

# Justice and cooperation

Lindsay E. Rankin and Tom R. Tyler

This study expands upon previous findings that justice plays an important role in shaping cooperation with the group. The authors argue that specific aspects of procedural justice can act differently and encourage varying degrees of norm-following compliance behaviours and voluntary helping behaviours. Specifically, when employees perceive their supervisors as neutral and fair in their decision-making, the employees should particularly increase their compliance with norms and expectations. When employees perceive their supervisors as treating them respectfully, the employees should particularly increase their voluntary efforts to help the group or organisation. Results of a longitudinal field study in an organisational context revealed support for these predictions. (*Netherlands Journal of Psychology*, 65, 146-154).

Keywords: procedural justice; decision-making; interpersonal treatment; cooperation; compliance; helping

Across the social sciences there has been a widespread recognition that it is important to understand how to motivate cooperation on the part of the people within group settings. This is the case irrespective of whether those settings are small groups, organisations or communities, and motivating cooperation has been a focus in diverse research domains including management, law, and political science.

Managers in work organisations want to encourage positive forms of cooperation like work-

ing hard at one's job and contributing extra-role and creative efforts to one's work performance because organisations benefit when their members actively work for company success (Tyler & Blader, 2000). They also seek to prevent personally rewarding acts that are destructive to the group, such as sabotage and stealing office supplies, by encouraging deference to rules and policies. For these reasons, a central area of research in organisational behaviour involves understanding how to motivate cooperation in work settings (Frey & Osterloh, 2002).

Law is also concerned with how to effectively regulate behaviour so as to encourage rule following and prevent people from engaging in personally rewarding but group-destructive acts — actions ranging from illegally copying music and movies to robbing banks (Tyler, 2006a; Tyler

Department of Psychology, New York University, New York, USA

Correspondence to: Lindsay E. Rankin or Tom R. Tyler, Department of Psychology, New York University, New York, NY, USA, e-mail: [lindsay.rankin@nyu.edu](mailto:lindsay.rankin@nyu.edu) or [tom.tyler@nyu.edu](mailto:tom.tyler@nyu.edu)

Received 11 August 2009; revision accepted 16 September 2009.

& Huo, 2002). Crime and problems of community disorder are difficult to solve without the active involvement of community residents (Tyler & Fagan, 2008). The police and courts need the active cooperation of members of the community to control crime and urban disorder by reporting crimes and cooperating in policing neighbourhoods (Tyler & Huo, 2002). Similarly, government wants people to cooperate by participating in personally costly acts ranging from paying taxes to fighting in wars (Braithwaite, 2003; Feld & Frey, 2007; Grimes, 2006; Levi, 1988, 1997; Levi & Stoker, 2000). Hence, an important aspect of the study of political science involves seeking to understand how to motivate people to cooperate with the government, leading to an interest in why people do or do not have trust and confidence in the government (Levi & Stoker, 2000).

### Cooperative behaviours

One way to characterise cooperative behaviours is to differentiate them by their relationship to the norms and expectations of the group. We distinguish between two types of cooperation: compliance and helping.

We use the term *compliance* to refer to behaviours that comply with rules or norms of the group. For groups to be effective they need to have some normative expectations followed, and they need to have rules that constrain the behaviour of their members, and those rules need to be followed. The study of rules and rule following in organised groups is referred to as the study of regulation (see Tyler, 2006a).

We use *helping* to refer to positive group-directed behaviours that are more voluntary in nature and are outside of norms and expectations. Helping behaviours can vary widely in their expression because they can be created and driven by an individual's own initiative, rather than following from the group's norms or expectations. Many aspects of involvement in a group are voluntary, and it is equally important, for example, to motivate community residents to engage in voluntary acts such as participating in community problem solving over issues such as environmental use (May, 2005). Helping behaviours are particularly useful to groups, because it is important that people not just do what is required. These behaviours can also be flexible in adapting to changing challenges faced by the group to which normative expectations and rules have not yet adapted. Thus, understanding how to motivate these voluntary helping behaviours is particularly important for group success.

This distinction between compliance and helping reflects Smith, Organ, and Near's (1983) distinction between generalised compliance and altruistic behaviours that help one's organisation. Originally, these behaviours were both conceptualised as dimensions of organisational citi-

zenship behaviour (OCB). Organ's conceptualisations later evolved to distinguish multiple dimensions within OCB (Organ, 1988), and to redefine compliance as task performance – behaviours that support the technical core of an organisation – and to redefine altruism as contextual performance – behaviours that support the broader environment (Organ, 1997). However, in a later meta-analysis LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) argued for a return to a single dimension of voluntary behaviour, and others have built upon this and argued for constructs that are conceptually similar to the original distinction of compliance and helping. Specifically, in a review of OCB literature Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, and Woehr (2007) conceptualise a construct of task performance as reflecting required work and they use the separate conceptualisation of OCB as discretionary work performance. The authors conclude that OCB and task performance are distinct, though correlated factors.

We believe our cooperation constructs conceptually relate to and can thus build upon these past findings. Given the changing terminology and conceptual frameworks used to talk about motivation, we do not draw our items directly from any specific prior scale. Instead, we will retain our definitions of compliance and helping and note the conceptual relationship of compliance to task performance and of helping to a set of constructs — OCB, discretionary work performance, contextual performance, prosocial organisational behaviour, and extra role behaviour.

In arguing for this distinction between behaviours, Hoffman, et al., (2007) note that OCB is more strongly related to attitudinal and motivational variables, including measures of justice, than is task performance. 'In essence, the utility of the OCB-task performance distinction is predicated on OCB representing an expansion or augmentation of the job performance domain and demonstrating a different pattern of relationships with motivational variables than task performance,' (p. 556). Thus, there is a history of interest in the differential motivations underlying varying kinds of cooperative behaviours, and we seek to expand on this interest and understanding.

There are many reasons that people might be motivated to cooperate with others, however cooperation is defined. One is that they are rewarded or punished for their actions in groups (Mulder, 2008; Mulder, Van Dijk, De Cremer, & Wilke, 2006). Other motivations for cooperation include individual or psychological variables such as trust (De Cremer, Snyder, & Dewitte, 2001) and the degree to which people merge their sense of self with the group (Tyler & Blader, 2000, 2003). Research also suggests that a key motivation shaping cooperation is an evaluation of the justice of the group (Tyler & Blader, 2000; DeCremer & Tyler, 2005).

## Justice and cooperation

People are motivated to cooperate in groups that they judge to be procedurally just, that is, groups in which decisions are made fairly and people are treated with interpersonal respect. Furthermore, it has been argued (De Cremer, Tyler, & den Ouden, 2005; Tyler and Blader, 2003; DeCremer & Tyler, 2005) that merging one's sense of self with the group, trust in others in the group, and perhaps other psychological variables that motivate cooperation may themselves be influenced by procedural justice; that is, these variables may mediate or explain the effect of procedural justice on cooperation. Since group procedures, and not member's internal states, are what groups can control, this further emphasises the importance of having groups implement just procedures.

Initially, theories of justice focused on the idea that people cooperated with groups because they received good outcomes, or distributive justice, from the group. Later, the emphasis shifted to the idea that people cared about procedures, albeit as a means to get desired outcomes. Forming the foundation of current theories of procedural justice, Thibaut and Walker (1975) began to argue that although people do care about outcomes, people cared as much or more about having just procedures, i.e. procedures that allow them to state their case when disputes over outcomes are at issue.

Studies in the area of law, for example, demonstrate that people's willingness to help legal authorities is based upon their judgments of the fairness of legal procedures (Tyler & Fagan, 2008). Similarly, in political settings cooperation with political leaders, for example the people who establish community rules and regulations, is found to be linked to the justice of the procedures through which local political authority is exercised (Tyler, 2006b; Tyler & Degoe, 1995). In organisational literature, Tyler and Blader (2000) link cooperation among workers to the procedural fairness of both their workplace and their overall work organisation. Specifically, in a study of workplaces similar to the workplaces considered in this analysis, the procedural justice in work settings was a central motivator of employee cooperation, and this was true both for people's willingness to follow group rules and for their engagement in voluntary extra-role behaviour for their group.

## Procedural justice aspects

In thinking about procedures, we are guided by the distinction made in earlier studies between two aspects of procedural justice: decision-making and interpersonal treatment (Blader & Tyler, 2003). This distinction emerges from studies that examine the role of each factor in overall evaluations of the fairness of organisations, and

reflects the finding that both issues emerge as distinctly important in such settings. Decision-making refers to neutral, fact-based, objective decision-making based upon the consistent application of rules and policies. Interpersonal treatment involves the dignified and respectful treatment of people by recognising them as people, giving them voice and deferring to their rights. Both matter in procedural justice (Blader & Tyler, 2003), but to date most research on motivating cooperation has focused on procedural justice as a single construct without examining different consequences of the two. For example, De Cremer, et al. (2005) argued that 'voice is now the most accepted and most frequently used manipulation of procedural fairness' (p. 397). While true, we would like to expand the understanding of procedural justice by examining whether the two aspects have any different impact in motivating the behavioural outcome of cooperation, specifically upon the two different kinds of cooperation, compliance and helping.

There is reason to believe that the two aspects of procedural justice may act differently. Past research has shown, for example, that a high quality of interpersonal treatment from a police officer may negate negative feelings that one has been unfairly profiled, which reflects an unfair decision-making procedure (Tyler & Wakslak, 2004). Thus, these two procedural justice aspects may act distinctly, with one aspect compensating for another. The question here is whether the two aspects also have different effects in motivating specific kinds of cooperation.

Past research into compliance and helping as forms of cooperation has shown them to be differentially predicted by attitudes about the group (Tyler & Smith, 1999). While not a direct examination of the impact of the different elements of procedural justice, these findings do support our hypotheses that the forms of cooperation may be differently motivated.

## Our model

Our primary goal in this analysis is to examine if the procedural justice elements of quality of decision-making and quality of interpersonal treatment differ in the degree to which they motivate the different cooperative behaviours of compliance and helping. Specifically, our argument is that quality of decision-making more strongly shapes compliance behaviour, while quality of treatment more strongly influences helping behaviour. Past work has demonstrated the influence of procedural justice on cooperation, but further knowledge of what specific aspects of procedural justice can more strongly encourage specific desired behaviours would aid in understanding how to motivate specific forms of cooperative behaviour in group settings.

This analysis uses a survey of employees' perceptions of their workplace. Specifically, these

Table 1		Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations.							
	Mean	Median	SD	DM1	T1	C1	H1	C2	H2
Decision-making (Time 1)	3.27	3.5	1.03	--					
Treatment (Time 1)	3.67	4.0	1.04	0.77	--				
Comply (Time 1)	5.65	6.0	1.12	0.12	0.07	--			
Help (Time 1)	5.76	6.0	0.98	0.13	0.16	0.29	--		
Comply (Time 2)	5.71	6.0	1.05	0.12	0.07	0.51	0.24	--	
Help (Time 2)	5.72	6.0	1.02	0.14	0.18	0.22	0.59	0.33	--

All correlations are significant at  $p < .01$

two aspects of justice that employees experienced from their supervisor, decision-making and interpersonal treatment, are used to predict two kinds of cooperation with the organisation a year later, compliance and helping. Further, we examine if the justice perceptions predict later cooperation above and beyond adjustments for the initial levels of that kind of cooperation.

## Method

### Sample and procedure

The study was based on responses to a questionnaire presented to a national panel of respondents via Knowledge Networks. Potential respondents were screened to ensure that they worked at least 20 hours a week, had a primary supervisor, and had worked at their current employer for at least three months. Respondents meeting these criteria completed the survey in two parts, one week apart ( $n = 4430$ ). Those who completed both portions of the survey received a small cash incentive. One year following the first interview those initial participants still in the panel were recontacted and asked to complete the same questionnaire a second time. The resultant sample contained 2366 employees and of those employees, 2095 had data for items of all six variables of interest in this analysis and are used as the sample for this study.

The employees came from a variety of organisations: 24% worked for small businesses, 21% for large companies in one location, 36% for large multi-city American companies, and 20% in multinational companies. At the first interview period, 30% had worked at their company for between one and five years and 65% had worked there for five years or more. The sample was 59% men, 86% were white, 32% had a bachelor's degree or higher, and 49% had a household income of \$50,000 or more. Both the mean and median age was 45 years.

### Measures

All of the following variables were constructed by averaging their respective items. The descriptive statistics and intercorrelations of the variables are presented in Table 1, and all Time 1 predictor variables were centred at their means prior to being entered into regression analyses.

#### Procedural justice (Time 1)

This analysis focuses only on procedural justice at the workgroup level with the employee's immediate supervisor. Items were on five-point scales (1 = *Disagree strongly*, 5 = *Agree strongly*). A two-factor solution yielded an eigenvalue of 0.78, and the item loadings, presented in Table 2, were consistent with the distinction between quality of decision-making and the quality of interpersonal treatment.

*Quality of decision-making.* Would you agree or disagree that your supervisor: 'Makes decisions that affect you in the same way as decisions that affect other employees'; 'Applies rules consistently across situations'; 'Tries to minimise the influence of personal biases on decisions'; 'Tries to make decisions based on accurate information' ( $\alpha = .90$ ).

*Quality of interpersonal treatment.* Would you agree or disagree that your supervisor: 'Takes your views into consideration'; 'Respects your rights'; 'Treats you with dignity'; 'Is polite and respectful to you' ( $\alpha = .93$ ).

#### Cooperation (Time 2)

The main outcomes of interest are the cooperative behaviours reported a year later (Time 2), and this analysis focuses on cooperative behaviours towards the organisation as a whole. Items were on seven-point scales (1 = *Never*, 7 = *Always*). A two-factor solution yielded an eigenvalue of 1.51; however, a three-factor solution did not yield an interpretable third factor with all items loaded on the first two factors consistent with the pattern of a two-factor solution. This two-

**Table 2** Factor analysis of Time 1 procedural justice aspects.

	Factor 1: Quality of decision-making	Factor 2: Quality of interpersonal treatment
Applies rules consistently	0.89	
Same decisions	0.78	
Minimise personal biases	0.77	
Accurate information	0.64	
Treats you with dignity		0.96
Is polite and respectful to you		0.92
Respects your rights		0.76
Considers your views		0.59

Factor analysis with promax rotation. All loadings above 0.30 are shown.

factor solution was consistent with the distinction between compliance behaviour and helping behaviour.

*Compliance behaviour.* How often do you: 'Use company rules to guide what you do on the job'; 'Seek information about appropriate company policies before acting'; 'Follow organisational rules about how you should spend your time' ( $\alpha = .75$ ).

*Helping behaviour.* How often do you: 'Volunteer to do things that are not required in order to help your organisation'; 'Put an extra effort into doing your job well, beyond what is normally expected'; 'Share your knowledge with others even when you will not receive credit'; 'Help others with work-related problems as a way of helping your organisation' ( $\alpha = .82$ ).

*Cooperation (Time 1).* The cooperative behaviours were also reported during the initial survey (Time 1), which allows adjustment for initial levels of compliance and helping in the regression analyses. The items for Time 1 were the same as those reported for Time 2. A two-factor solution yielded an eigenvalue of 1.55; however, again a three-factor solution did not yield an interpretable third factor and the items loaded on the first two factors consistent with the pattern of a two-factor solution. The resulting two-factor solution of these Time 1 measures was again consistent with the distinction of compliance ( $\alpha = .75$ ) and helping ( $\alpha = .78$ ).

## Results

The question addressed in this analysis is the potential for differential influence of the two procedural justice aspects of quality of decision-making and quality of interpersonal treatment

on the cooperative behaviours of compliance and helping. The procedural justice aspects were entered into regression models simultaneously to adjust for each other, and the models separately predicted compliance and helping. A second step in each hierarchical regression model adjusted for the initial levels of the respective cooperation behaviour.<sup>1</sup>

Specifically, we predicted that cooperative compliance behaviour would be motivated by the quality of decision-making and not motivated by the quality of interpersonal treatment. The results displayed in Table 3 support this hypothesis, with quality of decision-making predicting compliance ( $B = 0.16$ ,  $SE = 0.03$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and quality of interpersonal treatment not predicting compliance ( $B = -0.05$ ,  $SE = 0.03$ ,  $p = .159$ ). In the next step, compliance behaviour at Time 1 was entered into the model to adjust for initial levels when predicting compliance behaviour at Time 2. As shown in Table 4, while initial compliance is a significant predictor ( $B = 0.47$ ,  $SE = 0.02$ ,  $p < .001$ ), the same pattern of procedural justice aspects persists with decision-making, and not treatment, predicting compliance at Time 2.

<sup>1</sup> All the variables have some degree of negative skew – particularly the two cooperative variables – and the residuals of the regressions are non-normal. However, squared transformations of all six variables that create more normal distributions and more normal residuals produce similar patterns of results and significance for the regression coefficients. Further, all patterns of results remain consistent when excluding cases beyond the recommended cutoff of  $\pm 3$  studentised deleted residuals for large samples (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). In the second step of the regression analyses, there were 18 and 22 cases (out of  $n = 2095$ ) that met this exclusion criteria for compliance and helping, respectively.

Table 3 Regression analyses of cooperative behaviours on procedural justice aspects.		
Procedural justice, Time 1	Cooperation, Time 2	
	Compliance	Helping
Decision-making	0.16***	< 0.01
Interpersonal treatment	-0.05	0.17***
R <sup>2</sup>	1.5%***	3.1%***

Except where noted, entries are unstandardised weights for an equation in which all regression terms are entered simultaneously (n = 2095). \*\*\* p < .001.

Table 4 Regression analyses of cooperative behaviours on procedural justice aspects, adjusting for initial cooperation behaviours.		
Procedural justice and cooperation, Time 1	Cooperation, Time 2	
	Compliance	Helping
Decision-making	0.08**	-0.01
Interpersonal treatment	-0.02	0.09**
Compliance	0.47***	-----
Helping	-----	0.60***
R <sup>2</sup>	26.1%***	35.2%***

Except where noted, entries are unstandardised weights for an equation in which all regression terms are entered simultaneously (n = 2095). Each cooperation behaviour at Time 2 was adjusted for only its respective cooperation behaviour at time 1. \*\* p < .01; \*\*\* p < .001.

We also predicted that cooperative helping behaviour would be motivated by the quality of interpersonal treatment and not motivated by the quality of decision-making. The results also displayed in Table 3 support this hypothesis, with quality of interpersonal treatment predicting helping ( $B = 0.17$ ,  $SE = 0.03$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and quality of decision-making not predicting helping ( $B = 0.003$ ,  $SE = 0.03$ ,  $p = .932$ ). In the next step of a hierarchical regression, helping behaviour at Time 1 was entered to adjust for initial levels in predicting helping behaviour at Time 2. As shown in Table 4, while initial helping is a significant predictor ( $B = 0.60$ ,  $SE = 0.02$ ,  $p < .001$ ), the same pattern of procedural justice aspects persists with treatment, and not decision-making, predicting helping at Time 2.

## Discussion

This study expands upon previous findings that justice plays an important role in shaping coop-

eration with the group. We have argued that specific aspects of procedural justice can act differently and encourage varying degrees of norm-following compliance behaviours and voluntary helping behaviours. Specifically, when an employee perceives their supervisor as neutral and fair in their decision-making, the employee reports an increase in their compliance with norms and expectations. When an employee perceives their supervisor as treating them respectfully and giving them voice, the employee reports an increase in their voluntary efforts to help the group.

Although the general relationship between the justice of group procedures and cooperative behaviour is well established (Tyler & Lind, 1992; Tyler & Blader, 2000; Blader & Tyler, 2003), our goal is to provide a more nuanced view of that relationship. In particular, we seek to distinguish the influence of two aspects of procedural justice: decision-making and interpersonal treatment. These two aspects are shown to form distinct clusters within the general procedural

justice construct. And, of course, they reflect very different issues. Decision-making is about using facts, consistently applying rules, and avoiding personal prejudices when making decisions. Treatment is about respect, courtesy, consideration and treatment with dignity. Hence, it makes sense that these two clusters would be distinct in the minds of those interviewed. One can easily imagine an authority who makes decisions fairly, but who is interpersonally insensitive. Conversely, it is easy to imagine a sensitive, caring authority who makes decisions in particularistic and non-neutral ways.

Two ideas similar to our definitions of neutral decision-making and interpersonal treatment – namely justice and empathy – can be found in the work of Batson (2002). Batson argues that empathy and justice can be in conflict. This conflict occurs because justice involves the application of general principles, while empathy involves emotional reactions to individuals. A cute, blond child needing a kidney transplant, for example, may arouse more empathy than another person who may be more deserving in neutral, rule-based terms. The other person may, for example, have been waiting in the donor line for a longer time. Batson finds that people are sometimes willing to skip the cute person forward in the line, violating principles of fair decision-making. Hence, it is possible to think of situations in which those two aspects of procedural justice might conflict.

One way that these ideas could easily conflict in work settings occurs when an authority listens to and considers the special needs and concerns of one employee, leading them to deviate from the general rules to respond. An employee with a child, for example, may want to go home from work early although the workplace calls for everyone to stay until a set time. By responding to the employee's desire, the authority is showing sensitive and caring interpersonal treatment. They are also acting in a non-neutral way that violates the consistent application of the rules. On the other hand, if the authority considers the employee's request for their personal issues to be taken into account and then rejects it by citing the rules, they are being a fair decision-maker, but are not responding to personal needs.

The procedural justice literature suggests that although authorities face such conflicts they can often be resolved successfully because people focus on whether their concerns are considered, not on whether their requests are granted. As a consequence, authorities can acknowledge particularistic concerns, but still make decisions based upon the consistent application of rules. Of course, to the degree that control models such as that of Thibaut and Walker (1975) are true, people are also concerned about whether they obtain desired outcomes, which limits – though does not eliminate – the strength of 'voice' effects.

Further supporting the idea that different aspects of the group shape different types of be-

haviour is the previously noted study regarding group attitudes and behaviour. Specifically, Tyler and Smith (1999) looked at group-oriented behaviours in relation to pride, defined as one's judgement of the group's status, and respect, defined as one's feeling of their position or reputation within the group. A sample of university students was asked about a group important to their sense of self, while a separate sample of sorority members was asked about their sorority (adjusting for the extent to which their sorority was important to their sense of self). They found that 'conforming behaviours,' analogous to this study's compliance construct, were predicted by an individual's pride in the group. Further, 'assertive behaviours,' analogous to this study's helping construct, were predicted by an individual's perceived respect from the group. If decision-making has some relationship with feelings of pride, while treatment has some relationship with feelings of respect, their findings parallel those reported here.

#### *Justice and cooperation*

Our core point is that, while the connection between procedural justice and cooperative behaviours is well known, the pattern we outline is not. Motivating cooperative behaviours is a key goal of many groups, and finding that specific justice elements more strongly motivate specific cooperative behaviours increases our understanding of people's behaviour in groups and may enable targeting procedures to motivate specific cooperative behaviours.

Of particular note is that the cooperative behaviour items used in this study were not specified as cooperating with one's supervisor. A supervisor acting in procedurally just ways predicted employee cooperative behaviours a year later with co-workers and the organisation as a whole. This is important because cooperation not just with a particular individual but with the group that individual authority represents would be a valuable outcome for the group and particularly necessary for groups in which the authorities one encounters may not be the same individuals (i.e., one may encounter different police officers, who are one kind of authority in society).

An additional important implication from this analysis is the ability to specifically motivate helping. Such extra-role behaviour is widely noted to be of value in many organisations and communities, and the ability to motivate the kind of self-directed, individual initiative of helping behaviours provides groups with substantial flexibility. If employees are motivated to help on voluntary tasks, the organisation is more likely to be viable and effective. In fact, discussions of organisational design often emphasise the desire to build organisations that motivate employees to engage in voluntary helping behaviour beyond that required by formal job requirements (Tyler & Blader, 2000).

It is also important to acknowledge the other side of these findings. In each model adjusting for the level of the other procedural justice aspect, respectful interpersonal treatment cannot motivate employees to comply with company norms and expectations, and neutral decision-making cannot motivate employees to contribute voluntary helpful cooperation. Thus, for example, while supervisors may try to increase their neutrality and the quality of their decision-making in an effort to encourage pro-group behaviour from their employees, they may succeed in encouraging rule following but not be as successful in motivating valuable voluntary efforts without the supervisor also improving their interpersonal treatment. Similarly, increasing the level of respect during interactions with employees may not significantly improve their compliance with the rules if the employees do not also perceive neutral, fair decision-making from the supervisor.

#### *Limitations*

While these results point to many important possibilities, there are some important limitations on the generalisability of these results to groups other than the workplaces represented in this sample. All of the participants in this study were interviewed about a workplace they had been employed by for at least three months, most of them much longer. Being a part of a workplace group is a more voluntary membership than many other kinds of groups, and this leads to a general expectation of some reasonable level of justice in one's workplace. Indeed, few participants reported very low levels of procedural justice leading to the negatively skewed nature of the variables. Also, employees who display very little cooperation with their workgroup (particularly compliance with expected behaviours) are unlikely to remain in their jobs. One might expect them to be fired, or that such low levels of cooperation reflect other underlying problems and correspond to a high likelihood of quitting.

In addition, unlike an experimental manipulation, the two aspects of justice are correlated, and this is not surprising in a real world context. Though likely existing in some cases, as we have noted, one would suspect it would be less common to find supervisors who are extremely respectful but entirely biased towards employees or extremely neutral but entirely disrespectful compared with supervisors who demonstrate comparable levels of these two procedural justice aspects.

Although all analyses of each procedural justice aspect were adjusted for the other procedural justice aspect, the lack of very low levels and the correlated nature of the two aspects limit our knowledge of the extremes of the relationships of procedural justice and cooperation when one or both aspects of justice are entirely absent.

That is, we do not have examples parallel to important issues such as severe violations of one's civil rights in society or demeaning treatment by a police officer. However, this study does give us insight into workplace behaviour, a major and important institution in most people's lives. Furthermore, the focus of this study is on encouraging cooperation which presupposes willingness by the group and its authorities to treat people with justice, rather than a focus on what behaviours occur when justice is neglected.

#### *Future directions*

An important future step is to examine these relationships in an experimental context, in which the quality of decision-making and interpersonal treatment could be independently manipulated and which could include the distinct provision/lack of provision of one or both of the aspects of procedural justice. Similarly, outside of the context of a job, upon which many people are financially dependent, we might see more variance in levels of compliance and helping with other groups to which people belong.

A second important step is to address the psychological mechanisms: the question of *why* procedural justice matters and specifically why these aspects would motivate different behaviours. As noted, our initial theorising of the differential impact was influenced by past research that found that different attitudes about the group influenced different kinds of behaviour (Tyler & Smith, 1999). We suspect that such attitudes may follow from different forms of procedural justice, and this is a possibility worth future research. That is, perhaps these specific group attitudes mediate the relationship of procedural justice aspects to different cooperative behaviours: Decision-making encourages pride in one's group and this pride leads one to comply with the group's norms and expectations while interpersonal treatment encourages feelings of respect in the group which leads one to put forth voluntary helping efforts.

#### **Conclusion**

The repeatedly demonstrated connection between procedural justice and cooperation may contain important nuances and distinctions. The procedural justice aspect of quality of decision-making from one's supervisor motivated compliance with the organisation, but it was not as effective in motivating voluntary helping behaviour. The procedural justice aspect of quality of treatment from one's supervisor motivated such voluntary, extra effort helping behaviour, but it was not as effective in motivating compliance behaviour. Thus, the two aspects of procedural justice act differently, and both are uniquely important in motivating specific, desired cooperative behaviours within group contexts.



## References

- Batson, D. (2002). Justice motivation and moral motivation. In M. Ross and D. Miller (Eds), *The justice motive in everyday life* (pp. 91-106). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). A four component model of procedural justice: Defining the meaning of a fair process. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 747-758.
- Braithwaite, V. (2003). *Taxing democracy*. Aldershot, U. K.: Ashgate.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression / Correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*, 3rd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- De Cremer, D., Snyder, M., & Dewitte, S. (2001). 'The less I trust, the less I contribute (or not)?' The effects of trust, accountability and self-monitoring in social dilemmas. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 93-107.
- De Cremer, D. & Tyler, T. R. (2005). Managing group behavior: The interplay between procedural justice, sense of self, and cooperation (volume 37, pp. 151-218). Mark Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. New York: Academic Press.
- De Cremer, D., Tyler, T. R., & den Ouden, N. (2005). Managing cooperation via procedural fairness: The mediating influence of self-other merging. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 26, 393-406.
- Feld, L. P., & Frey, B. S. (2007). Tax compliance as the results of a psychological tax contract. *Law and Policy*, 29, 102-120.
- Frey, B. S., & Osterloh, M. (2002). *Successful management by motivation: Balancing intrinsic and extrinsic incentives*. Berlin: Springer.
- Grimes, M. (2006). Organizing consent: The role of procedural fairness in political trust and compliance. *European Journal of Political Research*, 45, 285-315.
- Hoffman, B. J., Blair, C. A., Meriac, J. P., & Woehr, D. J. (2007). Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of the OCB literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 555-566.
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 52-65.
- Levi, M. (1988). *Of rule and revenue*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levi, M. (1997). *Consent, dissent, and patriotism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levi, M., & Stoker, L. (2000). Political trust and trustworthiness. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3, 475-507.
- May, P. J. (2005). Regulation and compliance motivations: Examining different approaches. *Public Administration Review*, 65, 31-44.
- Mulder, L. B. (2008). The difference between punishments and rewards in the promotion of moral concerns in social decision-making. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 1436-1443.
- Mulder, L. B., Van Dijk, E., De Cremer, D., & Wilke, H. A. M. (2006). Undermining trust and cooperation: The paradox of sanctioning systems in social dilemmas. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 147-162.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10, 85-97.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006a). *Why people obey the law*. New Haven: Yale.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006b). Legitimacy and legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 375-400.
- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2000). *Cooperation in groups*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Tyler, T. R. & Blader, S. L. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 349-361.
- Tyler, T. R., & DeGoeij, P. (1995). Collective restraint in a social dilemma situation: The influence of procedural justice and community identification on the empowerment and legitimacy of authority. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 482-497.
- Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities? *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 6, 231-275.
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law*. New York: Russell-Sage.
- Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.) *Advances in experimental social psychology*, vol. 25 (pp. 115-191). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Tyler, T. R., & Smith, H. J. (1999). Justice, social identity, and group processes. In T. R. Tyler, R. M. Kramer & O. P. John (Eds.) *The psychology of the social self* (pp. 223-264). Mahaw, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tyler, T. R., & Wakslak, C. (2004). Profiling and the legitimacy of the police: Procedural justice, attributions of motive, and the acceptance of social authority. *Criminology*, 42, 13-42.