Chapter 6

Summary and Conclusions

In the previous chapters, nine experiments examining factors that determine whether fairness or favorability of treatment primarily influences reactions to authorities’ decisions have been reported. In the present chapter, main findings from each of the empirical studies are summarized. After that, general conclusions as well as suggested directions for future research will be discussed.

Reactions to Ingroup Versus Outgroup Authorities’ Decisions (Chapter 2)

According to the relational model, people’s reactions to decisions are positively affected by fairness of treatment primarily because it indicates that the authority can be trusted, and that they are themselves respected and valued members of the group. To the extent that procedural fairness effects are dependent on such relational concerns, it has been proposed that fairness of treatment should affect reactions to decisions primarily when the group the authority represents is a part of the recipient’s social identity. By contrast, people are expected to react more strongly to favorability of treatment when the authority is from a less social identity relevant group. Previous research has addressed this issue, and has provided some support for these hypotheses (e.g., Huo, 2003; Huo et al., 1996; Smith et al., 1998; Tyler & Degoey, 1995, 1996). At the same time, the majority of studies have focused solely on correlations between variables, and as such, provide relatively weak evidence for the existence and direction of causal relationships proposed by the relational model. Moreover, available experimental evidence focuses exclusively on feelings of respect and self-worth rather than on actual behavioral reactions to the decisions (Smith et al., 1998). In short, there is no conclusive evidence in support of the idea that the relationship to the authority moderates effects of fairness versus favorability of treatment on reactions to decisions. In response to this, Chapter 2 examined the direct causal influence of the authority’s group membership on reactions to fairness and favorability of treatment.

The purpose of Experiment 1 was to demonstrate that people respond to fairness of treatment for different reasons depending on whether the authority is from an ingroup or from an outgroup. While people were expected to value fair treatment due to its relational implications in encounters with an ingroup authority, we proposed that people should respond positively to fair treatment when faced with an outgroup authority to the extent that it indicates a positive outcome. Based on fairness heuristic theory, we argued that the favorability and fairness of outcomes is frequently relatively ambiguous. For example, information about outcomes of relevant others may not be available for comparison, which makes it difficult for people to conclude whether their outcome is fair or favorable. When this is the case, information about procedural fairness can be used as a heuristic
substitute for unambiguous outcome information to evaluate whether the outcome is positive or negative (Van den Bos et al., 1997). To the extent that responses to outgroup authorities’ decisions are driven by outcome concerns, we reasoned that information about procedural fairness should affect such responses only when it could be used as an instrument to evaluate the outcome. That is, when the available outcome information was ambiguous. By contrast, to the extent that responses to ingroup authorities’ decisions are driven by relational concerns, we argued that information about procedural fairness should affect such responses independent of whether outcome information was ambiguous or not.

In order to test this line of reasoning, we manipulated whether the authority was from a natural ingroup (Leiden university) or from an outgroup (Free University of Amsterdam), whether relevant outcome information was available or not, and whether procedures used by the authority were fair or unfair. Results largely corroborated our line of reasoning. When the authority was from an outgroup, perceived procedural fairness as well as willingness to accept the decision was affected by fairness of treatment only when outcome information was ambiguous. When the authority was from an ingroup, however, the influence of procedural fairness was independent of the ambiguity of outcome information.

Experiment 2 investigated more directly whether people are more strongly concerned about favorability of treatment in encounters with outgroup (vs. ingroup) authorities, and more concerned about fairness of treatment when faced with ingroup (vs. outgroup) authorities. This time we used a scenario methodology in which participants responded to hypothetical treatment by an authority from a minimal ingroup or outgroup. As expected, authority evaluations were more strongly affected by treatment favorability when the authority was from an outgroup (vs. ingroup). By contrast, authority evaluations were influenced by fairness of treatment to a larger extent when the authority was from an ingroup (vs. outgroup). Importantly, Experiment 3 replicated and extended these findings by demonstrating that they generalize to actual behavioral intentions (i.e., willingness to accept the authority’s decision).

Regarding responses to ingroup authorities’ decisions, these studies provide strong support for the relational model’s notion (1) that reactions are primarily guided by whether or not the authority uses fair allocation procedures, and (2) that the influence of procedural fairness is not attributable to instrumental concerns. These conclusions are based on the fact that people were strongly affected by the fairness of ingroup authority treatment and unaffected by the favorability of ingroup authority treatment in these studies. Specifically, reactions were positive following fair treatment and negative following unfair treatment, irrespective of whether the treatment was favorably or unfavorably unfair. These conclusions are further supported by the fact that procedural fairness was equally influential in responses to the ingroup authority’s decision irrespective of whether or not the available outcome information was ambiguous.

Concerning responses to outgroup authorities’ decisions, these studies suggest (1) that reactions are primarily guided by favorability of treatment, and (2) that the influence of procedural fairness is ultimately driven by instrumental concerns. These conclusions are based on the fact that people reacted equally positive to fair treatment as to favorably
unfair treatment, while reactions were significantly more negative following unfavorably unfair treatment. Moreover, responses were positively affected by procedural fairness only when outcome information was ambiguous. Notably, while these studies strongly support the notion that reactions to outgroup authorities’ decisions are driven by instrumental concerns, they offer little guidance as to why instrumental concerns are so influential in encounters with outgroup authorities. This question was addressed in subsequent chapters.

The Role of Ingroup Identification (Chapter 3)

The relational model holds that people respond strongly to fairness of treatment and less strongly to favorability of treatment particularly when the group the authority represents is relevant for one’s social identity (Tyler & Lind, 1992). In the previous chapter, to test this general proposition, social identity relevance was operationalized in terms of the authority’s group membership. While this proved sufficient to obtain the predicted effects, it remains a relatively crude operationalization. This is particularly the case when group memberships under investigation – rather than being created ad hoc – exist prior to entering the laboratory. Ultimately, the relevance of a certain group for one’s social identity is more appropriately conceptualized as a continuous variable, rather than as a dichotomous one (e.g., ingroup/outgroup). More importantly, social identity relevance is subjective rather than objective. For example, being a student of Leiden University is bound to be more important for some Leiden University students than for others. In response to this, Chapter 3 examined how the effects of differences in objective relations to authorities (i.e., same or different group affiliation) demonstrated in the previous chapter are affected by more subjective variations in authority relations. Specifically, we investigated whether reactions to ingroup as well as outgroup authorities’ decisions are influenced by people’s level of psychological commitment to the ingroup.

Concerning reactions to ingroup authorities, previous studies have found that people who identify strongly (vs. weakly) with the group show weaker associations between favorability of decisions and willingness to accept those decisions (Huo, 2003; Huo et al., 1996; Tyler & Degoe, 1995, 1996). These findings are consistent with the relational model and seem to imply that, as identification becomes stronger, favorability of treatment becomes less important. Thus, aside from belonging to another group than the authority, a lack of psychological attachment to an ingroup may accentuate the influence of favorability of treatment received by an authority from that ingroup. However, because previous studies have relied exclusively on correlational data, one of the aims of the present research was to test this hypothesis in a more controlled environment.

To the best of our knowledge, no prior studies have examined the role of ingroup identification in reactions to outgroup authorities’ decisions. Furthermore, because the relational model was put forward to explain intragroup processes (cf. Huo, 2003), little theoretical attention has been paid to situations where the authority is an outgroup member. Meanwhile, in the literature on intergroup perception, there is evidence that perceptions and expectations of outgroup members vary as a function of people’s level of
ingroup identification. Specifically, while people generally tend to perceive outgroup members as relatively untrustworthy and dishonest (Brewer, 1979), and generally expect them to be biased in favour of their own group members (e.g., Duck & Fielding, 1999; Vivian & Berkowitz, 1992), such expectations are more pronounced among people who identify strongly with the ingroup (Major et al., 2003; Operario & Fiske, 2001). Moreover, such expectations influence how people behave towards outgroup members. For example, it has been demonstrated that people favor the ingroup in allocations to the extent that they expect outgroup members to be biased (Duck & Fielding, 1999). To the extent that ingroup identification accentuates expectations that outgroup authorities are biased, we proposed that ingroup identification should affect interpretations of unfavorable treatment, in the sense that unfavorable treatment should tend to be interpreted as discrimination (cf. Operario & Fiske, 2001). As a result, we hypothesized that high identifiers should react particularly strongly to the favorability of treatment received from an outgroup authority.

In short, the main objective of Experiment 4 was to examine the combined effects of ingroup identification, authority’s group membership and treatment favorability on willingness to accept a decision. In order to do so, we experimentally manipulated whether the authority was from a natural ingroup (vs. outgroup), as well as whether the treatment received was favorable (vs. unfavorable). Because identification with natural groups is generally relatively stable (cf. Doosje et al., 2002; Jetten et al., 1996), and hence difficult to manipulate, we decided to measure rather than manipulate participants’ level of ingroup identification.

In line with the relational model, the results of Experiment 4 suggested that ingroup identification attenuates the effect of treatment favorability on acceptance of ingroup authorities’ decisions. By contrast, and in line with insights from research on intergroup perception, results indicated that ingroup identification accentuates the effect of treatment favorability on acceptance of outgroup authorities’ decisions. Finally, results also suggest that high ingroup identifiers more likely differentiate between ingroup and outgroup authorities in their responses, whereas low ingroup identifiers do not. The present findings thus support the notion that people react differently to treatment by ingroup versus outgroup authorities to the extent that the specific ingroup-outgroup distinction is psychologically meaningful to them.

The Role of Expected Bias (Chapter 4)

Chapter 3 provided indirect support for the notion that expectations of bias guide reactions to outgroup authorities’ decisions. A primary aim of Chapter 4 was to collect more direct and conclusive evidence in support of this idea. To the extent that differences in expected bias explain why high ingroup identifiers react more strongly than low identifiers to the favorability of outgroup authority treatment, direct variations in expected bias should function as a moderator of treatment favorability effects in encounters with an outgroup authority. Thus, a first objective was to establish that expected bias indeed moderates the influence of treatment favorability on reactions to an outgroup authority’s
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decisions. In order to more fully understand this phenomenon, a second aim was to examine the psychological processes accounting for this effect. Inspired by research on intergroup perception it was proposed that expectations of bias cause people to attribute unfavorable treatment received from an outgroup authority as discrimination. This idea is consistent with how members of low-status groups attribute unfavorable treatment by authorities from a high-status group (Operario & Fiske, 2001). Furthermore, although it is unknown whether expectations of outgroup members as biased accounted for this effect, this line of reasoning is also consistent with the finding that perceptions of outcome fairness are more strongly affected by the favorability of treatment received by outgroup authorities (vs. ingroup authorities, Duck & Fielding, 2003). Based on these findings, as well as the close link between outcome fairness judgments and decision acceptance (e.g., Walster et al., 1973), we proposed a causal sequence where expected bias and outcome favorability interactively shape perceptions of outcome fairness, which in turn determine people’s willingness to accept an outgroup authority’s decisions.

Because resources are frequently scarce, and favorable outcomes therefore often difficult to provide, another aim of this chapter was to examine an alternative route to acceptance of outgroup authorities’ decisions. Procedural justice research has convincingly shown that fair procedures, such as an opportunity to voice one’s opinion in the decision making process, has a strong influence on people’s evaluations of authorities as well as on acceptance of decisions (e.g., Tyler & Lind, 1992). In fact, according to this literature, conditions when an opportunity to voice one’s opinion does not positively affect reactions to decisions are difficult to find. However, one of the few conditions under which voice effects are known to disappear is when people do not believe that the authority actually considers their views (Tyler et al., 1985). Based on this finding we proposed that the limited procedural fairness effects generally found in encounters with outgroup authorities may partly be explained by expectations that the outgroup authority is biased, and therefore will not consider their views. Thus, we put forward the interesting possibility that expectations of bias may have a reversed moderating role in procedural fairness effects as compared to the one hypothesized for treatment favorability effects.

A final aim was to examine potential mediating processes for the predicted interaction between bias expectations and procedural fairness on reactions to decisions. Because previous research has consistently linked procedural fairness effects to encounters with ingroup authorities, an interesting possibility is that information that an outgroup authority is not biased, in concert with the application of fair procedures may alter perceptions of the relationship to the authority. Specifically, we argued that information about bias and procedural fairness interactively affect to what extent the outgroup is perceived as different from the ingroup. This line of reasoning is supported by recent research showing that perceived differences between an ingroup and an outgroup are smaller when intergroup relations are characterized by relative harmony rather than conflict (Riketta, 2005). We therefore proposed that information about bias and procedural fairness interactively shape perceptions of intergroup similarity, in the sense that perceived intergroup similarity is highest when information indicates a neutral outgroup authority which subsequently uses fair procedures. Finally, we suggested that
perceived intergroup similarity should increase acceptance of outgroup authorities’ decisions.

These ideas were tested in two studies. In Experiment 5 we attempted to attain preliminary support by having participants read a scenario about an encounter with an outgroup authority in which information about bias, procedural fairness and outcome favorability was manipulated. Participants then reported their evaluations of the authority as well as their willingness to accept the decision. Results confirmed that expected bias accentuated the effect of outcome favorability. By contrast, information that the outgroup authority was not biased accentuated the effect of procedural fairness. Thus, initial support was found for our predictions.

In Experiment 6 we set out to replicate these findings in a more self-involving setting, as well as to examine mediating processes of these effects. To do so we once again manipulated expected bias, procedural fairness and outcome favorability, after which we measured participants’ intentions to protest against the decision. This time, however, participants were immersed in the situation themselves and actually experienced the manipulations. Importantly, the main findings of Experiment 5 were replicated. First, people reported stronger intentions to protest following an unfavorable (vs. favorable) outcome when the authority was expected to be biased, but not when the authority was expected to be neutral. Furthermore, mediation analyses confirmed that this effect was explained by differences in perceived outcome fairness. Second, supporting the alternative route to decision acceptance, people reported stronger intentions to protest following unfair (vs. fair) treatment when the authority was expected to be neutral, but not when the authority was expected to be biased. As predicted, mediation analyses confirmed that this effect was driven by differences in perceived intergroup similarity.

Based on these findings we conclude that there are two routes for outgroup authorities to promote decision acceptance. Because outgroup authorities are generally expected to be biased, perhaps the simplest route is to provide people with favorable outcomes. This approach should increase perceived outcome fairness and hereby also increase acceptance of the decision. At the same time, providing favorable outcomes is frequently a difficult task. A promising alternative would then be to provide clear and truthful information that one is not biased in favor of own group members. To the extent that the authority is seen as neutral, fair treatment should accentuate perceived intergroup similarity and hence yield reactions similar to responses to ingroup authorities’ decisions. That is, fair treatment should promote decision acceptance.

The Role of Relational Versus Instrumental Concerns (Chapter 5)

At the core of the relational model, as well as the line of reasoning put forward in this thesis, is the argument that people are concerned about their relationships to important social groups and key representatives of those groups. According to the relational model, a consequence of such relational concerns is that people value procedural fairness. Specifically, fair treatment is seen as an indication (1) that the authority can be trusted, (2) that one is a respected member of the group, and (3) that one has relatively high status in
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the group (Tyler & Lind, 1992). However, in situations where people are primarily concerned about instrumental issues, such as to attain positive outcomes, people are expected to react less strongly to fairness of treatment, and to respond primarily to whether the treatment received is favorable or unfavorable.

Although the studies reported in previous chapters of this thesis are consistent with this line of reasoning, support is of an indirect rather than direct nature. For example, the finding that people react more strongly to fairness of treatment and less strongly to favorability of treatment when faced with an ingroup (vs. outgroup) authority supports this line of reasoning to the extent that people are more strongly concerned about relations to ingroup authorities than about relations to outgroup authorities. In a similar vein, to the extent that low (vs. high) ingroup identifiers have stronger instrumental concerns and less strong concerns about their relations to the ingroup, the finding that low (vs. high) ingroup identifiers react more strongly to favorability of treatment from an ingroup authority supports this line of reasoning as well. However, because relational and instrumental concerns were never actually measured or manipulated in these studies, it remains somewhat uncertain whether differences in relational versus instrumental concerns contributed to the effects obtained. Notably, previous studies have examined correlations between self-reported instrumental versus relational concerns and self-reported reactions to decisions, and support for this line of reasoning has been found (e.g., Tyler, 1994; Huo et al., 1996; Tyler & Degoey, 1995, 1996). However, because these studies are based on correlational data, it remains uncertain whether the findings represent the specific causal relationships proposed by the relational model. In Chapter 5 we aimed to obtain more conclusive evidence about the causal role of the two motives in reactions to decisions, and hence carried out a series of experiments where relational versus instrumental concerns as well as treatment by an authority were manipulated.

In Experiment 7 we manipulated the salience of relational versus instrumental concerns by means of a modified uncertainty manipulation (cf. Van den Bos, 2001). Specifically, participants were asked to think about and to write down how it feels to be uncertain about whether or not they would get something that they really want (instrumental uncertainty) or about whether or not they were respected in a group of importance to them (relational uncertainty). This was followed by a filler task and a manipulation of favorability of treatment by an authority. As expected, authority evaluations were positively affected by favorability of treatment when instrumental concerns were salient, but not when relational concerns were salient.

In Experiment 8 we aimed to conceptually replicate these findings, as well as to test whether people respond more positively to fairness of treatment when relational rather than instrumental concerns are activated. This time, to reduce the risk of demand effects, relational versus instrumental concerns were activated by means of a scrambled sentence task (e.g., Srull & Wyer, 1979). After that, participants read a short scenario in which treatment by an authority was manipulated. To enable examination of reactions to fairness of treatment as well as favorability of treatment, fair, favorable and unfavorable treatment conditions were included. Replicating the previous study, authority evaluations were more positively affected by favorable treatment when instrumental (vs. relational) concerns
were activated. By contrast, authority evaluations were more positively affected by fair treatment when relational (vs. instrumental) concerns were activated.

In Experiment 9, finally, the aim was to demonstrate that these findings were not restricted to evaluations of the authority, but in fact generalize to behavioral intentions following authority treatment. After working on a scrambled sentence task intended to activate relational versus instrumental concerns (identical to the previous study), participants experienced fair, favorable or unfavorable treatment by an authority. After that, intentions to protest against the authority’s decision were measured. Results confirmed that people’s intentions to protest were more strongly affected by fairness of treatment when relational (vs. instrumental) concerns were activated, whereas responses were more strongly affected by favorability of treatment when instrumental (vs. relational) concerns were activated.

To summarize, the present studies (Experiments 8-9) provided the first conclusive test of the idea proposed by the relational model that people react to fairness of treatment particularly when relational concerns are activated. In addition, the notion that responses are primarily determined by favorability of treatment when instrumental concerns are activated was tested as well (Experiments 7-9). Using more and less unobtrusive manipulations of the relevant motives, hypothetical scenarios as well as more self-involving experimental paradigms in which treatment by an authority was manipulated, the data collected here consistently supported both of these hypotheses. We thus conclude that relational concerns play a crucial role in procedural fairness effects, whereas instrumental concerns accentuate effects of favorability of treatment.

Conclusions

A reasonable assumption is that people value membership in social groups (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), as well as to feel appreciated and respected in the groups which they belong to (Tyler & Lind, 1992). An important task for people is therefore to evaluate to what extent they are in fact included, respected and appreciated in groups they belong to. According to the relational model, an effective and frequently used strategy to evaluate one’s position in a group is to evaluate the fairness of treatment received from group representatives.

The studies reported in this thesis took these assumptions as a starting point to examine when people’s reactions to authorities’ decisions are based on fairness versus favorability of treatment. Based on relational accounts of procedural fairness effects (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Lind, 1992), a core argument has been that fairness of treatment primarily drives responses to decisions when the authority is from a group of relevance to one’s social identity (e.g., Huo, 2003; Huo et al., 1996; Smith et al., 1998). In such situations, fairness of treatment should provide relevant information about whether or not one is a respected and important member of the group, which in turn should influence reactions to the authority’s decisions (Tyler & Lind, 1992). This line of reasoning was consistently supported in the present research (Chapter 2), in which it was demonstrated that people react more positively to fair (vs. unfair) treatment when the authority is from
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an ingroup rather than from an outgroup. A relational interpretation of these findings was
further supported by studies in which relational (vs. instrumental) concerns were activated
directly (Chapter 5). These studies demonstrated that fairness of treatment influence
evaluations of an authority and reactions to the authority’s decision when relational
concerns are activated, but not when instrumental concerns are activated. By contrast,
reactions to decisions were more strongly influenced by favorability of treatment when
instrumental (vs. relational) concerns were activated. Taken together, these findings
provide strong support for the relational model’s notion that people are affected by
fairness of treatment when they encounter authorities from groups of relevance for their
social identities. Furthermore, fairness of treatment influence reactions to decisions in
such situations because people are concerned about their position in the group, and
because fairness of treatment is indicative of whether or not they are respected and
appreciated by members of the group.

Aside from providing important insights concerning how procedural fairness effects
are moderated by people’s relationship to the authority, and by activated relational (vs.
instrumental) concerns, the findings reported here also suggest some promising directions
for future research. In the present research, different levels of relational concerns in
encounters with an ingroup (vs. outgroup) authority were inferred based on responses to
fairness of treatment. A fruitful extension would be to gather direct evidence that an
encounter with an ingroup authority indeed activates relational concerns. Activation of
relational concerns should be possible to measure by means of a modified Stroop task
(Hafer, 2000), or a word-completion task (Van Prooijen et al., 2002). Such a study would
be of particular value if a manipulation of procedural fairness followed by measures of
reactions to the authority’s decision were included as well. This would enable a direct test
of whether activated relational concerns indeed mediate the role of authority’s group
membership in reactions to procedural fairness, as proposed by the relational model.

Whereas fairness of treatment affects reactions to decisions in encounters with an
ingroup authority, people react more strongly to the favorability of treatment when the
authority is from a group of less relevance for their social identities (Chapter 2-3, cf. Huo,
2003; Huo et al., 1996). A central theme throughout this thesis is that such responses to
outgroup members’ decisions are, at least in part, attributable to category-based
perceptions and expectations of outgroup members. Research on intergroup perception
indicates that people generally expect outgroup members to be relatively untrustworthy,
uncooperative and biased in favor of members of their own group (e.g., Brewer, 1979;
Duck & Fielding, 1999; Vivian & Berkowitz, 1992). Based on such findings it was
proposed that people primarily attend to and react upon information concerning the
favorability of treatment in encounters with outgroup authorities because this information
ultimately demonstrate whether the authority favors members of his/her own group.
Specifically, it has been argued here that, in the light of category-based expectations of
bias, unfavorable treatment from an outgroup authority tends to be perceived as
discrimination (cf. Operario & Fiske, 2001). As a result, favorability of treatment strongly
influences behavioral responses to an outgroup authority’s decisions. This line of
reasoning received strong support in the present research. First, reactions to decisions
among people who should hold particularly strong expectations that outgroup members
are biased (i.e., high ingroup identifiers) were indeed most strongly influenced by favorability of treatment (Chapter 3). Second, directly manipulating information suggesting that the outgroup authority was either biased or not biased confirmed that reactions to decisions were strongly influenced by outcome favorability only when information indicated that the authority was biased (Chapter 4).

The present research also indicates that responses to outgroup members’ decisions are not always based on outcome favorability, but are in fact sometimes strongly influenced by procedural fairness. However, an important condition seems to be that information indicates that the authority is not biased (cf. Tyler et al., 1985). When this is the case, fair treatment may actually alter perceptions of the relationship to the authority, in the sense that perceived differences between the ingroup and the outgroup are attenuated. As a result, people react to the outgroup authority’s decisions in similar ways as to an ingroup authority’s decisions. That is, reactions are strongly influenced by procedural fairness.

Taken together, these findings provide important new insights into the processes that guide reactions to outgroup authorities’ decisions. Although it has previously been established that people generally have negative expectations about encounters with outgroup authorities, this knowledge has not been considered in research on reactions to allocation decisions. A lot more work could be done here, however, and several new interesting questions are raised as a result of the present findings. For example, an important question to address in the future is whether mere categorization of the authority as an outgroup member is enough, or whether additional information is needed, to activate expectations of bias. As for activated relational concerns, activation of expected bias might be suitable to examine using unobtrusive measures such as Stroop tasks or word-completion tasks. A related question concerns whether similar response patterns as the ones obtained here would be found in natural groups where stereotypical perceptions and expectations should be more developed. Intuitively, it may seem reasonable that it would be more difficult to convince people that an authority from a natural outgroup is not biased. As a result, it may also be more difficult to reduce effects of outcome favorability, and to obtain strong effects of procedural fairness, in natural group settings. On the other hand, in people’s minds, some groups (e.g., priests) are more likely to be associated with moral conduct than others (e.g., convicts). Consequently, it also seems reasonable to suspect that expectations that outgroup members are biased should to some extent be dependent on the specific content of group stereotypes. Therefore, effects of outcome favorability and procedural fairness in encounters with outgroup authorities should most likely also be moderated by specific stereotype content. The answers to these questions should have important practical implications for authorities in modern diverse societies. Therefore, examining the relationship between group membership, stereotypes and reactions to authorities’ allocation decisions might be a particularly worthwhile direction for future research.
Endnotes

1This chapter is adapted from Ståhl, Van Prooijen, & Vermunt (2004).
2The vector that was used for testing the contrast was 0, +1, -1, thereby contrasting the favorably inaccurate procedure condition with the unfavorably inaccurate procedure condition.
3This chapter is adapted from Ståhl, Vermunt, & Ellemers (in press).
4This chapter is adapted from Ståhl, Vermunt, & Ellemers (2005a).
5In the present thesis bias refers specifically to a tendency to favor certain individuals over others in allocation decisions. For example, an authority with a tendency to favor members of his/her ingroup over members of an outgroup would be considered as biased from this perspective.
6We also measured evaluations of the authority, and results closely corresponded with results of the first study. The positive effect of voice was significant irrespective of whether or not the authority was biased, whereas the positive effect of a favorable outcome was significant only when the authority was biased. Due to space limitations, we chose not to report these data here.
7Although we also found a main effect of bias information, $F(1, 120) = 6.00, p < .05$; and a three-way interaction, $F(1, 120) = 7.36, p < .01$, post hoc tests (Tukey) indicated that the only significant differences were found between all the voice conditions on the one hand, and all the no-voice conditions on the other ($p < .05$). Based on the strong main effect of procedure ($\eta^2 = .58$), and the fact that post hoc tests revealed no significant differences between conditions other than the ones intended, we conclude that the procedure manipulation was perceived as intended.
8This chapter is adapted from Ståhl, Vermunt, & Ellemers (2005b).
9Recently a social-cognitive explanation of procedural fairness effects has been put forward as well. The general idea from this perspective is that procedural justice helps to reduce uncertainty about important issues in people’s lives (Lind & Van den Bos, 2002; Van den Bos & Lind, 2002).
10Six words were required to accurately translate the original Swedish word string into English. In the Swedish stimulus materials however, the word string contained only five words (Olle Kalle mycket soligt respekterar), and the unscrambled sentence only contained four words (Olle respekterar Kalle mycket). Also note that words associated with instrumental and relational concerns were italicized here, but not in the original stimulus materials.