly concerned about their outcomes in encounters with outgroup authorities, it is argued that they should react positively to procedural fairness in encounters with an outgroup authority when the available outcome information is ambiguous. In such situations, fairness of treatment should be used as a heuristic

substitute for unambiguous outcome information to evaluate outcomes received by an outgroup authority (cf. Van den Bos et al., 1997). In encounters with an ingroup authority, however, the relational model holds that people should value fair treatment primarily because it suggests that they are respected members of the group, not to evaluate their outcomes. As a result, reactions to fairness of treatment should be relatively unaffected by whether or not outcome information is ambiguous. These ideas are tested in Experiment 1 by manipulating the authority's group membership, fairness of treatment and ambiguity of outcome information. Dependent variables are participants' procedural fairness judgments and willingness to accept the authority's decision. Results confirm that reactions to outgroup authorities' decisions are affected by procedural fairness, but only when outcome information is ambiguous. By contrast, the influence of procedural fairness in encounters with an ingroup authority is unaffected by the ambiguity of outcome information.

Experiments 2-3 test directly whether or not people react more strongly to fairness of treatment and less strongly to favorability of treatment when the authority is from an ingroup rather than from an outgroup. In order to do so, whether the procedure used is fair, favorably unfair or unfavorably unfair to the participant is manipulated. Experiment 2 demonstrates that evaluations of the authority are more strongly affected by fairness of treatment and less strongly by favorability of treatment in encounters with an ingroup authority than in encounters with an outgroup authority. Experiment 3 extends this study by demonstrating that these findings generalize to behavior intentions (i.e., decision acceptance).

Chapter 3

Chapter 3 introduces the question of *why* people react strongly to favorability of treatment particularly when faced with outgroup authorities. Based on research on intergroup perception it is argued that people generally perceive outgroup members as relatively untrustworthy, uncooperative and dishonest (Brewer, 1979), and generally expect them to favor members of their own group (Duck & Fielding, 1999; Harinck & Ellemers, submitted; Horwitz & Rabbie, 1989; Kramer et al., 1995; Moy & Ng, 1996; Vivian & Berkowitz, 1992). It is further proposed that such perceptions and expectations may cause particularly negative reactions to unfavorable treatment, as it is interpreted as discrimination (Duck & Fielding, 2003).

Experiment 4 aimed to obtain preliminary support for this line of reasoning by examining whether reactions to the favorability of treatment received from an outgroup authority vary as a function of one's level of ingroup identification. Because high ingroup identifiers differentiate to a larger extent than low ingroup identifiers between the ingroup and outgroups (Doosje et al., 1995), and should have stronger expectations that outgroup members are biased, it was expected that high identifiers should react particularly negatively to unfavorable treatment from an outgroup authority. Main dependent variables were once again participants' behavioral intentions following authority treatment (i.e., willingness to accept the authority's decision). Experiment 4 also tested the hypothesis

derived from the relational model that ingroup identification should have a reversed effect on reactions to the favorability of treatment from an ingroup authority, such that low ingroup identifiers react more strongly than high ingroup identifiers to the favorability of treatment (cf. Huo et al., 1996). Results corroborated both predictions.

Chapter 4

Chapter 4 more directly addresses how expectations of bias affect reactions to outgroup authority treatment. In Experiment 5 information suggesting that an outgroup authority is biased (vs. unbiased), whether or not the outcome is favorable (vs. unfavorable), and whether or not the procedure is fair (vs. unfair) was manipulated using a scenario methodology. Results suggest that decision acceptance is more strongly affected by outcome favorability when the authority is expected to be biased rather than unbiased. By contrast, decision acceptance was more strongly affected by procedural fairness when the authority was expected to be unbiased rather than biased (cf. Tyler, Rasinski, & Spodick, 1985).

The aim of Experiment 6 was to replicate the findings of Experiment 5 in a situation where participants experienced the manipulations directly, and to examine the mediating processes accounting for the effects obtained. Based on previous work suggesting that outcome favorability affects perceived outcome fairness in encounters with outgroup authorities (Duck & Fielding, 2003), we examined whether perceived outcome fairness mediates the effect of outcome favorability on behavioral intentions when the outgroup authority is biased. Results corroborated this line of reasoning.

Based on previous research indicating that procedural fairness effects are stronger in encounters with ingroup authorities than in encounters with outgroup authorities (e.g., Smith et al., 1998; Chapter 2, this thesis), we investigated whether information about bias and procedural fairness interactively affect perceptions of the relationship to the outgroup authority. Specifically, we investigated whether the outgroup was seen as more similar to the ingroup when the authority was expected to be unbiased and used fair allocation procedures. The results supported this line of reasoning and further indicate that perceived intergroup similarity mediates the interaction effect between expected bias and procedural fairness on behavioral intentions (i.e., intentions to protest).

Chapter 5

The aim of Chapter 5 was to test directly two underlying assumptions of the previous studies of the thesis. People are assumed to react more strongly to fairness of treatment and less strongly to favorability of treatment in encounters with ingroup (vs. outgroup) authorities because they are more strongly concerned about their relationship to the group the authority represents, and less strongly concerned about material gains and losses. However, relational versus instrumental concerns were not manipulated or measured in any of the studies reported above. Thus, it is yet unclear whether the *assumed* motives

contribute to the findings obtained. As a final step we therefore wanted to examine whether activating instrumental versus relational concerns moderates effects of authority treatment in comparable ways as a manipulation of the authority's group membership.

In Experiment 7 it is demonstrated that making instrumental concerns salient by means of a modified uncertainty manipulation (cf. Van den Bos, 2001) accentuates the effect of treatment favorability on evaluations of an authority as compared to when relational concerns are salient. In Experiment 8 this finding is replicated using unobtrusive priming procedures to activate relational versus instrumental concerns. In addition, it is shown that effects of the fairness of treatment are accentuated when relational (vs. instrumental) concerns are activated. Finally, Experiment 9 demonstrates that the results obtained in Experiments 7-8 generalize to actual behavior intentions (i.e., intentions to protest).

