

Interpersonal treatment, social identity, and organizational behavior

Heather J. Smith

Sonoma State University

Tom R. Tyler

New York University

Yuen J. Huo

University of California, Los Angeles

Published in:

Social Identity at Work: The Social Identity Approach (2002).

Haslam, A, Knippenberg, D, Platow, M. & Ellemers, N., Editors.

Psychology Press.

Imagine that you are about to meet with your immediate work supervisor about a recent conflict with a colleague; that you are about to discuss a grade you have received from a professor; or that you are about to discuss your taxes with an IRS auditor. What will you care about in such situations? Will it be most important that the authority gives you the outcome that you want? Or will it be more important that he or she listens to you and treat you with respect? When people are asked to imagine these types of situations, they typically report that they think that their personal outcomes are the most important issue to them and it is their outcomes that will determine how they react to their experiences with authorities (Tyler, Huo, & Lind, 1999; also see Miller & Ratner, 1998). However, research shows that people in the actual situation often are more concerned with how authorities treat them--i.e. with procedural or process issues--than they are with the favorability or the fairness of the outcomes they receive when dealing with those authorities (see Platnow, Wenzel & Nolan, Chapter 16, this volume; Messick, Bloom, Boldizar, & Samuelson, 1985; Mikula, Petri & Tanzer, 1990). When people feel they have been fairly treated, they are more likely to cooperate in social dilemmas, show greater organizational commitment, more support for authorities, more voluntary compliance with rules and regulations and greater acceptance of (unfavorable) decisions (see Tyler & Lind, 1992, Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith & Huo, 1997 for an overview). In contrast, people who feel unfairly treated by authorities are more likely to act aggressively or retaliate in the workplace, (e.g., Miller, 2001), are more likely to steal or sabotage their workplace (e.g., Greenberg, 1993) and are more supportive of sit-ins & strikes (e.g., Leung, Chiu & Au, 1993),

Justice researchers distinguish between distributive justice (how fair are decision outcomes) and procedural justice (how fair are the methods for making outcome decisions, Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1991; Greenberg, 1987; Greenberg & Baron, 2000). Procedural justice includes both structural aspects of decision making and treatment quality by decision-makers (sometimes defined as interactional justice, Bies & Moag, 1986; Greenberg & Baron, 2000, Tyler & Blader, 2000). In this chapter, we outline a relational model of authority in which we link findings about the importance of the quality of the treatment that people experience from group authorities to their emotional attachment to groups and to their self-categorization as group members.

The relational model of authority seeks to explain why and when people care about issues of process, and in particular, why and when they will care about the quality of authority treatment. We argue that group authorities don't just distribute resources; they also communicate information about the person's value to the group. Our research shows that people draw such identity relevant information from the quality of their treatment by authorities during their interactions with key group authorities (Tyler & Smith, 1999). Further, this information influences both people's voluntary actions on behalf of the group and their self-images (Tyler & Blader, 2000). The relational model of authority builds upon the insight articulated by social identity and self-categorization researchers that people incorporate important group memberships (or social identities) into their self-concept (Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1999; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherell, 1987). People strive for positive social identities and they will be particularly sensitive to information about both their group's value and their value to the group (Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1999; Schmidt & Branscombe, 2001).

Two views of what people want from authorities: the instrumental and relational models.

The traditional view of authority relations is found within both social exchange and interdependence theories (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) and realistic group conflict theories (Campbell, 1965; Sherif, 1966; Taylor & Moghaddam, 1987). These theories suggest that people's interactions with authorities are shaped by their desire to gain benefits and avoid costs when dealing with others in groups, organizations, or societies. According to this view, people should be most concerned about the amount and quality of the resources that they receive from group authorities. If group authorities are successful in securing resources and can dispense those to group members, and/or if they can wield credible threats of potential sanctioning behavior for undesirable behavior, people will cooperate with those authorities. This focus on the costs and benefits of particular authority-subordinate relationships shapes analyses of organizational power in which power is defined as the capacity that one person has to influence the behavior of another person. According to the dependency hypothesis, power is linked to the extent that the person controls important, scarce or nonsubstitutionable resources (Fiske & Dupret, 1996; Greenberg & Baron, 2000; Robbins, 1998). Similarly, leader-member exchange theory (Graen, Novak & Sommerkamp, 1962; Robbins, 1998) proposes that leaders' relationships to selected "ingroup" members are qualitatively

different than leaders' relationships with other "outgroup" members. Ingroup members give and get more attention and more rewards from leaders than do outgroup members.

In contrast, the relational model of authority argues that the way that authorities behave is important because the behavior of group authorities tells people about the nature of their relationship to the group (Tyler & Lind, 1992). When people are treated fairly, this fair treatment communicates the message that they are important and included within the group, organization or society. On the other hand, when people are treated unfairly, this unfair treatment communicates the message that they are marginal or excluded from the group, organization or society. It is the self-relevant implications of procedural treatment that make the behavior of authorities such a powerful influence on people's attitudes and behaviors.

In the relational model, fair treatment is defined in terms of three elements: a) evaluations of whether authorities' motives can be trusted (benevolence); b) judgments about whether authorities' actions are based upon the nonbiased examination of facts (neutrality); and c) evaluations of the degree to which authorities are treating people with the dignity and respect appropriate for full group members (status recognition, Tyler, 1989; Tyler & Blader, 2000). In addition to our own work, research on interactional justice also strongly suggests that when reacting to authorities, individuals are attuned to these relational issues (Bies & Moag, 1986; Bies & Shapiro, 1987).

As a first test of the relational model, we can compare the predictive power of relational judgments and instrumental judgments when people are making judgments about authorities. Instrumental judgments include evaluations of the favorability and the fairness of the outcomes received from the decisions made and policies enacted by the authority. These judgments reflect people's assessments of the quality and quantity of the resources being received from the group and from the group's authorities. If treatment by group authorities communicates identity-relevant information to group members, relational judgments about treatment by those authorities should predict people's group-related behaviors and their feelings about themselves independent of the influence of instrumental judgments.

Table 1 presents the results of a recent survey of 404 employees varying from low income and part-time employees to long-time and highly compensated executive and technical staff (see Tyler & Blader, 2000, for details). This analysis focuses directly on the influence of the quality of the authority

treatment that people experience from the authorities with whom they are dealing. This influence can be compared to the influence of instrumental judgments including outcome favorability, outcome fairness and the structural aspects of the decision-making processes.

As Table 1 shows, the quality of the treatment that the employees studied receive from organizational authorities predicts a great deal of the variance in a wide variety of dependent measures, ranging from job satisfaction to employees' willingness to go above and beyond their job requirements (extra-role behavior, Folger & Konofsky, 1989; Organ & Moorman, 1993). For example, 36 percent of the variance in job satisfaction was explained by four judgments: outcome favorability, outcome fairness, structural aspects of decision-making and quality of treatment received. Of those four factors, treatment quality is most strongly related to job satisfaction. The same four factors explain 19% of the variance in extra-role behavior. Again, treatment quality is most strongly related to extra-role behavior.

This pattern of results supports our argument that people place considerable weight on the quality of their interpersonal treatment by groups and group authorities (and much less weight on instrumental judgments). Perhaps most strikingly, people place more weight on quality of their interpersonal treatment than they do on the quality of the decision-making that they believe is occurring. These findings support the argument that how authorities treat people is the key to people's connection to the group and to group authorities.

Table 1 about here

We find the same pattern of results in interviews with community residents who describe their encounters with police and the legal system (Tyler & Huo, 2000), interviews with community residents about water regulation authorities (Tyler & Degoey, 1995), interviews with employees in a public sector work organization in Northern California (Huo & Tyler, 2001) and other survey studies of employees in for profit organizations (Tyler, 1999). What is striking about all of these studies is that the quality of people's interpersonal treatment not only predicts people's feelings toward supervisors and other authorities, and their commitment to organizations, institutions, and communities, but it also influences their actual behavior.

As the relational model of authority predicts, the quality of people's treatment is more important than are the outcomes they receive for predicting group-oriented behavior. This pattern of results leads us

to view treatment by authorities as the key factor that mediates the relationship between group members and the groups to which they belong. Such an image contrasts sharply with the suggestions of the traditional social exchange and interdependence models, which link the relationship between people and groups to issues of resource exchange.

Social categorization moderates the importance that people place on the quality of their treatment.

An even stronger demonstration of the importance of the relational model would be to show that people care more strongly about the treatment quality by group authorities when the group the authority represents is important to their sense of identity and self. Information that you are a marginal or excluded group member should be less important if you don't care about the group, but the same information should be very important if the group is central to your self-definition, and hence to the basis of your feelings of self-esteem and self-worth. As suggested by social identity theory (Doosje, Ellemers & Spears, 1999), group members' reactions to particular group memberships and their willingness to act in terms of group norms depends upon the salience of the group membership and the relative importance members attach to the membership. For example, group members who identify closely with the group will support collective improvements even at the expense of their own personal interests (Ellemers, Wilke & van Knippenberg, 1993; Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1997). In the same situation, group members who do not identify with the group will focus on personal risks and benefits

To explore whether the salience of particular group memberships shapes reactions to treatment by group authorities, 335 public sector employees were asked to describe a recent conflict they had in their work setting and to talk about how their supervisor resolved it (see Huo & Tyler, 2001; Tyler, Lind, Ohbuchi, Sugwara, & Huo, 1998). The results showed that when the supervisor shared the same ethnicity as the employee (i.e., the supervisor was an ingroup authority), relational judgments shaped their views about the supervisor's legitimacy (i.e. their right to make binding decisions that workers should obey, Tyler et al, 1998), as well as their willingness to cooperate with the supervisor's suggestions for how to handle the problem (Huo & Tyler, 2001). When the supervisor was a member of a different ethnicity (i.e., the supervisor was an outgroup authority), instrumental judgments shaped their judgments about the legitimacy of their supervisor and their willingness to cooperate. Further, when employees were dealing with an ingroup supervisor, they accepted the decisions of an authority if they were fairly treated by that authority,

whereas if the supervisor represented an outgroup, employees accepted their decisions if those decisions were favorable to them.

We tested the same argument using an experimental design in which outcome favorability, quality of treatment, and the group affiliation of the authority were independently manipulated (Tyler & Smith, 1999). In this experiment, a graduate student responsible for grading a social skills test was presented to students as either an ingroup member (from the student's university) or an outgroup member (from a rival university). Later, the graduate student entered the room and treated the student fairly or unfairly by either carefully grading their work performance, or doing a superficial job. Independently, the study manipulated whether the student received a favorable outcome (97% correct) or an unfavorable outcome (43% correct).

Students in the experiment were also asked whether they would be willing to help the graduate student's supervisor in further studies (voluntary "extra-role" behavior, Tyler & Smith, 1999). The results showed that if the test grader and advisor represented an ingroup (i.e. were from the student's own school), the willingness to help further was significantly related to how fairly the test grader treated the student, and not to the outcome the student received. In contrast, if the test grader and advisor represented an outgroup (i.e. were from another university), the willingness to help those authorities further was significantly related to favorable outcomes, but not to how fairly the test grader treated the student.

In this research, we find that how ingroup authorities treat people influences their behavior, as we would predict from the relational model's assumption that treatment by an authority communicates information about a person's value to the group. Further, outcome favorability does not influence people's behavior when the authority represents an ingroup. So, for ingroup authorities the key issue is quality of interpersonal treatment, not resources. This finding contradicts the key prediction of traditional social exchange and interdependence models, which suggest that people should be concerned with the possible costs and benefits associated with their interaction with a particular authority. This should be true regardless of the authority's group affiliation. Whether the authority represents an ingroup or an outgroup does not change the material rewards and costs that an authority can deliver to group members.

Group identification moderates the importance of relational treatment.

Our explanation for this pattern of results assumes that the categorization differences illustrated in the research described above occur because the differences in group membership served as a proxy for

higher or lower degrees of "identification" with the group whom the authority represented. In fact, the ingroup/outgroup effects we have outlined are consistent with the relational perspective only if we assume that people identify more strongly with ingroup authorities than with outgroup authorities.

It is important to recognize that identification with particular groups or social categories is a subjective psychological experience that is not necessarily defined by objective membership characteristics. Although it is natural to assume that people identify with their ingroup more than with an outgroup, people are potential members of a variety of different groups and social categories, some of which will be more important to their sense of self (Brewer, 1991; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1992; Turner et al, 1987). A more direct test of the argument is to measure how much people identify with the group the authority represents, and to explore whether quality of treatment is more important when people identify more strongly with a group.

To test this idea, we divided a sample of Chicago employees into two groups based upon the degree to which they indicated that their work organization was central to their sense of self (Tyler & Smith, 1999). We then examined the degree to which employees were willing to accept their supervisor's decisions because: (a) the outcome of the decision favored them or (b) they were fairly treated by their supervisor during the process in which the decision was made. For employees who identified more strongly with their work organization, their acceptance of their supervisor's decision was more closely related to the quality of their supervisors' treatment of them than by the favorability of their outcomes. In contrast, outcome favorability and not quality of treatment, shaped the opinions of those who identified less strongly with the organization.

As a second test of this idea, we focused on 205 employees of a public university who worked with supervisors from a different ethnic background (Huo, Smith, Tyler & Lind, 1996). Our earlier research suggests that in this cross-ethnicity management context, there is considerable likelihood that employees will focus on the instrumental implications of their supervisor's behavior. This occurs because from an ethnic group perspective the supervisor is an outgroup member (Fiske & Dupret, 1996). Our concern was with whether identification with the larger organization could encourage employees to focus on how a supervisor from a different ethnic background treats them rather than on the outcomes they receive. As predicted by the relational model, employees who identified more strongly with the overall

work organization focused on the quality of their treatment by their supervisor when evaluating the fairness of their experience and when determining whether or not to accept their supervisor's decision. In contrast, instrumental judgments were much more important to acceptance decisions among employees who did not identify as strongly with the organization.

These results suggest that, even in cross-ethnic interactions, employees cared about how fairly supervisors treated them, and that concern was greater when they identified more strongly with the organization that the supervisor represented. Hence, if we consider subjective identification with a group, rather than simple group membership, we continue to find results consistent with the predictions of the relational model.

The quality of the treatment received from authorities shapes whether a person feels respected in their group.

Why do people place greater emphasis on the quality of their treatment by authorities when those authorities represent a group with whom they identify? We believe that people care about relational issues because these aspects of their experience communicate information about their self-worth. Initial evidence for a link between procedural fairness and the self-concept occurs in a set of experiments conducted by Koper and her colleagues (Koper, Van Knippenberg, Bouhuijs, Vermunt & Wilke, 1993). In two different experiments, treatment quality (defined as how an experimenter graded a test) influenced participant's self-esteem. . However, the relational model of authority predicts that if the source of this information does not represent an important reference group, the treatment quality by authorities will be less important as a source of information about identity. In other words, the argument that people learn identity relevant information from authorities can predict when people will care how authorities treat them. However, the next step of our argument requires us to specify more completely the information that we believe ingroup authorities communicate to group members by their treatment.

We propose that the enactment of procedures, particularly by group authorities, tells people whether they are valued by the group represented by the procedures or authorities, (i.e. treatment communicates respect, Tyler, Degoey & Smith, 1996). Respect is a psychological construct that captures people's views of their value to the group. Feelings of respect represent an entire group's opinions rather than the sum of idiosyncratic interpersonal relationships with a variety of people (Ellemers, Doosje &

Spears, 2001; Emler & Reicher, 1995). Because authorities represent the group, people typically see their behavior as representing the views of the group (Haslam & Platnow, 1995).

We view feeling respected by an important reference group as being a central part of people's social identity. According to social identity and self-categorization theories (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner et al, 1987), both personal or idiosyncratic attributes and the groups and categories to which we belong shape our self-concepts. However, most social identity and self-categorization research focuses on people's knowledge, attachment and evaluations of the entire group to which they belong. Whether people view the group as valuable is clearly important. However, we also believe that people's beliefs about whether the group values them can be equally, if not more, important (Smith & Tyler, 1997; Tyler & Lind, 1992). As suggested by Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears & Doosje (1999), the possibility that one might be demoted or excluded from an important group can be as threatening to one's social identity as stigmatizing or challenging the entire group's status.

In Table 2, we summarize the results from a number of different studies in which people's feelings of respect from a reference group and personal self-esteem were measured. Both social identity theory (Noel, Branscombe & Wann, 1995; Schmidt & Branscombe, 2001) and other recent models of self-esteem (Leary & Baumeister, 2000) suggest that feeling included or excluded from an important group should influence personal self-esteem. For example, Leary and Baumeister (2000) propose that personal self-esteem is best defined as an internal monitor of the possible social exclusion by other people.

As shown in Table 2, from groups as large as the United States, in which people could not know every member of the group, to small housing cooperatives and sororities, in which members know each other intimately, feeling respected by other group members is significantly related to personal self-esteem. Interesting, in the studies in which a collective measure of self-esteem (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) was included, respect also is significantly related to collective self-esteem, supporting the hypothesized group-based nature of respect. Table 2 also presents the correlations between feeling respected by one's group and discretionary group-oriented behavior - actions that promote the group's goals but are not necessarily prescribed by the group (e.g., extra-role behaviors or voluntary deference to decisions, Folger & Konofsky, 1989; Organ & Moorman, 1993). We have also referred to these behaviors as assertive behaviors (Tyler & Smith, 1999), because they reflect proactive behaviors on the part of group members. In fact, discretionary

behaviors represent an important group asset. When environment requirements can change quickly, flexible, creative employee behavior is particularly valuable.

Table 2 also includes the data obtained from the set of experiments (Smith et al, 1998) described earlier. There is also recent experimental evidence that shows a direct influence of feeling respected by *other group members* on self-evaluations and behavior (in contrast to a single group authority). For example, in three different experiments, Simon and Sturmer (2001) directly manipulate respectful treatment from other group members independently of how negative or positive the actual feedback is. Across three experiments, respectful treatment by other group members increased collective self-esteem and participants' willingness to engage in group serving behavior. In a different set of experiments, Ellemers and her colleagues (2001) also directly manipulate respect from other group members (operationalized as other group members' evaluations of the participants' descriptions of their personal behavior). They find that high respect from the ingroup leads to more self-esteem than low respect, particularly if respondents identify more closely with the ingroup. Moreover, the respect manipulation also influenced participants' willingness to help the group and discriminate against an outgroup (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 2001).¹ Further, Ellemers and her colleagues (2001) show that the influence of respect depends upon the source of the information. The same positive information from an outgroup made participants feel worse rather than better. More importantly, this information was communicated by an entire team of individuals rather than single identifiable individuals, supporting that respect represents a group level variable (Ellemers, Doosje & Spears, 2001).

Having shown that feeling respected by other group members is related to self-evaluations and group-oriented behavior, the next question is whether the quality of the treatment that people receive influences their judgments of how respected they are by the group. Earlier we showed that treatment by ingroup authorities, and/or by authorities representing a group with whom a person identifies, is more closely related to the willingness to help and the acceptance of supervisors' decisions than are measures of

¹ In a related research tradition, researchers have examined how participants react to the suggestion that they are not as prototypical a group member as they assumed or as are other group members (Schmidt & Branscombe, 2001; Hogg, Hains & Mason, 1998). Although prototypicality, being liked as a group member and being respected as a group member are most likely positively related, we do not think they are the same thing. In fact, when members of sorority pledge class were asked to nominate the most representative, the most liked and the most respected members of their class, nominations for most liked and most representative were more closely related ($r(80)=.77, p<.05$) than were nominations for most representative and most respected ($r(80)=.56, p<.05$) and most liked and most respected

outcome favorability. Now the question is whether feeling respected is more closely related to the quality of the treatment that people receive or to the favorability of their outcomes.

In two different laboratory experiments (Smith et al. 1998), we manipulated the group affiliation of an authority responsible for people's treatment and outcomes. In the first experiment (described earlier), participants who were treated unfairly by the test grader from the participant's own university reported feeling significantly less respected by other people than participants who were treated fairly, regardless of the outcome. In a second experiment, students completed three timed tasks for which they could earn points toward participation in a subject payment lottery. However, as sometimes is the case in the "real world", the computer that students were using would unexpectedly freeze and the students would lose time for their task of earning points. Afterwards, students could email an unseen supervisor (presented as either from their university or from a rival university) about the computer problems. This supervisor responded to the participants' email messages with either three very polite and considerate messages or an initially polite message followed by two rude and insensitive messages (a manipulation of treatment quality). As predicted, unfair treatment by an ingroup authority led to feeling less respected by other people, particularly when outcomes were negative.

Having shown that when the authority represents an ingroup, the quality of treatment by an authority shapes feelings respected by other,, we can test the complete pattern of relational model predictions (see Figure 1). According to the relational model of authority, identification with the group or organization the authority represents determines whether people will pay more attention to relational or instrumental justice concerns. When people identify with the organization, how key organizational authorities treat them influences their feelings of respect from the organization as a whole, and consequently their personal self-evaluations and their willingness to help the organization.

Figure 1 about here

To test the full model, we asked university students to describe a recent conflict with a faculty or staff member of the university (Smith et al, 1998). As the relational model predicts, how fairly students felt the staff treated them or faculty member was related to lower feelings of respect from the University

($r(80) = .56, p < .05$). The distinction between respect and liking may be similar to the distinction made in the organizational power literature between position and personal power (Robbins, 1998).

community, but only if they identified with the university. If they did *not* identify with the university, unfair treatment by the faculty member was actually associated with feeling more respected.

In this survey, we also asked students how they felt about themselves (personal self-esteem) and whether they put in a great deal of effort beyond what is expected to make university successful, make innovative suggestions, and volunteered to do things for university that are not required (extra-role or discretionary behaviors). For students who identified closely with the university, the quality of the treatment received from an authority was related to both personal self-esteem and to discretionary behavior helping the group. Given the relationship among treatment quality, respect and personal self-esteem, we could explore whether feeling respected by other members of the university community mediated the relationship between authority treatment quality and personal self-esteem or discretionary behavior. However, this pattern should only occur for students who identified closely with the university. For students who do not identify with the university, authority treatment quality should not predict self-evaluations or group-oriented behavior. When we included feeling respected in the regression equation for personal self-esteem and extra-role behavior for high identifiers, the original relationship between quality of treatment and personal self-esteem/extra-role is reduced significantly. In contrast, there is no relationship between the quality of the treatment received, feeling respected and the two outcome variables for low identifiers.

Thus far, we have focused on studies that examine the quality of people's treatment by authorities within hierarchical conflicts, but in a recent study of housing cooperative members (Smith, Tyler & Daubenmeir, 2002), we find the same pattern among general evaluations of procedural fairness, feeling respected by group members and personal self-esteem. These results suggest that the relationships we are describing apply more generally to procedures (not just a single enactment of procedures by an authority) and even to cooperative groups with clearly nonhierarchical group structures. We also find the same pattern of relationships in a questionnaire study of concrete construction workers' experiences with their immediate work supervisors (Smith, Tyler & Daubenmeir, 2002).

What about multiple group memberships?

The evidence we have described supports our argument that people can be relationally oriented when responding to group authorities, but only if these authorities represent a group with whom people

identify. Further, we show that fair treatment shapes whether people feel respected by group members, and it is feeling respected that shapes personal self-esteem and group-oriented behavior. However, one could argue that this research is based on an overly simplified conception of group and organizational life in which individuals and authorities are either members of the same group or they are organized into separate groups through the process of social categorization.

In fact, most people belong to a variety of different groups and social categories (i.e., a member of the work organization may also perceive herself as being a woman, an ethnic minority, and a member of the management team). Given the complexity of group identities, it is worth considering how multiple group memberships might shape the relationship between treatment quality and people's self-evaluations and group-oriented cooperative behavior (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). Moreover, a multiple-group framework provides an opportunity for us to consider whether and to what extent social and cultural diversity will disrupt social relations within an organization or other structured groups.

We have studied this question by evaluating the influence of social identification on relational justice concerns in contexts where people may experience tension between loyalty to two different groups (e.g., the larger society and one's ethnic group). A typology of acculturation orientations developed by Berry (1984) offers a framework from which to consider the influence of multiple group identities. In Berry's typology, attachment or identification with a superordinate group (e.g., society or work organization) is crossed with identification with a subgroup (e.g., ethnic group membership) to produce four categories of people – each with a different acculturation orientation: a) assimilators (strong superordinate identification, weak subgroup identification); b) separatists (weak superordinate identification, strong subgroup identification); c) biculturalists (strong identification with both the superordinate and the subgroup); and d) alienated (weak identification with both the superordinate and the subgroup).

A relational model of authority suggests how individuals within each of these categories will respond to interactions with authorities who share his or her group membership at the superordinate level but not at the subgroup level (e.g., a white employee responding to interactions with a Latino supervisor). We predict that assimilators will emphasize quality of treatment in this situation because his or her primary form of identification is with an overarching category that includes the authority. In contrast, we predict

that separatists will emphasize instrumental issues in a similar situation because his or her primary form of identification is with the subgroup that excludes the authority.

Biculturalists identify strongly with both the superordinate group and the subgroup. This group provides an interesting test of the effects of multiple group memberships. The relational model does not make an a priori prediction of how biculturalists would respond to an authority in the situation we described. However, the response of this group is likely to generate potentially important insight into the dynamics of culturally and ethnically diverse organizations. If a person with dual identities evaluate authorities primarily in terms of their instrumental interest, then one of the likely costs of valuing and acknowledging diversity is the inevitability of subgroup conflicts that may threaten organizational cohesion. On the other hand, if a person with dual identities evaluate authorities and policies primarily in terms of how he or she is treated, then it may be possible for authorities to smooth over internal conflicts and maintain organizational cohesion. It is important to recognize that while the relational approach may benefit the organization by maintaining positive relations between subgroups, it may be costly for individuals who relinquish their pursuit of self or subgroup interest for the good of the collective.²

In the Huo et al. study (1996) described earlier, work place employees were asked to recount a recent encounter with their supervisor. Individuals were organized into one of the three categories based on their self-reports of how much they identified with the university and their ethnic group. Analyses were conducted separately for each group to determine whether outcome favorability or treatment quality best predicted willingness to cooperate with the decisions of the supervisors. The findings show that decision acceptance was closely related to the belief that the outcome was favorable (e.g., receiving a promotion or a raise) for separatists. In contrast, decision acceptance was closely related to perceptions of fair treatment among both assimilators and biculturalists. This pattern of results offers an interesting insight into the dynamics of diverse groups. It suggests that diversity will not necessarily hinder authorities' ability to gain cooperation. Diversity disrupts the relational processes we described only when individual's attachment to their subgroup outweighs their attachment to a more inclusive category that they share with the authority (for a related discussion, see Chapters 14 and 15 of this volume.)

² The fourth group of the alienated is excluded from our analysis because they expressed very little interest in either of the relevant groups. Inclusion within the relational model is premised upon individuals valuing at least some form of group membership.

In this project, we assumed subordinate and superordinate identification are independent constructs. In other words, greater identification with a superordinate category does not mean less identification with a subordinate category. Although this assumption seems reasonable in light of theories of acculturation (Azzi, 1992; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993; Phinney, 1999), we recently acknowledged that this view may be inconsistent with other theoretical perspectives (Huo & Tyler, 2000). The strongest challenge comes from self-categorization theory (Turner et al, 1987). According to the principle of functional antagonism derived from self-categorization theory, simultaneous superordinate and subgroup identifications are inherently incompatible. When a superordinate category is made salient, subgroup boundaries become blurred and perceptions of differences among subgroup members dissipate and are replaced by perceptions of similarity. A second challenge is suggested by social dominance theorists (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) who propose that superordinate and subgroup identities should be negatively related for subordinate (i.e., minority) groups in diverse societies. According to the instrumental perspective of social dominance theory, members of subordinate groups should either place their loyalty to their subgroup or to the dominant group but not both.

We put these challenges to the test using data collected from a recent telephone study of California residents (see Huo & Tyler, 2001 for study details). White, Latino and African-American respondents in this study described and evaluated recent encounters with either the police or court officials. They also indicated how much they identified with the United States as a superordinate category and their particular ethnic group. Factor analyses revealed that the two types of identification were empirically distinct, and further, the two types of identification were positively (as opposed to negatively) related for each of the three ethnic groups. Together, these findings support our prior assumption that superordinate and subgroup identification are distinct constructs rather than two ends of a single dimension. We sought to replicate the earlier findings by entering interaction terms comprised of the appropriate group identification measures and fair treatment into a regression analysis. In support of the relational prediction, greater identification with the United States was associated with a greater emphasis on treatment quality than instrumental judgments when people decide whether to accept an authority's decisions. Further, subgroup identification did not influence the way individuals respond to superordinate authorities. These results bolster our

original conclusion that the operation of relational processes is dependent upon the individual and the authority experiencing a common group membership but that this process is not disrupted by subgroup identification.

Although the evidence that subgroup and superordinate identification are independent constructs appears to contradict the social categorization theory principle of functional antagonism, this may be a context in which the superordinate category represents what Haslam (2001) has termed an “organic social identity”. In a group characterized by organic solidarity, each member or subgroup contributes toward building a sense of shared identification through their uniqueness. We argue that the premise underlying an organic social identity is consistent with the multicultural celebration of difference which asserts that distinct ethnic loyalties can not only co-exist but they, in fact, function to promote a common national identity through their ethnic identity (Berry, 1991; de la Garza, Flacon & Garcia, 1996). This line of reasoning leads to the conclusion that to the extent that the shared superordinate identity is defined in terms of all relevant subgroup identities, dual identification is not only possible by is easily sustainable.

Conclusions.

Our research shows that people care about receiving fair treatment by group authorities because it communicates how much the group or organization respects them. People who feel respected by groups that are important to them enjoy higher personal self-esteem and will pursue creative ways to help the group. However, if people do not identify with the group or authority the authority represents, they appear to care more about the favorability of their outcomes than about the respectfulness of their treatment. When people don't care about the organization the authority represents, relational justice does not communicate any self-relevant information, and consequently, does not shape people's behavior. In fact, there is recent experimental evidence that people define procedural fairness differently in intergroup contexts than they do in intragroup contexts (Platnow, Reid & Andrew, 1998). Participants in intergroup and intragroup contexts viewed the same leadership behavior as equally neutral, trustworthy and respectful, but rated the intergroup leader as significantly less procedurally fair than the intragroup leader.

On the one hand, fair treatment by organizational authorities can encourage employees to accept less than favorable outcomes or decisions when resources are scarce. On the other hand, fair treatment can draw attention away from structural inequities and problems. Group members might tolerate great

inequities in resources because they feel “valued” by their organization (Martin & Harder, 1994; Haney, 1991). Further, unfair treatment by an important group representative can diminish or threaten people’s self-esteem and lead to passivity, or in some cases, increased interpersonal violence. Baumeister and his colleagues (1996) argue that feeling disrespected provokes aggressive reactions among people with high (but perhaps unstable) personal self-esteem. Procedures and how they are enacted are often an afterthought in many organizations. Our research illustrates the potential costs of ignoring what procedures and authorities who enact them communicate to people about their value to the organization.

References

- Azzi, A. E. (1992). Procedural justice and the allocation of power in intergroup relations: Studies in the United States and South Africa. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 736-747.
- Baumeister, R.F., Smart, L. & Boden, J.M. (1996). Relation of Threatened Egotism to Violence and Aggression: The Dark Side of High Self-Esteem. Psychology Review, 103, 5-33.
- Berry, J.W. (1984). Cultural relations in plural societies: Alternatives to segregation and their sociopsychological implications. In N. Miller and M.B. Brewer (Eds), Groups in Contact (pp. 11-27). San Diego: Academic press.
- Bies, R.J. & Moag, J.S. (1986). Interactional Justice: Communication Criteria of Fairness. In R.J. Lewicki, B.M. Straw (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior (Vol. 9, pp. 289-319). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1987). Interactional fairness judgments: The influence of causal accounts. Social Justice Research, 1, 199-218.
- Branscombe, N.R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R. & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), Social identity: Context, commitment, content (35-58). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Campbell, D.T. (1965). Ethnocentrism and other altruistic motives. In David Levine (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 13, 283-311. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Crocker, J. and Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 60-67.
- de la Garza, R.O., Falcon, A., & Garcia, F.C. (1996). Will the real Americans please stand up: Anglo and Mexican-American support of core American Political Values. American Journal of Political Science, 40, 335-51.
- Doosje, B., Ellemers, N., & Spears, R. (1999). Commitment and intergroup behavior. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), Social identity: Context, commitment, content (84-106). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ellemers, N., Wilke, H. and van Knippenberg, A. (1993). Effects of the legitimacy of low group or individual status on individual and collective status-enhancement strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64, 766-778.

- Ellemer, N., Doosje, B. & Spears, R. (2001). Sources of Respect: The Effects of Being Liked By Ingroups and Outgroups. Unpublished manuscript. Leiden University.
- Ellemer, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1997). Sticking together or falling apart: In-group identification as a psychological determinant of group commitment versus individual mobility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *72*, 617-626.
- Ellemer, N., Spears, R & Doosje, B. (1999). Social Identity: Context, Commitment, Content. Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishers.
- Emler, N. and Hopkins, N. (1990). Reputation, social identity and the self. In D. Abrams and M.A. Hogg, (Eds.), Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Emler, N., and Reicher, S. (1995). Adolescence and Delinquency. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fiske, S. & Dupret, E. (1996). Control, interdependence and power: Understanding social cognition in its social context. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone, (Eds.), European Review of Social Psychology, *7*. New York: Wiley.
- Folger, R. and Konovsky, M. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. Academy of Management Journal, *32*, 115 - 130.
- Graen, G., Novak, M. & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of Leader-Member Exchange and Job Design on Productivity and Satisfaction: Testing a Dual Attachment Model. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 109-131.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. Academy of Management Review, *12*, 9-22.
- Greenberg, G. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Information and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Making Processes, *54*, 81-103.
- Greenberg, G. & R. Baron. (2000). Behavior in Organizations. 6th Edition. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Gurin, P. & Townsend, A. (1986). Properties of Gender Identity and Their Implications For Gender Consciousness. American Political Science Review, *67*, 514-539.

Haney, C. (1991). The Fourteenth Amendment and symbolic legality: Let them eat due process. Law and Human Behavior, *15*, 193-204.

Haslam, S. A. (2001). Psychology in Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Haslam, S. A., & Platow, M. J. (2001). The link between leadership and followership: How affirming social identity translates vision into action. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *27*, 1469-1479.

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

Hogg, M.A., Hains, S.C. & Mason, I. (1998). Identification and leadership in small groups; Salience, frame of reference and leader stereotypicality effects on leader evaluations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *75*, 1248-1263.

Huo, Y.J., Smith, H.J., Tyler, T.R., and Lind, E.A. (1996). Superordinate identification, subgroup identification, and justice concerns: Is separatism the problem, is assimilation the answer. Psychological Science, *7*, 40-45.

Huo, Y.J. & Tyler, T.R. (2001). Procedural Justice, Identity and Social Regulation Across Group Boundaries: Does Subgroup Loyalty Undermine Relationship-based Governance? Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Los Angeles.

Huo, Y. J., & Tyler, T. R. (2001). Ethnic diversity and the viability of organizations: The role of procedural justice in bridging differences. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), Advances in organizational justice (pp. 213-244). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Koper, G., Van Knippenberg, D., Bouhuijs, F., Vermunt, R., & Wilke, H. (1993). Procedural fairness and self-esteem. European Journal of Social Psychology, *23*, 313-325.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H.L.K. & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and Theory. Psychological Bulletin, *114*, 395-412.

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

Leung, K., Chiu, W.H. & Au, Y.F. (1993). Sympathy and support for industrial actions: A justice analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, *78*, 781-787.

- 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.
- Martin, J. & Harder, J.W. (1994). Bread and roses: Justice and the distribution of financial and socioemotional rewards in organizations. Social Justice Research, 7, 484-496.
- Messick, D. M., Bloom, S., Boldizar, J. P., & Samuelson, C. D. (1985). Why we are fairer than others. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 21, 480-500.
- Mikula, G., Petri, B., & Tanzer, N. (1990). What people regard as unjust: Types and structures of everyday experiences of injustice. European Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 133-149.
- Miller, D.T. (2001). Disrespect and the experience of injustice. American Review of Psychology, 52, 527-53.
- Miller, D.T. & Ratner, R.K. (1998). The disparity between the actual and assumed power of self-interest. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 53-62.
- Psychology, 40, 45--81.
- Noel, J.G., Branscombe, N.R. and Wann, D.L. (1995). Peripheral Ingroup Membership Status and Public Negativity Toward Outgroups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 127-137.
- Organ, D.W. and Moorman, R.H. (1993). Fairness and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: What are the connections? Social Justice Research, 6, 5-18.
- Phinney, J.S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. Psychological Bulletin, 108, 499-514.
- Robbins, S. P. (1998). Organizational Behavior. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Simon & Schuster.
- Schmitt, M.T. & Branscombe, N.R. The good, the bad, and the manly: Threats to one's prototypicality and evaluations of fellow in-group members. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37, 510-517.
- Sherif, M. (1966). The psychology of social norms. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (1999). Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, B. & Sturmer, S. (2001). Respect for group members: Intragroup determinants of collective identification and group-serving behavior. Unpublished manuscript.

- Smith, H.J. & Tyler, T.R. (1997). Choosing the right pond: How group membership shapes self-esteem and group-oriented behavior. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33, 146-170.
- Smith, H.J., Tyler, T.R. & Daubenmeir, J. (2002). Coop members and construction workers: When does procedural fairness shape self-evaluations? Unpublished manuscript, Sonoma State University.
- Smith, H.J., Tyler, T.R., Huo, Y.J., Ortiz, D.J. & Lind, E.A. (1998). The Self-Relevant Implications of the Group-Value Model: Group Membership, Self-Worth and Procedural Justice. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 34, 480-493.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Human Groups and Social Categories. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. (1986). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In Worchel, S., (Ed.) Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Chicago: Nelson Hall.
- Taylor, D. M., and Moghaddam, F. M. (1994). Theories of Intergroup Relations: International Social Psychological Perspectives (2nd ed). N.Y.: Praeger.
- Thibaut, J.W. and Kelly, H.H. (1959). The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley.
- Turner, J.C., Hogg, M.A., Oakes, P.J., Reicher, S., and Wetherell, M.S. (1987). Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tyler, T.R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group value model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 830-838.
- Tyler, T.R., and Lind, E.A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25, 115-191.
- Tyler, T.R., Lind, E.A., and Huo, Y.J. (1995). Social categorization and social orientation effects on the psychology of procedural justice. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.
- Tyler, T.R., Lind, E.A., Ohbuchi, K., Sugawara, I, and Huo, Y.J. (1995). Conflict with outsiders: Disputing within and across cultural boundaries. Unpublished manuscript.
- Tyler, T.R. (1999). Why people cooperate with organizations: An identity-based perspective. Research in Organizational Behavior, 21, 201-246.
- Tyler, T.R. & Blader, S. (2000). Cooperation in groups: Procedural justice, social identity and behavioral engagement. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

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

Tyler, T.R., Degoey, P. & Smith, H.J. (1996). Understanding why the justice of group procedures matters: A test of the psychological dynamics of the group-value model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *70*, 913-930.

Tyler, T.R., Huo, Y.J., & Lind, E.A. (1999). The two psychologies of conflict resolution: Differing antecedents of pre-experience choices and post-experience evaluations. Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, *2*, 99-118.

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.

Tyler, T.R. & Smith, H.J. (1999). Justice, Social Identity and Group Processes. In Tyler, T.R., Kramer, R., & John, O. (Eds.), The Psychology of the Social Self. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Van Knippenberg, D. & van Schie, E. (2000). Foci and correlates of organizational identification. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, *73*, 137-147.

Table 1.

The relationship among outcome favorability, treatment quality and key organizational measures.

Predictors	Outcome Measures				
	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Commitment	Compliance with authorities	In-role Behavior	Extra-Role Behavior
Outcome Favorability	.10	.21***	-.04	.12	.02
Distributive Justice	.12*	.03	-.01	-.03	-.11*
Structure of decision-making	-.04	-.07	.12	-.12	-.18*
Treatment quality	.50***	.52***	.20*	.35***	.62***
Adjusted R ²	37%	40%	7%	10%	19%

Note. N=404. After Tyler and Blader, 2000, pg. 121.

Table 2.

The relationship among respect from group members, self-evaluations and group-oriented cooperative behavior.

Study	N	Personal self-esteem	Collective self-esteem	Discretionary /Assertive behaviors
Smith & Tyler, 1997, university as student	200	.43	.42	.20
Smith & Tyler, 1997, sororities	83	.32	.63	.45
Tyler, DeGoey & Smith, 1996, families	335	.47	-	.45
Tyler, DeGoey & Smith, 1996, university as employee	335	-	-	.22
Tyler, DeGoey & Smith, 1996, nation as citizen	502	.34	-	-
Smith et al 1998, Experiment 1	115	.34	-	.16 (b)
Smith et al. , 1998, Experiment 2	119	.33	-	-
Smith, Tyler & Daubenmeir, cooperatives	193	.22	.24(a)	.19
Smith, Tyler & Daubenmeir, construction workers	49	.46(c)	-	-
Tyler & Blader, 2000, employees (average effect size)	404	.33	.39	.22
Average Effect Size		.36	.39	.27

(a) Correlation is with the identification subscale of the collective self-esteem scale.

(b) Sample size is 108.

(c) Correlation is with a measure of self-efficacy.

Figure 1.
A Relational Model of Authority

