The paradox of the disrespected: Disrespected group members’ engagement in group-serving efforts
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Abstract

Previous research has demonstrated that intra-group respect can strengthen people’s group identification, and encourage them to exert themselves on behalf of their group. In the present contribution, we focus on the possibility that those who are not respected by other group members (i.e., the disrespected) can also display group beneficial behavior. Experiment 1 (N = 159) confirms this paradoxical premise and reveals that systematically disrespected group members indeed exert themselves on group-serving tasks. These findings were replicated in Experiment 2 (N = 110). Additional indicators in Experiment 2 demonstrate that the effort by systematically disrespected group members cannot be attributed to a desire to improve their acceptance in the group, but should be interpreted as attempts to assert the worth of the self separately from the group. Results are discussed in relation to the group-value model and insights on marginal group membership and social exclusion.
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Introduction

Recent theory and research examining what may lead group members to exert themselves on behalf of a group has established the importance of intra-group respect. The most prominent approach in this context, the group-value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Blader, 2000; Tyler, Degoey, & Smith, 1996; Tyler & Lind, 1992) has argued that intra-group interactions that lead people to feel respected as group members reinforce their engagement with the group and encourage them to participate in the achievement of group goals and to show group-supportive behavior (De Cremer, 2003; Simon & Stürmer, 2003; Smith & Tyler, 1997; Smith, Tyler, Hoo, Ortiz, & Lind, 1998; Tyler & Smith, 1998; Tyler & Blader, 2000, 2001, 2002). In the present contribution, we argue that a more complex situation arises when respect from other group members is not forthcoming, as in this case contradictory considerations possibly play a role. On the one hand, the reasoning proposed by the group-value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Smith & Tyler, 1997; Tyler & Lind, 1992) would predict that lack of respect undermines psychological and behavioral involvement with the group, resulting in reduced identification and effort. On the other hand, however, the literature on social exclusion and marginal group membership (Jetten, Branscombe, & Spears, 2002; Noel, Wann, & Branscombe, 1995) suggests that a lack of respect from other group members...
will tend to motivate people to display the behavior that shows their loyalty and worth to the group, implying that they maintain their identification with the group and show increased effort. To address these contradictory predictions and examine how we can combine insights from these two literatures, in the present paper we will focus on the case of those who are disrespected, and examine the psychological as well as actual behavioral responses that emerge as a result.

The importance of intra-group respect

In line with the social-identity/self-categorization approach, which proposes that people's group-based identity tends to constitute an important guideline for the social perceptions and behaviors of individual group members (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), it has been examined how different group characteristics can motivate individuals to think of themselves and behave in terms of their group membership (Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992). However, more recently, it was proposed that social identity considerations might also apply to intra-group dynamics. That is, to the extent that memberships in social groups are important for people, they should also be concerned about the way they compare to other members of their group, in addition to the question of how their group compares to other groups.

This reasoning was formalized in the group-value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Blader, 2000; Tyler & Lind, 1992), which focuses on how intra-group interactions can communicate the individual's standing in the group, which is denoted as intra-group respect (Tyler et al., 1996). The main argument is that when people feel respected, they will value the group more, and will be more willing to invest in the group (see Tyler & Blader, 2000 for an overview). Indeed, research demonstrated that perceptions of intra-group respect covary with measures of identification or commitment to the group and the willingness to exert effort on behalf of it (Branscombe, Spears, Ellemers, & Doosje, 2002; De Cremer, 2003; De Cremer & Tyler, 2005; Simon & Stürmer, 2003; Smith & Tyler, 1997; Smith et al., 1998; Tyler, 1999; Tyler & Blader, 2000, 2001, 2002).

Consequences of disrespect

Research on the group-value model so far, has focused on demonstrating the motivational force of intra-group respect, independently of material rewards (see Tyler & Blader, 2000). Thus, correlational data were collected to investigate how the quality of interpersonal treatment conveys feelings of respect, which in turn are related to identification and supportive behaviors on behalf of the group (De Cremer & Tyler, 2005; Smith & Tyler, 1997; Tyler, 1999; Tyler & Blader, 2000, 2001, 2002). Additionally, it has been examined how experimental manipulations that convey differential intra-group respect impact upon behavioral intentions and resource allocations (Branscombe et al., 2002; De Cremer, 2002, 2003; Simon & Stürmer, 2003; Tyler & Blader, 2001). However, to date, relatively less attention has been devoted to study the effects of being disrespected as a group member, except that this is considered to result in a comparative lack of identification and effort.

Although on the basis of previous research it would seem that those who are disrespected should be less inclined to exert themselves on behalf of the group, this is by no means a foregone conclusion. In fact, we propose that the case of disrespected group members is particularly interesting, precisely because in this case there is reason to believe that self-reported willingness to invest in the group does not reliably predict people's actual behavior on group tasks. Self-reports can only be taken as an indicator of actual behavior to the extent that people are both able to indicate the behavior they will display, and are willing to report this truthfully. However, in the case of disrespect, the psychological mechanisms that may help group members cope with this negatively laden self-relevant information are likely to elicit self-presentational or reactive considerations that guide their self-reports, which is not necessarily mirrored in the actual behavior they display (Ellemers, Barreto, & Spears, 1999). Assuming that in the case of disrespect different psychological mechanisms are likely to play a role than in the case of respect, we conclude that a combination of self-reported and behavioral measures is necessary to uncover how people respond when they are disrespected, and to assess how this affects their actual behavior in the group.

Social exclusion and peripheral group membership

The literature on social exclusion, in which the need to belong is considered a basic human motive (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), posits that those who are socially excluded experience a lack of belongingness, which elicits feelings of anxiety and distress (Eisenberger, Lieberman, & Williams, 2003). As a result, people who feel their sense of belongingness is in jeopardy, should be highly motivated to display those behaviors that will gain them social acceptance (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Williams & Sommer, 1997). Accordingly, group members who felt their position in the group was marginal or peripheral, have been observed to endorse behaviors that might show their worth as group members, presumably in order to demonstrate their deservings of full membership in the group (De Cremer, 2002; Jetten et al., 2002; Noel et al., 1995). In a similar vein, we propose that disrespect implies the threat of social exclusion (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 2002). Therefore, disrespected group members should be motivated to
show their worth to the group, for instance by displaying increased effort on behalf of it (Jetten et al., 2002).

**Separating intra-group respect from group attractiveness**

At first sight, this would seem to indicate that the group-value model (suggesting that disrespect should result in decreased identification and effort) yields different predictions than previous work on social exclusion and marginal group membership (indicating that those who feel their standing in the group is insecure respond by showing increased effort on behalf of the group). However, we argue that this is not necessarily the case, and with the present research we aim to reconcile both approaches. In doing this, it is important to note that the instances where marginal group membership resulted in increased adherence to group norms or group-supportive behavior emerged in situations where these individuals aspired to full membership and inclusion in the group (Jetten et al., 2002; Noel et al., 1995).

Although the desire to be included and respected may represent a generic need (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), we emphasize that this does not necessarily imply that people want to be respected and included by any group they encounter. For instance, when we are assigned to a temporary work team, or find ourselves grouped together with other parents just because our children participate in the same activities, we do not necessarily care too much whether or not we are accepted by and included in the group. Indeed, recent research where the effects of respect afforded by the ingroup were separated from respect received from outgroup members, indicated that people attach more importance to respect from groups that are more relevant to the self (Ellemers, Doosje, & Spears, 2004; see also Tyler & Lind, 1992). Accordingly, it has been proposed that the possibility of being excluded from the group only constitutes a threat for those who identify with that group (Ellemers et al., 2002). Previous research on marginal or peripheral group membership focused on groups that were important for the self, for instance sorority/fraternity pledges who were in the process of gaining acceptance into a group they found subjectively attractive (Noel et al., 1995; Smith & Tyler, 1997). However, keeping in mind that people usually have the option of seeing themselves in terms of multiple groups (Van Rijswijk, Haslam, & Ellemers, in press), it may well be that people who are insecure about their acceptance into one group, then start thinking of themselves as (accepted) members of another group. This implies that when people are disrespected by their fellow group members, in the case they continue to identify with the group they should engage in efforts that may help them gain acceptance into the group (in line with what the literature on marginal group membership would suggest). However, this is not necessarily the case when the lack of respect they receive causes them to disidentify with this particular group (consistent with what the group-value model would propose; see also Jetten, Branscombe, Spears, & McKimmie, 2003). Thus, in retrospect, we assume that the seeming inconsistency between predictions from the group-value model and theories of social exclusion may be resolved when we consider that previous research on marginal group membership actually examined the joint effect of marginal group membership and identification based on the a priori attractiveness of the group. By contrast, previous research on the group-value model examined how identification with the group was affected due to variations in intra-group respect.

**The present research**

In the present research, we combine insights from these two theoretical perspectives, and use more specific measures to examine how disrespect affects the way the group makes the self feel by assessing feelings of anxiety about acceptance by the group and feelings of belongingness, in addition to determining how the self feels about the group, with measures of willingness to work with the group (Experiment 1) and group identification (Experiment 2). We predict that disrespect elicits anxiety about acceptance by the group (motivating people to show their worth to the group) on the one hand, but lack of belongingness (lowering their willingness to invest in the group) on the other. On the basis of existing theory and previous research, it is not possible to infer how these contradictory considerations will affect behavioral investment in the group. Therefore, we will examine the effects of respect versus disrespect on the amount of actual effort displayed on group tasks, in addition to assessing the psychological consequences of respect and disrespect.

**Experiment 1**

In Experiment 1, we induced different levels of respect in collaborative task groups, to experimentally assess their effects on group-serving efforts. To extend previous work in this area (Branscombe et al., 2002; De Cremer, 2002, 2003; Simon & Stürmer, 2003) that relied on expressed intentions, we used behavioral observations to assess actual engagement in group-serving tasks. We varied the contextual belief systems under which these efforts were displayed, in order to check the robustness of the behavioral effects of intra-group respect. That is, we explored whether differential displays of effort could be observed on a group task due to variations in intra-group respect, regardless of whether group members worked in a collectivistic group context (where priority was placed on collective goals and cooperative action), or in an individualistic group context (that focused on
the maximization of individual goals and individual achievements; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998; Wagner, 1995).

Because the current research focuses on the effects of disrespect, we have opted to use two dimensions of group-relevant behavior to induce this state. That is, in a task group setting we manipulated the respect participants received from fellow ingroup members for self-reported previous individual achievements and the respect they received for self-reported previous cooperation (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). Systematic disrespect was conveyed by leading participants to believe that their fellow group members devalued them on both these dimensions. We did this because (as also indicated above) self-defensive strategies and coping mechanisms can cause people to discount negative self-relevant information, for instance, by considering the criterion on which they are negatively evaluated as irrelevant, and focusing on another performance domain instead (Schmader, Major, Eccleston, & McCoy, 2001).

Method

Participants and design
Students of Leiden University (N = 159, mean age: 19.8 years) participated voluntarily in this experiment. The duration of the experiment was 50 minutes, for which they received 4.5€. Participants (36 men, 123 women) were randomly assigned and proportionally distributed across conditions of a 2 (contextual norm: individualistic/collectivistic) by 2 (respect for individual achievements: high/low) by 2 (respect for cooperation: high/low) factorial design.

Experimental procedure: introduction and cover story
Students at Leiden University were invited to the laboratory to participate in a study on how people work in task-groups. Participants (eight persons per session) were seated in separate cubicles, containing a computer with a monitor and a keyboard; participants were told that they could communicate with each other by means of the computer network. The computers were used to provide all instructions, ask questions and collect participants’ responses. Participants started by practicing a computer-task (pre-test), consisting of thirty 3-digit numbers (e.g., 112, 212, etc.), they had to enter as fast as they could. Then participants were told a cover story, explaining that this was an investigation into team collaboration in financial/administrative organizations. A bogus personality test followed, which allegedly allowed the experimenter to divide the participants that were present into two four-person teams with the same problem-solving style (Noel et al., 1995). In reality, all participants were told that they were holistic-focused problem solvers; they received pre-programmed information to simulate the alleged responses of other members of their task-group.

Contextual norm manipulation
Subsequently, an instruction about “how to work in a task-group” was provided, in which an individualistic or collectivistic contextual norm was manipulated. That is, the simulated organization was portrayed as valuing and rewarding individual performance, individual effort and competition in the individualistic condition, and cooperation, shared benefits, and teamwork in the collectivistic condition. Later in the experiment, after the respect manipulation, this manipulation was strengthened by statements allegedly endorsed by their fellow group members, which emphasized individualistic (e.g., “It is important that I do my job better than others”) or collectivistic values (e.g., “Employees within a task-group should stick together, no matter what sacrifices are required”; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

Respect manipulations
Next, each participant was asked to provide some personal information by typing a brief summary statement on the computer, ostensibly for the purpose of getting to know each other better (see Branscombe et al., 2002). Specifically, participants were asked to relate one example of a successful individual achievement that they were proud of, and one example of an unsuccessful individual achievement that they were ashamed of. In a similar vein, they were asked to reveal one favorable cooperation of which they were proud, and one unfavorable cooperation of which they were ashamed. Subsequently, participants were asked to evaluate their fellow ingroup members on a nine-point scale (1 = little respect, 9 = great respect), based on the behavioral descriptions they had ostensibly provided (NB: participants could not evaluate themselves). Participants were led to believe that their fellow ingroup members were evaluating them based on their behavioral descriptions. In reality, all participants received standardized pre-programmed feedback, containing behavioral episodes that had been rated equally positive (e.g., “At work, somebody had a stroke and I applied first aid”), or equally negative (e.g., “I failed my driving license test three times in a row”) in a pilot study. Respect in terms of both individual achievements and cooperation was manipulated by informing participants about the way they had supposedly been evaluated by other ingroup members, based on the behavioral descriptions they themselves had provided. In the case of low respect for individual achievements, they were informed that, on average, other ingroup members had rated their performance lower (4.3) than the neutral point (6), and that their score was lower than judgments received by other ingroup members (which were stated to be 6, 5.3, and 6.7, respectively). In the high respect for individual achievements condition, participants were led to believe that their score (7.7) was above the neutral point, and higher than the evaluations of fellow ingroup members.
(which were stated to be 6, 5.3, and 6.7, respectively). High respect for cooperation (7.7) vs. low respect for cooperation (4.3) was manipulated with similar instructions (fellow ingroup members’ evaluations were stated to be 6, 5, and 7 respectively, to avoid suspicion about the veridical nature of these scores). After the respect manipulation, dependent measures followed.

Dependent variables
Participants were asked to answer a series of statements, starting with the manipulation checks.

Manipulation checks
The perception of an individualistic contextual norm or collectivistic contextual norm was measured with two items. One referred to the individualistic contextual norm “To what extent is individual effort and initiative important in task-groups?” (1 = not at all, 7 = very much), and a similar item referred to the collectivistic contextual norm “To what extent is cooperation and teamwork important in task-groups?” (1 = not at all, 7 = very much). To measure perceived respect for individual achievements and respect for cooperation, participants were asked to what extent they agreed with the following two statements “To what extent do you think your fellow group-members respect you for your individual achievements?” (1 = not at all, 7 = very much), and “To what extent do you think your fellow group-members respect you for your ways of cooperation?” (1 = not at all, 7 = very much).

Feelings of belongingness
The degree to which people felt they belonged to their task-group was measured with two items (r = .49, p < .001), e.g., “At this moment, I feel at home among my fellow group members in this task-group” (1 = totally disagree, 7 = totally agree), adapted from Ellemers, De Gilder, & Van den Heuvel (1998; cf. De Cremer, 2003).

Anxiety about acceptance by the group
The extent to which people had anxiety about their acceptance by the group was measured with four questions (α = .80) adapted from the Social Group Attachment Scale (Smith, Murphy, & Coats, 1999). These items were four items from the anxiety subscale and were suitable for the studies. The scale assessed any doubts (1 = not at all, 7 = very much) participants might have about being seen as a fully accepted group member, containing items such as “I worry that my group does not really accept me”.

After answering these statements, participants were told that the study continued with its main goal: gaining more insight in effects of implementing task-groups in financial/administrative organizations. A computer-task followed.

Group task effort
The group-task, which was presented as “a simplified version of the work employees in financial/administrative organizations do”, was similar to the task they had practiced at the start of the experiment. Participants had to enter four rounds of thirty 3-digit numbers at the highest possible speed; the less time participants took to complete this task, the greater their effort (speed). Participants were told that only their collective effort as a group would be judged, and that no information would be provided about their individual performance.

Discretionary effort
After participants had completed the group task, they were told that it would be possible to work on an additional group task on a voluntary basis. It was stated that they could use this additional task to improve their group’s previous performance. Again, it was emphasized that their efforts on this additional task could only serve to enhance the score of the group. This additional round was slightly different from the former task, as it consisted of entering as many 3-digit numbers (e.g., 112, 211, etc.) as possible within two minutes. Thus, greater effort on this voluntary group-task was indicated by a higher amount of numbers entered (persistence). It was emphasized that this was a voluntary, additional task, and participants were allowed to stop any time they wanted. Because this measure yielded scores that were not normally distributed (skewness = −2.703), we classified the scores on this task into five categories representing equal amounts of participants (Mead, 1988) without loss or disturbance of information (Heatcoate, Popiel, & Mewhort, 1991; cut-off points were the 20%, 40%, 60%, and 80%). This resulted in an acceptable skewness = .02.

Willingness to continue working with the group
After participants had finished working on the voluntary group task, two questions were posed to assess their willingness to continue working together with the group. On seven-point bipolar scales they were asked to indicate the extent to which they would prefer to work on their own (1) instead of continuing to work together with the same group members (7), and to what extent they would prefer to work with others (1) instead of continuing to work together with the same group members (7). The scores on these two questions were aggregated, r (159) = .63, p < .001, for further analysis; higher aggregate scores indicated greater willingness to continue working with the group.

Upon completion of this measure, participants were asked to indicate their age and gender, after which they were told that the experiment had finished. They were paid and fully debriefed.
Results

Unless otherwise indicated, all measures were analyzed with 2 (contextual norm) by 2 (respect for individual achievements) by 2 (respect for cooperation) analyses of variance. Because we anticipated that behavioral effort would increase both in the respect (high/high) condition (as predicted by the group-value model) and in the systematic disrespect (low/low) condition (as a response to marginal group membership), as compared to a situation where people receive moderate respect (high/low or low/high), any significant two-way interactions on the behavioral effort measures were followed up by examining this predicted contrast (1 − 1 − 1; Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1996).

Manipulation checks

Participants in the individualistic contextual norm condition agreed more that individual effort and initialitions on the behavioral effort measures were followed up with systematic disrespect (low/low) condition (as predicted by the group-value model) and respect for cooperation reported greater anxiety (M = 3.46; SD = 1.28) than participants who had received low respect for cooperation reported greater anxiety (M = 3.65; SD = 1.25) than high respect for individual achievements (M = 2.79; SD = 1.00), F(1, 151) = 24.47, p < .001, η² = .14. Likewise, those who had received low respect for individual achievements reported greater anxiety (M = 3.63; SD = 1.52) than participants who had received high respect for cooperation (M = 2.98; SD = 1.08), F(1, 151) = 7.71, p < .01, η² = .05.

Feelings of belongingness

The feelings of belongingness scale yielded significant main effects of both respect for individual achievements and respect for cooperation. High respect for individual achievements (M = 5.29; SD = 1.07) induced more feelings of belongingness with the task-group than low respect for individual achievements (M = 4.52; SD = 1.11), F(1, 151) = 20.45, p < .001, η² = .12. Similarly, high respect for cooperation (M = 5.12; SD = 1.17) resulted in more feelings of belongingness with the task-group than low respect for cooperation (M = 4.69; SD = 1.10), F(1, 151) = 6.56, p < .02, η² = .04.

Group task effort

We examined participants’ effort on the group-task, as an initial indicator of the extent to which they displayed behavior to the benefit of the group. When analyzing the speed at which participants completed their assignment (time spent to complete the task, so that more effort is evident from a lower score) for the benefit of the task-group, the initial performance on the computer task (pretest score) was used as covariate and respect for cooperation reported greater anxiety (M = 3.63; SD = 1.52) than participants who had received low respect for cooperation reported greater anxiety (M = 3.65; SD = 1.25) than high respect for individual achievements (M = 2.79; SD = 1.00), F(1, 151) = 24.47, p < .001, η² = .14. Likewise, those who had received low respect for individual achievements reported greater anxiety (M = 3.63; SD = 1.52) than participants who had received high respect for cooperation (M = 2.98; SD = 1.08), F(1, 151) = 7.71, p < .01, η² = .05.

Table 1
Means and standard deviations of group task effort as a function of respect for individual achievements and respect for cooperation (Experiment 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respect for individual achievements</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>M (SD) = 38.73 (5.34)</td>
<td>39.42 (5.44)</td>
<td>39.97 (5.63)</td>
<td>38.41 (4.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means are in number of seconds, necessary to complete the task, with lower values indicating greater group task effort (speed).
group task by highly respected as well as systematically disrespected group members compared to those who were moderately respected.

Discretionary effort
When analyzing results on the discretionary task (i.e., the number of items completed, so that higher scores indicate greater effort), again individual performance on the pretest was used as a covariate, \( F(1,150) = 79.87, p < .001, \eta^2 = .35 \), to correct for individual differences in work speed. This analysis only revealed a significant three-way interaction \( F(1,150) = 5.70, p < .05, \eta^2 = .04 \) (cell means and standard deviations of the discretionary group efforts measure are displayed in Table 2). To break down this complex interaction, we examined lower order effects in each of the contextual norm conditions. In the collectivistic norm condition, no significant lower order interactions or main effects were obtained. However, in the individualistic contextual norm condition, after correction for work speed differences on the pretest, \( \beta = -.58, t(1,150) = -8.94, p < .001 \), we obtained a significant two-way interaction \( F(1,150) = 5.59, p < .05, \eta^2 = .04 \). In addition, the predicted contrast was significant, \( F(7,150) = 5.69, p < .05, \eta^2 = .04, r_{\text{contrast}} = .19, r_{\text{effect size}} = .19, r_{\text{alerting}} = .81 \), offering support for our main hypothesis. That is, the discretionary task reveals that, when intra-group differences matter (in the individualistic contextual norm condition), an increase in voluntary group-serving effort is more likely to emerge among respected (high/high) and systematically disrespected (low/low) group members than among those who are moderately respected (high/low and low/high).

Willingness to continue working with the group
Analysis of variance on the willingness to continue working with the group yielded a significant main effect of respect for individual achievement, \( F(1,151) = 14.56, p < .001, \eta^2 = .09 \). Participants showed less willingness to continue working with the group when respect for individual achievements was low (\( M = 3.91; SD = 1.44 \)) than after having received high respect for individual achievements (\( M = 4.74; SD = 1.32 \)). Likewise, we observed a main effect of respect for cooperation, \( F(1,151) = 3.62, p < .06, \eta^2 = .02 \). That is, participants demonstrated less willingness to continue working with the group when respect for cooperation was low (\( M = 4.12; SD = 1.51 \)) than when respect for cooperation was high (\( M = 4.53; SD = 1.34 \)). Together these main effects caused participants who were systematically disrespected to be significantly less willing to continue working with the group (low/low: \( M = 3.56; SD = 1.45 \)) than participants in the other conditions (high/high: \( M = 4.80; SD = 1.28 \); high/low: \( M = 4.68; SD = 1.38 \); and low/high: \( M = 4.26; SD = 1.36 \)). A planned contrast comparing the low/low cell with the other three respect conditions (1 1 1 3) confirms that this difference is significant, \( F(3,151) = 6.62, p < .001, \eta^2 = .12, r_{\text{contrast}} = .31, r_{\text{effect size}} = .31, \) and \( r_{\text{alerting}} = .91 \).

To explore how the different responses to respect and disrespect relate to each other, we correlated the willingness to continue working with the group with anxiety about acceptance by the group and belongingness. This revealed a significant negative correlation between anxiety and willingness to continue working with the group, \( r(159) = -.34, p < .001 \), and a reliable positive correlation between belongingness and willingness to continue working with the group, \( r(159) = .37, p < .001 \). That is, group members were less willing to continue working with the group when they were more anxious about their acceptance, and more willing to work with the group when they experienced greater belongingness.

Discussion
In this first study, we examined psychological as well as behavioral effects of disrespect, in order to uncover whether people who are devalued by their fellow group members respond by lowering their psychological and behavioral commitment to the group (as would be predicted by the group-value model), or maintain their interest in the group, and display increased effort to secure their inclusion in the group (in line with work on social exclusion and marginal group membership). When we look at the different self-report measures and the correlations between them, these seem to be in line with predictions based on the group-value model. That is, the different indicators of the psychological state people are in due to our respect manipulations suggest that when the group is not attractive in its own right, the threat of exclusion (increased anxiety and decreased

---

Table 2
Means and standard deviations of discretionary effort on behalf of the collective as a function of contextual norm, respect for individual achievements and respect for cooperation (Experiment 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respect for cooperation</th>
<th>Respect for individual achievements</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Respect for individual achievements</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contextual norm: individualistic</td>
<td>( M ) (( SD ))</td>
<td>3.00 (1.30)</td>
<td>2.60 (1.22)</td>
<td>2.38 (1.31)</td>
<td>3.20 (1.39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual norm: collectivistic</td>
<td>( M ) (( SD ))</td>
<td>2.69 (1.41)</td>
<td>3.10 (1.51)</td>
<td>3.06 (1.64)</td>
<td>2.97 (1.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Higher values indicate greater discretionary efforts (persistence).*
belongingness) that results when people are systematically disrespected by their fellow group members is accompanied by the desire to disengage the self from the group.

However, the behavioral measures show a different pattern, which seems to be more consistent with the reasoning based on social exclusion and marginal group membership. That is, we observed that those who are systematically disrespected display increased behavioral effort on obligatory as well as voluntary group tasks, which is similar to the behavior of those who are highly respected. It is important to note that this occurred despite their lack of belongingness and reluctance to continue working with the group. Thus, the picture that emerges from people’s self-reported psychological states is different from the pattern displayed by the results of the behavioral measures.

On the one hand, this underlines the added value of including self-report measures as well as behavioral measures in the same study, as this offers a richer and more complete view on the way people respond to respect and disrespect. Indeed, like we anticipated on the basis of previous research (e.g., Ellemers et al., 1999), particularly for those who were systematically disrespected, the self-reported psychological state is not directly reflected in the behavioral effort that is displayed. On the other hand, however, the fact that neither of the two theoretical frameworks we proposed seems to be able to fully account for this pattern of results raises the question of how to interpret these findings. So why would systematically disrespected group members continue to exert themselves on group tasks while they express a lack of interest in the group?

We propose that in addition to the two lines of reasoning proposed by the group-value model and work on social exclusion and marginal group membership, respectively, there may be a third response pattern, in which notions from these two theoretical perspectives are combined. We speculate that more individualistic concerns triggered by the systematic disrespect conveyed by one’s fellow group members could have motivated people to show increased behavioral effort on the only task that was available to them in this situation, namely the group task. This would imply that their efforts were not necessarily intended to help the group, but possibly stemmed from the desire to assert their self-worth, relatively independently of whether or not this would improve the respect they receive from others in this particular group.

In sum, the findings of Experiment 1 provide preliminary evidence in support of our reasoning that processes described by the group-value model and insights about social exclusion and marginal group membership should be combined to understand the psychological and behavioral effects of disrespect. At the same time, these results raise the possibility that in addition to the concern for acceptance into the group that is the focus of work on social exclusion and marginal group membership, more individualistic self-focused concerns may play a role when people are disrespected by members of a group that has no particular significance for them. In Experiment 2, we will examine the robustness of these findings, and further examine the extent to which group-focused versus self-focused concerns can explain the behavior of disrespected group members.

**Experiment 2**

In Experiment 2, we aim to replicate the main findings of Experiment 1, and extend these with additional data focusing in particular on the different motives that systematically disrespected group members may have to engage in group-serving effort. In doing this, we will elaborate on the notion that in addition to group-focused considerations, self-focused concerns play a role (Branscombe et al., 2002; Leung, Tong, & Ho, 2004). Accordingly, the increased effort displayed by systematically disrespected group members does not necessarily imply that people work towards greater acceptance into this particular group. Indeed, as we have argued above, this is only likely to be the case when the group is sufficiently attractive for the individual. When, however, the rejection by other group members leads people to disidentify with the group (Buckley, Winkel, & Leary, 2004), there is always the possibility of seeking the association with another set of individuals in an alternative group that might be more appreciative of one’s qualities (Bettencourt, Dorr, Charton, & Hume, 2001; Ellemers, 1993; Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1997). In other words, whereas acceptance anxiety and lack of belongingness can motivate people to increase their behavioral efforts, it is important to note that to the extent that a self-motivate is at work instead of a group-motive, this does not necessarily imply that these efforts are intended to increase acceptance into this group. Instead, we propose that a self-motivated performance increase might just as well constitute an attempt to maintain a positive self-image independently of the group or is intended to gain acceptance into another group. To be able to assess more explicitly to what extent people continue to identify with the group after they realize they are systematically disrespected by other group members, in the second study we include a measure of ingroup identification, in addition to assessing acceptance anxiety and lack of belongingness.

To contrast the operation of group-focused motives with self-focused motives that may explain the behavioral efforts of systematically disrespected group members, the design of Experiment 2 was adapted to experimentally separate the different goals that might be achieved with displays of effort on the group-task. To assess the extent to which inclusion motives encourage group
members to engage in effort contributive to the group, we created an experimental condition in which group members had to excel on a group-task in order to remain included in the group (Jetten et al., 2003; Noel et al., 1995). This was contrasted with another condition, where the group-task allegedly served to decide who would be able to leave the group (Ellemers, 1993). Thus, rather than obtaining self-reports about the intentions or aims systematically disrespected group members might have to exert themselves on behalf of the group, the present study was designed in such a way that we could reliably infer whether group-related or self-related motives played a role from the behavior people displayed. We did this by focusing on a group task (Tyler & Blader, 2000), which was adapted in such a way that we could directly observe the amount of actual effort invested to be able to stay or to leave the group.

At first sight, asking people to exert themselves on a group-task in order to be able to leave the group may seem odd, and out of touch with reality outside the lab. However, in real life too, sometimes we find ourselves in situations where the only way to improve our personal situation is through working with the group, even when we are actually hoping to leave the group. For instance, a soccer player who has the ambition to continue his career in another team may work hard to make his own team win as this is the only way to show off his individual skills as a team player, and obtain an offer that will help him transfer out of the team.

In Experiment 2, in addition to self-reported levels of feelings of belongingness and group acceptance anxiety, we also attempted to assess more unobtrusively to what extent people were primarily concerned with the group or with the self. In doing this, we built on group-value theory and research (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Lind, 1992) arguing that people will be more attentive to fairness and justice information when they perceive themselves as belonging to this social group (Skitka, 2003). By contrast, when people feel excluded from the group, instead of claiming the situation to be unjust, they simply cease to care about the fairness of their relations with others in the group, and cognitively switch off from further considering these relations in terms of fairness (Van Prooijen, Van den Bos, & Wilke, 2004). Based on these findings, we argue that when systematically disrespected group members focus on the self as an independent agent, this implies that they will be less concerned with their relations with others which should be evident from the decreased cognitive accessibility of justice and fairness concerns.

Method

Participants and Design

Students of Leiden University ($N=110$; mean age: 20.5 years) participated voluntarily in this experiment. The duration of the experiment was 50 minutes for which they received 4.5€. Participants (46 men, 64 women) were randomly assigned and proportionally distributed across conditions to cells of a 2 (respect for individual achievements: high/low) by 2 (respect for cooperation: high/low) by 2 (work motive: leave/stay) factorial design.

Experimental Procedure

In Experiment 2, we used the same introduction, cover story, and respect manipulation as in Experiment 1, with the exception of the contextual norm manipulation. Checks for the respect manipulations were identical to the ones used in Experiment 1. To further check the combined effects of our manipulations on the two dimensions of respect, this time we also assessed how participants perceived their intra-group status (De Cremer & Tyler, 2004), with one item, “How high do you think your status in the group is?” (1 = very low, 7 = very high). Feelings of belongingness ($r = .29, p < .002$), and anxiety about acceptance by others in the group ($z = .84$) were assessed with the same questions that were used in Experiment 1. Additionally, we measured identification with the group to get an indication to what extend participants defined themselves as group members. The degree of identification with the taskgroup was measured with a four-item scale ($z = .85$), e.g.: “I identify with my fellow group members” (1 = totally disagree, 7 = totally agree), adapted from Ellemers et al. (1997).

Cognitive accessibility of justice and fairness

To assess the cognitive accessibility of the justice and fairness construct, we used a lexical decision task (Miedema, Van den Bos, & Vermunt, 2000; see also Bargh & Chartrand, 1999), which was presented as a word recognition task (Neely, 1991). Participants were instructed to respond as accurately and as quickly as possible to series of letters, to indicate whether or not these letters formed an existing Dutch word. Reaction times (in milliseconds) were recorded by the computer. The task consisted of eighteen rounds of words and non-words, and comprised three Dutch words that were related to justice and fairness (e.g., “justice”). These were matched with three neutral Dutch words (with a comparable amount of letters and syllables, and that had a similar occurrence frequency in the Dutch language when requested in Google.nl), to be able to compare the reaction times for the target words with those for the neutral Dutch words. This resulted in the six target words; just (rechtvaardig) versus radiant heater (straalkachel), respect (respect) versus track (landweg), and fair (eerlijk) versus headlight (koplamp). Reaction times above or below three standard deviations from the mean were fixed on, respectively, three standard deviations above or below the mean (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998).
Work motive manipulation

After completing the lexical decision task, participants were told that it was very likely that in the ‘second part’ of the study, the composition of the task-groups had to be changed. In the ‘work to stay’ condition, participants were led to believe that those who would perform best at the group-task that would follow would be allowed to stay in the same group. In the ‘work to leave condition’, participants were told that those who would perform best at the group-task that would follow would be allowed to leave their task-group.

Motivated group efforts

Then participants started to work on the computer task. The task was very similar to the voluntary group task in Experiment 1, except that this time participants were given three times two minutes to enter as many digits as possible which made the outcomes more robust. It was emphasized that individual efforts on the task would not be reviewed, so that their efforts could only benefit the group. As in Experiment 1, to correct for skewness (−1.28; Heatcoate et al., 1991; Mead, 1988), the scores on this task were recoded into five categories, based on percentile scores. This resulted in an acceptable skewness = .08.

Manipulation checks

The manipulation of work motive (‘work to stay’ or ‘work to leave’) was checked with two items (1 = not at all convinced, 7 = very much convinced), “To what extent are you convinced that you will be allowed to stay within your task-group when you are one of the best performers on the group-task?”, and “To what extent are you convinced that you will be allowed to leave your task-group when you are one of the best performers on the group-task?”. Finally, participants were asked to indicate their age and gender, and they were told that the experiment had finished. They were paid and fully debriefed.

Results

Unless otherwise indicated, all analyses were conducted with 2 (respect for individual achievements) by 2 (respect for cooperation) analyses of variance. Based on the results found in Experiment 1, our main prediction in this second study was that systematically disrespected (low/low) group members would differ from moderately respected (low/high; high/low) or highly respected (high/high) group members. Therefore, we used planned contrasts (ordered from high/high; low/high; high/low; low/low; 11 1−1 1−3) on the cognitive accessibility of justice and fairness concerns and motivated group efforts to follow up on any significant interactions (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1996).

Manipulation checks: respect

Participants in the high respect for individual achievements condition (M = 6.24; SD = .69) agreed more that they were respected for their individual achievements F(1,106) = 567.43, p < .001, η² = .84, than participants in the low respect for individual achievements condition (M = 2.55; SD = .90). Likewise, participants in the high respect for cooperation condition indicated that they felt more respected for cooperation (M = 6.25; SD = .66) than participants in the low respect for cooperation condition (M = 2.50; SD = .89), F(1,106) = 680.09, p < .001, η² = .87.

Intra-group status

This measure revealed significant main effects of respect for individual achievements, F(1,106) = 27.44, p < .001, η² = .21, and respect for cooperation, F(1,106) = 41.45, p < .001, η² = .28, which were qualified by a significant two-way interaction,
$F(1,106) = 5.52, \ p < .05, \ \eta^2 = .05$ (see Table 3). The cell means indicate that participants perceive their in-group status to be significantly lower in the systematic disrespect condition than in any of the other cells, $F(3,106) = 71.29, \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .40, \ r_{\text{contrast}} = .63, \ r_{\text{effect size}} = .62, \ r_{\text{alerting}} = .94$.

**Anxiety about acceptance by others in the group**

Acceptance anxiety increased significantly as a result of low respect for individual achievements ($M = 3.20; \ SD = 1.45$) as compared to high respect for individual achievements ($M = 2.62; \ SD = 1.13, \ F(1,106) = 5.88, \ p < .05, \ \eta^2 = .05$). Additionally, significant differences in acceptance anxiety were found ($F(1,106) = 10.88, \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .09$, due to low respect for cooperation ($M = 3.30; \ SD = 1.36$) versus high respect for cooperation ($M = 2.51; \ SD = 1.16$). As a result of these two main effects, acceptance anxiety was more pronounced in the systematic disrespect condition than in any of the other cells, $F(3,106) = 8.24, \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .07, \ r_{\text{contrast}} = .27, \ r_{\text{effect size}} = .26, \ r_{\text{alerting}} = .67$.

**Feelings of belongingness**

Again, the feelings of belongingness scale yielded significant main effects of respect for individual achievements as well as respect for cooperation. High respect for individual achievements ($M = 4.98; \ SD = .97$) resulted in greater feelings of belongingness to the task-group than low respect for individual achievements ($M = 4.21; \ SD = 1.23, \ F(1,106) = 15.02, \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .12$). Similarly, high respect for cooperation ($M = 4.87; \ SD = 1.04$) resulted in greater feelings of belongingness with the task-group than low respect for cooperation ($M = 4.32; \ SD = 1.24, \ F(1,106) = 7.50, \ p < .01, \ \eta^2 = .07$). Alternatively, we obtained a significant two-way interaction, $F(1,106) = 9.66, \ p < .002, \ \eta^2 = .08$ (see Table 3). This interaction indicated that feelings of belongingness were significantly lower in the systematic disrespect condition than in any of the other experimental conditions, $F(3,106) = 34.25, \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .24, \ r_{\text{contrast}} = .49, \ r_{\text{effect size}} = .49, \ r_{\text{alerting}} = .99$.

**Identification with the group**

For this variable, we only obtained a significant two-way interaction $F(1,106) = 6.45, \ p < .02, \ \eta^2 = .06$. The combined effect of the two respect manipulations (see Table 3) caused identification with the group to be significantly lower in the systematic disrespect condition than in any of the other conditions participants, $F(3,106) = 11.79, \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .10, \ r_{\text{contrast}} = .32, \ r_{\text{effect size}} = .32, \ r_{\text{alerting}} = .96$. Additionally, we examined the validity of our reasoning that perceived belongingness (whether the group accepts the self) mediates the effect of respect on identification (whether the self wants to be part of the group). At Step 1 (Baron & Kenny, 1986), regression analyses showed that belongingness was predicted by intra-group respect (recoded as $3 = \text{high/high}, \ 2 = \text{high/low}, \ 1 = \text{low/high}$, and $0 = \text{low/low}$), $\beta = .42, \ t(1,108) = 4.78, \ p < .001$ ($R^2 = .18, \ R^2_{\text{adjusted}} = .17$). At Step 2, the respect manipulation significantly predicted identification, $\beta = .22, \ t(1,108) = 2.37, \ p < .02$ ($R^2 = .05, \ R^2_{\text{adjusted}} = .04$). At Step 3, belongingness significantly predicted identification, $\beta = .58, \ t(1,108) = 7.34, \ p < .001$ ($R^2 = .33, \ R^2_{\text{adjusted}} = .33$). At Step 4, the significant effect of respect on identification disappeared, $\beta = .02, \ t(2,107) = .26, \ p = .80$, when we included belongingness in the analysis, $\beta = .59, \ t(2,107) = 6.75, \ p < .001$. Finally, Sobel’s test equation (1982) and both Goodman (I) and Goodman (II) test equations (1960) showed significance of the mediation at $p < .001$, indicating that belongingness reliably mediates the effect of respect on identification, as hypothesized.

**Cognitive accessibility of justice and fairness**

We calculated the difference in response times between matched pairs of fairness related words and neutral words (for each pair, $p < .001$), and combined these into a single scale indicating the cognitive accessibility of the justice/fairness construct (cf. Neely, 1991). More negative deviation scores indicate that people respond more quickly (i.e., needed less milliseconds) in the case of justice/fairness words compared to neutral words (indicating enhanced cognitive accessibility of justice/fairness). This deviation score was subjected to an analysis of variance (ANOVA). This yielded the predicted two-way interaction $F(1,91) = 11.63 \ p < .001, \ \eta^2 = .11$ (see Table 3), indicating that justice and fairness concerns were significantly more cognitively accessible in the three respect conditions than in the systematic disrespect condition, $F(3,91) = 5.06 \ p < .01, \ \eta^2 = .14, \ r_{\text{contrast}} = .34, \ r_{\text{effect size}} = .33, \ r_{\text{alerting}} = .88$.

In order to substantiate our reasoning that when systematically disrespected by other group members the justice/fairness construct is less accessible because people are less concerned about their relations with others in the group, we also examined how this indicator of cognitive accessibility was related to self-reported group identification. Thus, we conducted a regression analysis (Cohen & Cohen, 1983) in which cognitive accessibility of the justice and fairness construct was regressed on intra-group respect and group identification. To be able to contrast the responses of systematically disrespected group members with those of respected group members, dummy scores were created, by coding those in the respect conditions (high/high, high/low, and low/high) as zero, and participants in the systematic disrespect condition (low/low) as one. This analysis again indicated that cognitive accessibility of the justice and fairness construct (in milliseconds) was related to the respect participants had received, $R^2_{\text{ch}} = .11, \ b = 31.90, \ t(2,92) = 2.44, \ p < .05$. Although identification had no
direct effect on the cognitive accessibility of justice/fairness, $R^2_{ch} = 0, b = -1.51, t(2,92) = -.12, p = .92$, we did obtain a significant two-way interaction between respect $\times$ identification with the group, $R^2_{ch} = .04, b = -28.32, t(3,91) = -1.99, p < .05$ (see Fig. 1). We conducted simple slope analyses to further interpret the significant interaction that was obtained (Aiken & West, 1991). Within the respect condition, the simple slope was not significant, $R^2_{ch} = .02, b = -1.33, t = -.45, p = .66$, indicating that when respected, identification with the task-group did not predict cognitive accessibility of justice and fairness. However, when participants were systematically disrespected, the simple slope was significant, $R^2_{ch} = .21, b = -29.09, t = -2.45, p < .05$. This indicates that under conditions of systematic disrespect, a decrease in group identification predicts lesser cognitive accessibility of the justice/fairness construct. This confirms the notion that when participants disidentify with the group as a result of systematic disrespect, the justice/fairness construct becomes less cognitively accessible.

**Motivated group efforts**

As in Experiment 1, when analyzing the discretionary effort measure, we corrected for individual differences in work speed (pretest) $F(1,101) = 79.82, p < .001, \eta^2 = .44$. Results yielded the predicted three-way interaction $F(1,101) = 6.15, p < .05, \eta^2 = .06$ (see Table 4). To break down this complex interaction, we examined the responses in the ‘work to leave’ and ‘work to stay’ conditions separately. In the ‘work to stay’ condition, the two-way interaction was not significant $F(1,101) = 1.15, p = .29, \eta^2 = .01$. However, as predicted, in the ‘work to leave’ condition, there was a significant interaction between respect for individual achievements and respect for cooperation, $F(1,101) = 5.08, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05$. In line with our prediction, the means pattern indicates that participants were more inclined to ‘work to leave’, when they were systematically disrespected by their fellow ingroup members, $F(7,101) = 8.24, p < .01, \eta^2 = .08, r_{contrast} = .27, r_{effect size} = .27, r_{alerting} = .83$. In other words, the amount of discretionary effort invested to leave the group was significantly larger in the systematic disrespect condition than in any of the other conditions.

**Manipulation checks: work motive**

The checks for the manipulation of work motive revealed the intended effects. Participants in the ‘work to stay’ condition believed more strongly that they could stay within the group when excelling on the group-serving effort task ($M = 5.48; SD = 1.60$) than participants in the ‘work to leave’ condition ($M = 4.60; SD = 1.91$), $F(1,102) = 6.60, p = .05, \eta^2 = .06$. Participants in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Means and standard deviations of discretionary efforts on behalf of the collective as a function of work motive, respect for individual achievements and respect for cooperation (Experiment 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for cooperation</td>
<td>Respect for individual achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work motive: stay</td>
<td>$M$ (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work motive: leave</td>
<td>$M$ (SD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Higher values indicate greater discretionary efforts.*
‘work to leave’ condition were more convinced that a
good task performance would enable them to leave the
group ($M = 5.52; SD = 1.83$) than participants in the
‘work to stay’ condition ($M = 2.59; SD = 1.47$), $F(1,102) = 81.52$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .44$.

**Discussion**

The results we obtained replicate and extend the find-
ings of Experiment 1. This second study confirmed that
the combination of low respect for individual achieve-
ments and for cooperation causes people to perceive
their intra-group status as significantly reduced, and
leads them to experience anxiety about their acceptance
into the group. Additionally, the lack of belongingness
they report as a result of the systematic disrespect
extended by their fellow group members, in turn causes
them to identify less with the group. All these results
from the self-report measures are in line with predictions
from the group-value model, and corroborate the find-
ings obtained in Experiment 1.

The results from the cognitive and behavioral mea-
ures complement this picture. In line with the explana-
tion we advanced to account for the observations in
Experiment 1, the results of Experiment 2 suggest that
the group-serving efforts displayed by systematically
disrespected participants primarily originate from self-
focused rather than group-focused concerns. That is,
with the adaptations made in Experiment 2, we were
able to conclude that systematically disrespected group
members psychologically disengage the self from the
group. This was not only evident from the lowered iden-
tification with the ingroup they reported, but also from
their responses on the lexical decision task, indicating
that for them justice and fairness concerns were less cog-
nitively accessible than for participants in the other re-
spect conditions. Moreover, under conditions of
systematic disrespect, decreased group identification
predicted less cognitive accessibility of the justice and
fairness construct. Finally, because we explicitly manip-
ulated different possible work motives in Experiment 2,
we were able to establish that the greater tendency of
systematically disrespected group members to exert
themselves on behalf of the group only emerged when
this might enable them to leave the group. No increase
in behavioral effort was observed when they thought
their efforts might enable them to stay in this group.

We think the present results contribute in important
ways to our understanding of the different conditions
under which group-serving behaviors may emerge. That
is, theory and research on marginal group membership
and social exclusion (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Jetten
et al., 2002, 2003; Noel et al., 1995; Williams & Sommer,
1997) suggests that displays of group-serving effort by
disrespected group members emerge because those
who are insecure about the inclusion of the self in a
group wish to belong and they try to behave in ways that
can earn them acceptance into the group, i.e., out of
group-focused concerns. However, because we exam-
ined the effects of intra-group respect independently of
the a priori attractiveness of the group, we were able
to establish that the acceptance anxiety and lack of
belongingness resulting from disrespect can also evoke
self-focused concerns. That is, when participants in our
study realized that respect from their fellow group mem-
bers was not forthcoming, they identified less with the
group, and showed evidence of decreased concern about
their relations with others in the situation (i.e., less cog-
nitive accessibility of the justice/fairness construct). Fur-
thermore, even though they displayed increased effort on
a voluntary group task, this was motivated by the desire
to leave the group.

**General discussion**

Whereas previous research on the effects of intra-
group respect mainly addressed the possibility that high
respect induces group identification and thus motivates
people to invest in the group, in the present paper we fo-
cused on the consequences of disrespect, by examining
its cognitive, psychological, and behavioral responses
in a group context. On the basis of previous work on
the group-value model on the one hand, and insights
on marginal group membership and social exclusion
on the other, we argued that two different response pat-
tterns could be identified. First, the group-value model
would predict that disrespect results in decreased group
identification and hence should undermine the willing-
ness to exert oneself on behalf of the group, and this re-
sponse would be most likely when the group held no
intrinsic value for the individual. Second, on the basis
of insights derived from work on social exclusion and
marginal group membership, we argued that disrespect
(and the anxiety about acceptance by others in the group
this gives rise to) might motivate people to maintain
their identification with the group and display increased
effort to show their worth as a group member. We ar-
gued that this response pattern was most likely to be ob-
served in the case that the group was attractive for the
individual so that he or she would be interested in gain-
ing full acceptance into the group.

The different measures we included in the present re-
search showed elements of both response patterns, with
self-reported group identification being in line with pre-
dictions from the group-value model, and behavioral ef-
fects consistent with previous observations in the
literature on marginal group membership. However,
the results of neither of the two studies reported here
could be fully explained by one of them. Hence, we pro-
posed and tested a third possibility, namely that instead
of identifying with the group, disrespected group members become concerned with establishing their personal self-worth, which is not necessarily connected to their membership in this particular group. Indeed, in both studies we obtained evidence that when respect from one’s fellow group members was not forthcoming, the resulting acceptance anxiety and lack of belongingness resulted in greater displays of behavioral effort on the group task, which, however, were not motivated by the desire to contribute to the group, or to secure one’s inclusion in the group. Thus, while others before us have demonstrated that people may comply with group norms to show their worth as group members or to improve their standing in the group (e.g., Noel et al., 1995; see also Branscombe et al., 2002), as far as we know ours is the first research showing that enhanced effort on a group serving task may occur among individuals who psychologically disengage from the group, and are looking for ways to get out.

This is consistent with insights from social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), and research showing that when people have no realistic prospect of leaving the group (impermeable group boundaries, as was the case in Experiment 1), they tend to behave in terms of their group membership, even when the group does not seem particularly attractive to them. By contrast, when group boundaries are permeable (as was the case in Experiment 2), individual mobility across groups constitutes a prominent strategy for those who seek to enhance their social identity (Ellemers, Wilke, & Van Knippenberg, 1993; Ellemers et al., 1997). While theoretical arguments and previous research on identity management focus on individual mobility as a way to avoid inclusion in a group that has low status, the current research extends this reasoning, as it suggests that similar effects may occur to avoid inclusion in a group that affords the individual low personal status. That is, when group boundaries are permeable, systematically disrespected group members will be motivated to invest in their self-worth and hence work to leave (as in Experiment 2), whereas systematically disrespected group members may continue to work for the group as a means to improve their personal standing when leaving is not an option (as in Experiment 1, see also Ellemers, 1993). Again, it is important to note that in both cases this results in a performance increase that benefits the group, even though systematically disrespected group members report low levels of perceived intra-group status, lack identification with the group, and show decreased accessibility of the justice and fairness construct, attesting to their psychological withdrawal from the group.

Our focus in the present research enabled us to examine the validity of two competing theoretical frameworks for the understanding of the behavior of disrespected group members. In our investigation, the results on the cognitive, psychological, and behavioral measures provided us with an opportunity to explicate a novel perspective that to our concerns can function symbiotically and in interaction with the two existing frameworks. In this sense we feel that the present research points to an important new avenue that enables us to gain more understanding in collaborative group performance in general and in the psychology of disrespect in particular.
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