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Distributive justice theories (e.g., relative deprivation, equity, justice motive theory) have consistently postulated that disputants’ satisfaction with the outcomes of social conflict is influenced by the extent to which allocations are consistent with salient standards of deservingness or entitlement. So, for example, relative deprivation theorists (e.g. Crosby, 1976; Davis, 1959; Gurr, 1970; Runciman, 1966) have shown that feelings of indignation or outrage stemming from deprivation are moderated by notions of entitlement. They revealed that judgments about what individuals feel they deserve are based on comparisons with what others within their group or within a similar context have received rather than on absolute outcomes. This theory explains why those in an objectively positive situation can evaluate their situation negatively and why those in a seemingly poor situation can view their situation optimistically. Crosby’s (1982), study of working women identified two preconditions essential for relative deprivation—lesser outcomes than one wants and lesser outcomes than one deserves.

Similarly, equity theorists (Adams, 1965; Homans, 1961; Walster, Berscheid, & Walster, 1976) assume that an individual’s sense of equity acts as a powerful norm influencing social behavior. This norm is comprised of the belief that outcomes, both positive and negative, should be proportional to ones contribution and involvement within the group. When an inequitable distribution of outcomes is perceived, it is argued that individuals will experience “inequity distress”. It is theorized that the dissonance this perception creates will motivate the individual to restore equity. Adams (1963) asserted that even individuals profiting from inequity would feel “inequity distress” and attempt to restore equity. Thus, individuals experience dissonance both when they get more as well as less than they perceive they deserve.

Although distributive justice theories have consistently included notions of deservingness in their models, none have located it as centrally as Mel Lerner’s Justice Motive Theory (Lerner,
1977, 1987). So, for example, while equity theory includes justice as one of various motives that influence people’s satisfaction with the outcomes of social conflicts, Justice Motive Theory (JMT) assumes a “preeminent guiding principle or motive in the commitment to deserving which serves to organize most goal-seeking behavior” (Lerner, 1977, p. 23). Subsequently, Lerner (1987) asserted that “…the experience of entitlement is the essential psychological ingredient of an entire family of human events associated with social justice” (pp. 107-108).

According to JMT, the justice motive is not merely a consequence of enlightened self-interest, as assumed by equity theorists (e.g., Walster, Berscheid, & Walster, 1976; Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978). Rather, notions of entitlement are shaped by unconscious processes occurring in the early stages of cognitive development. One consequence of the centrality of deservingness in JMT is that violated *entitlements* are explicitly identified as the essential ingredient that distinguishes injustices from simple disappointments or frustration—it is *injustices* that lead to anger and outrage (Lerner, 1987). Thus, while equity theory points to a variety of motives (including self-interest as well as justice) to explain individuals reactions to inequity, JMT emphasizes the preeminence of the commitment to deserving.

However, despite the centrality of deservingness in theories of distributive justice, theories of procedural justice are largely silent about its role in perceptions of fairness and satisfaction. So, for example, in their seminal theory of procedural justice, Thibaut and Walker (1975, 1978) asserted that variations in the degree of control over conflict resolution procedures impacts perceptions of fairness. According to this theory, procedures will be perceived as fair to the extent that they promote fair outcomes. Thus, control over the presentation of evidence (process control or ‘voice’) and control over the final decision (decision control), is predicted to be important to disputants because it is expected to influence decisions; in other words, it is
important for instrumental reasons. Because of the underlying assumption of self-interested individuals present in Thibaut and Walker’s theory (an assumption this theory shares with equity theory), Lind and Tyler (1988) have referred to it as a self-interest model. While an abundance of research has been overwhelmingly supportive of their prediction that process and decision control are crucial determinants of procedural fairness (e.g., Folger, 1977; Kanfer, Sawyer, Earley & Lind, 1987; LaTour, 1978; Lind, Kurtz, Musante, Walker, & Thibaut, 1980; Lind, Lissak, & Conlon, 1983; Tyler, Rasinski, & Spodick, 1985) the theory is largely silent about the role of entitlement in the control-fairness relationships except as it is involved in equity theory. So, for example, virtually none of the research testing the control model has examined situational variables that might be expected to affect disputants’ judgments that they are entitled to process or decision control (see Brockner, et al., 1998 for a notable exception).

Recently, responding in part to findings inconsistent with the self-interest model of procedural justice, Lind & Tyler (1988, Tyler 1994; Tyler & Lind, 1992) proposed a Group Value theory of procedural justice. The Group Value model emphasizes individuals’ concern about their relationship with social groups and the authorities representing those groups. It assumes that group identification and group membership is psychologically rewarding, and that individuals are motivated to establish and maintain group bonds. According to this theory, when individuals are focused on their long term relationship with groups, they evaluate the fairness of procedures according to a different set of criteria than the control variables proposed by Thibaut and Walker. Lind and Tyler proposed that under such circumstances procedures are evaluated according to three criteria: the trustworthiness of the authorities enacting the procedures; the neutrality of those authorities, and; information emanating from the procedure about the individuals’ standing in the group. Numerous studies provide indirect support for Lind and Tyler's
suggestion that individuals are sensitive to issues such as polite or respectful treatment (e.g., Bies & Moag, 1986; Bies & Shapiro, 1987; Tyler & Bies, 1990; Tyler & Folger, 1980) or information about their standing in the group (Huo, Smith, & Tyler, & Lind, 1996; MacCoun, et al., 1988; Tyler & DeGoey, 1995). Additional research (e.g., Tyler, 1989; 1994) is directly and strongly supportive of Lind and Tyler’s (1992; Tyler, 1989) claim that trust, neutrality, and standing are strongly linked to procedural justice judgments, and that these relational concerns explain considerable variation in justice perceptions that is not explained by the control variables or self-interest motives specified by Thibaut and Walker’s (1975; 1978) model. It is clear from such research that individuals evaluate the fairness of their treatment on more dimensions than simply their opportunity for control.

However, like the self-interest model of procedural justice, the Group Value model does not explicitly address the role of entitlement for the effect of trust, neutrality, and standing on procedural fairness. So, for example, the Group Value model asserts that respectful treatment, because of the positive message it communicates about an individual’s within-group standing, enhances procedural fairness.

We suspect that the relationship between respectful treatment and procedural fairness is more complex. Our reasoning here borrows heavily from the distributive justice theories reviewed above--just as distributions are perceived as fair and satisfactory according to the extent that they are consistent with peoples notions of entitlement, we hypothesize that procedural fairness judgments are a function of the fit between peoples’ beliefs that they deserve respectful and their beliefs that they received it (see Heuer, Blumenthal, Douglas, & Weinblatt, 1999, for a more thorough explication of theoretical considerations consistent with our reasoning about the reasons that people might feel entitled to respectful treatment).
The moderating effect of deservingness on the relationship between respect and perceptions of fair procedure has been previously examined by Heuer et al., (1999). Drawing upon Feather’s (1992) matching hypothesis, which states that positive outcomes are perceived as fair when they follow positively valued acts, as are negative outcomes when followed by negatively valued acts, Heuer et al. proposed that the same pattern of matches would exist between the valence of a person’s attributes (such as but not limited to within-group status), and the manner in which individuals are treated by others. A similar view was put forth by Pepitone and L’Armand (1996) who proposed that a state of justice is perceived when the valence of the person observed has the same sign as the valence of the outcome experienced by that person. In other words, good things are perceived to happen to those with positive attributes and bad things to those with negative attributes. In the Pepitone and L’Armand study, matches between attributes and outcomes were perceived as significantly more fair than mismatches.

In the Heuer et al. (1999) inquiry, the deservingness hypothesis was strongly supported in 3 studies. Studies 1 & 2 used vignettes to test the hypothesis that the relation between respectful treatment and procedural fairness is qualified by the positive or negative value of the treatment recipient’s behaviors. In the first vignette subjects read and responded to someone else’s treatment of another. The value of behavior by respectful treatment hypothesis was supported, as was a hypothesized three-way interaction showing that the relation between respect and the value of one’s behavior was further qualified by attributions about the actor’s responsibility for their behavior (the two-way interaction between respect and fairness was strongest when the recipients were viewed as being responsible for their positively or negatively valued behaviors). One finding reported in this study that is especially supportive of the deservingness view is that respondents rated disrespectful treatment as more fair than respectful
treatment of individuals who were responsible for performing negatively valued behaviors—a reversal of the typically reported relation between respect and fairness. In a second vignette, students imagined themselves in an encounter with a professor. The results of this study also supported the three-way interaction, showing that respect was most fair when individuals were responsible for positively valued classroom behaviors, but least fair when individuals were responsible for negatively valued classroom behaviors. This study also included a measure of the respondent’s belief that they deserved the treatment that they received. This additional measure permitted a test of the expectation that deservingness beliefs mediate the relation between respect and fairness. The mediation hypothesis was supported when the deservingness judgment was entered as a covariate in the analyses. Its presence in the equation reduced, substantially and significantly, the effect of respect on fairness as well as reducing the significant three-way interaction to non-significance.

Study 3 surveyed several hundred New Yorkers about a recent encounter with another individual and then asked a series of questions about the encounter, including ones about how respectfully they had been treated by the other individual and how fair they thought their treatment by the other individual had been. Additional measures included items from the Coopersmith Self-Esteem inventory (Coopersmith, 1981). These data enabled a test of the hypothesis that high self-esteem individuals would be more likely than low self-esteem individuals to evaluate the fairness of their treatment according to the relational concerns described by Tyler & Lind (the self-esteem hypothesis follows from Feather’s matching hypothesis with the assumption that high self-esteem is equivalent to a positive appraisal of one’s self value). This interaction hypothesis was strongly supported.
While these studies are supportive of our predictions, the present research improves upon this work in several ways. First, two of our earlier studies tested our hypothesis by having the participants read imaginary vignettes. The third studied actual encounters, but not ones in which the encounter was necessarily one between a subordinate and an authority (participants in our previous field survey were asked to think of an encounter with another individual, with no mention of whether the other individual had more or less decision authority than they did), as has typically been the case in previous tests of the Group Value theory. Thus, it is conceivable that the previous findings are at least partly an artifact of the type of encounter examined. The present study examines the perceptions of civilians in a recent encounter with a police officer.

In addition, while the previous study tested the deservingness hypothesis by looking for matches between respect and either the value of one’s behavior or self-esteem, the present study looks for matches between civilians’ perception of their standing in a valued social group and their perception of the police officer’s judgment of their intra-group standing. Thus, the present study addresses the concern with intra-group standing specified by Lind & Tyler’s (1988) Group Value theory.

Finally, the present study extends the test of the matching hypothesis to look for the match between perceptions of the treatment deserved and the treatment received on several dimensions in addition to within-group standing. Thus, civilian respondents in this study are asked to report what manner of treatment they feel entitled to and what manner of treatment they received from the police officer that would reflect the officer’s views of the value of their behavior, their self-esteem, and the value of their group. While our earlier (Heuer et al., 1999) research found support for the matching hypothesis on the dimensions of the value of one’s behavior and self-esteem, this study is the first to test the matching hypothesis on the dimension
of one’s perception of one’s group standing vis-à-vis other groups (as opposed to the intra-group perceptions addressed by the Group Value theory). Arguably, most of our civilian respondents will perceive police officers as out-group members, and will be sensitive to what the police officer’s behavior indicates about their impressions of the civilian’s salient social group.

Method

Participants

Respondents were 354 males, 110 females and 52 who left the gender question unanswered yielding a sample size of 516. The respondents ranged in age from 14 to 83 (M = 30.6). The ethnic breakdown of the sample consisted of 291 Caucasians, 75 African-Americans, 30 Hispanics, 55 indicating “other” and 63 individuals who left this question unanswered.

Procedure

In order to test the moderating effect of deservingness across multiple motivations on the relationship between respect and perceptions of fair procedure civilians were approached in various locations throughout New York City and invited to participate in a study of police-civilian encounters. Approximately half of the respondents had received a summons from a police officer to appear in misdemeanor court. These respondents were approached while they waited for their case to be called. Those who agreed to participate were asked to think about the encounter with a police officer that resulted in their summons. The remaining respondents were approached outside coffee shops in New York City. These respondents were asked to think about a recent encounter with a New York City police officer. All participants were offered a token of appreciation for completing the survey, with a value of approximately $1.50.

All respondents were asked to provide a brief description of their encounter with a New York City police officer and to answer series of 158 questions in reference to that encounter.
Respondents were also asked to identify a social group that they belonged to and valued greatly in order to enable them to respond to questions about what they thought the police officer ought to think about their group as well as what they thought the officer actually did think of their group. Except for demographic measures about themselves and the police officer, all questions employed Likert-type scales designed to tap the relevant constructs such as treatment deserved and treatment received (multiple items were used to measure of each of these constructs) on each of the dimensions of group value/intra-group standing, inter-group standing, value of behavior (VOB), and social self-esteem (SSE).

The moderation hypothesis (matches between “received” and “deserved” are perceived as fairer than mismatches) will be tested by looking for interactions between the treatment deserved (respectful-disrespectful) and the treatment received on each of these four dimensions. In particular, we expect that individuals’ will think treatment is more fair not simply because police officers’ treatment suggests that the police officer thinks highly of their standing in their social group, or the standing of their group vis-à-vis other groups, or their behaviors, or their value as individuals. Rather, we expect that such positive views will be related to fairness judgments to the extent that the officer’s treatment suggests an evaluation on each of these dimensions that matches our respondents’ notions that they are entitled to have others think favorably of their within-group standing, their inter-group standing, their behaviors, or their value as individuals.

**Measures**

Multiple items were employed to measure each of the construct of treatment received (questions asking respondents about the treatment received) and each entitlement judgment (questions asking respondents about the treatment they felt they deserved) corresponding with
that attribute. Indices were constructed from the component scores obtained by a principal component analysis on the questions that composed each theoretical construct.

Separate principal component analyses were performed on the items tapping each of the four entitlement constructs and each of the four treatment constructs. The resulting component scores were then used as an index for the construct. Indices were created this way in order to maximize the relevant proportion of variance examined thereby increasing measurement accuracy. These constructs were measured as follows:

- **Intra-group standing received**: (4 items, e.g., 9 = I was treated like a high status member of the community; these questions yielded a single component accounting for 75.5% of the variance);
- **Intra-group standing deserved**: (4 items, e.g., 9 = I deserved to be treated like a high status member of the community; these items yielded a single component accounting for 66% of the variance);
- **Inter-group standing received**: (three items, e.g., 9 = The police officer seemed to have a favorable view of my group; these items yielded a single component accounting for 75.6% of the variance);
- **Inter-group standing deserved**: (three items, yielding a single component accounting for 76% of the variance);
- **Social self-esteem received**: (two items, e.g., 9 = The police officer thought I’m popular with persons my own age; these items were taken from the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1987) and yielded a single component accounting for 68% of the variance);
- **Social self-esteem deserved**: (two items, yielded a single component accounting for 87% of the variance);
- **VOB received**: (three items, e.g., 9 = The police officer thought highly of my behavior; these items yielded a single component accounting for 79% of the variance);
- **VOB deserved**: (three items, yielding a single component accounting for 79% of the variance).

Procedural fairness judgments were measured with four questions (e.g., 9 = The police officer treated me in a fair and reasonable way) yielding a single component which accounted for 75% of the variance.
Interaction terms were created by multiplying each received index with its corresponding deserved index. Thus, high scores on the interaction variable indicate matches and low scores indicate mismatches between perceptions of treatment deserved and treatment received.

Results

In order to test the matching hypothesis a principal components regression analysis was performed (Belsley, 1991; Daling & Tamura, 1970; Farrar & Glauber, 1967; Greenberg, 1975; Kendall, 1957; Massy, 1965; Sclove, 1968; Urban & Von Hippel, 1988). The PC regression procedure is particularly appropriate for the current data set due to the risk of unstable correlation matrices resulting from the fairly high correlations among the constructs tapping the civilians’ perception that the police officer’s treatment reflected positive assessments of their intra-group standing and their inter-group standing ($r = .75$, $p < .001$).

PC regression avoids the collinearity problem by taking advantage of the orthogonal structure of a principal component matrix. Regression is performed on a subset of uncorrelated component scores constructed through principal components analysis. The beta weights obtained for each component are then multiplied by the corresponding factor loading for each variable within each component and summed across components. The result is a regression beta weight for each original variable.

In the present analysis, principal components analysis on the 4 “treatment deserved” variables, the 4 “treatment received” variables, and the 4 hypothesized deserved x received interactions variables yielded three factors accounting for 60% of the variance. The 4 “received” variables loaded on the first component, the 4 “deserved” variables loaded on the second and the 4 interaction terms loaded on the third component. The dependent measure of procedural fairness was then regressed on the three principal components.
In block one, the first and second components (those upon which the main effects of “treatment deserved” and “treatment received” loaded in the PC analysis) were entered. This block accounted for a significant portion of the variance in the dependent variable, $F(2, 359) = 109.76, p < .001, R^2 = .38)$. Table 1 reports the beta weights for the original 8 main effects (the products of the betas in the PC Regression and the factor loadings of the eight original main effects on their respective components in the PC analysis). As can be seen in the Table, each of the 4 “treatment deserved” effects are negative, indicating that procedures are generally considered less fair with increases in civilians’ notions of entitlement. Alternatively, each of the “treatment received” effects are positive, indicating that procedures are considered more fair with increases in the favorability of the treatment received. In other words, for example, as the police officer’s behavior was interpreted as indicating a favorable view of the civilian’s standing within their group, the civilians report that they were treated more fairly. This is sensible, and is supportive of the Group Value theory’s claim that procedural fairness is enhanced as a result of the view that others view us as members of high standing in our valued social groups.

The second block added the hypothesized interaction terms to the equation, and constitutes the test of our matching hypothesis. This block added significantly to the proportion of variance accounted for by the equation, change in $R^2$ change = .05, $F(1, 358) = 32.17, p < .001$. The beta weights obtained for the original variables are presented in Table 1. Note that, as hypothesized, the coefficients for each of the four interaction terms is positive, and at least three (intra-group, inter-group, and VOB) are of a substantial magnitude. In other words, for at least these three dimensions, procedural fairness is greater when there is a match between the treatment deserved and the treatment received. Unfortunately, at present there is no procedure available to determine the statistical significance of each beta weight for the original variables.
As one way of understanding the implication of these interactions, we can solve for the effect of ‘treatment received’ at both high (1 standard deviation above the mean) and low (1 standard deviation below the mean) levels of ‘treatment deserved’ (see Cohen & Cohen, 1975). Table 2 shows the values of treatment received at high versus low levels of entitlement on each of the four dimensions examined in this study. For the dimensions of intra-group standing, inter-group standing, and VOB, it is clear that favorable treatment has a considerably greater positive effect on procedural fairness when civilians’ notions of entitlement are high, just as predicted by the matching hypothesis. Although the magnitude of the effect for self-esteem is smaller, it too is positive, and consistent with our prediction.

Discussion

We began our inquiry with the observation that while distributive justice theories have consistently noted the importance of deservingness for people’s judgments that the outcomes they received are fair and satisfactory. These theories have explicitly distinguished their models from straightforward hedonic theories by including the assumption that fairness and satisfaction derive from obtaining what one is entitled to rather than simply what one desires. On the other hand, procedural justice theories, such as Thibaut & Walker’s (1975; 1978) procedural justice theory, interactional justice theories (e.g., Bies, 1987; Bies & Moag, 1986; Bies & Shapiro, 1987; 1988; Bies, Shapiro, & Cummings, 1988; Cropanzano & Folger, 1989; Folger & Bies, 1989; Tyler & Folger, 1980), or Group Value theory (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 1989; Tyler & Lind, 1992) have not obviously included the same assumption. So, for example, we suggested that while Group Value theory offers a compelling link between respectful treatment and procedural satisfaction or preference, the link between respect and justice judgments is less clearly specified.
Based upon arguments about the centrality of notions of entitlement for justice judgments advanced most clearly by Lerner (1977; 1980; 1987) and supported in numerous studies by Lerner and his colleagues (e.g. Braband & Lerner, 1975; Lerner, Miller, & Holmes, 1977; Simmons & Lerner, 1968), we argued that notions of entitlement can be expected to play a similar role in affecting the relation between people are treated and their reports that they have been treated in a fair and satisfying manner. Thus, we proposed that people will evaluate the way others treat them as fair not simply because it implies that others think highly of their standing in social groups, but rather because the treatment they receive matches their judgments about what they are entitled to have others believe about their standing in social groups.

In order to test this matching hypothesis, we surveyed civilians about a recent encounter with a New York City police officer. Among the questions we asked them were first, ones pertaining to their beliefs about whether they deserved to have the police officer think highly of their standing in their community, the standing of their self-identified social group vis-à-vis other social groups, the value of their behavior that led up to their encounter with the police officer, and their beliefs about their individual social worth; and second, their perception that the police officer’s behavior communicated that the officer actually did think highly of their standing in their community, the standing of their self-identified social group vis-à-vis other social groups, the value of their behavior that led up to their encounter with the police officer, and their individual social worth. We predicted that the civilians’ procedural fairness judgments would be influenced not simply by how favorably the officer treated them, but rather by the match between the civilians’ notions of entitlement and the officers’ treatment.

Overall, this hypothesis was strongly supported. While the regression analyses revealed a substantial main effect of being treated in a respectful manner, the magnitude of this effect was
considerably qualified by the civilians notions of the kind of treatment they were entitled to. On each of the dimensions measured— intra-group standing, inter-group standing, value of behavior, and self-esteem, favorable treatment had a greater positive effect on procedural fairness when civilians’ notions of entitlement were high than when they were low.

This finding adds to the evidence from three earlier studies which were similarly supportive of the deservingness hypothesis for procedural justice (Heuer et al., 1999). However, this study extends that work in some important ways. First, two of our earlier studies were experiments that varied respectful treatment and value of behavior in an orthogonal design, and showed that respectful treatment was considered more fair when it followed positively valued acts. This study produces a similar result regarding the match between positively valued behaviors and respectful treatment in a field survey of civilians recounting their recent encounters with police officers. Thus, the present findings converge with our earlier ones, while employing a different method and different measures, and do so in a manner that strengthens our claims to external validity while sacrificing a bit in terms of internal validity.

The present findings also extend the deservingness argument, and the theoretical reasoning about the relationship between respect and procedural fairness, by looking at the effect of respect on other motives in addition to the group value motive (the belief that we are members in good standing of our valued social groups). Thus, the present findings suggest that respect is also valued for its implications for what others’ behavior communicates about their view of the standing of our group, the value of our behaviors, and our value as social beings. The main effects of “treatment received” on each of the dimensions of inter-group standing, value of behavior, and self-esteem point to the variety of messages communicated by respectful treatment; and the evidence for matches resulting from the positive interactions between each of
these and the “treatment deserved” measures provides still further evidence for the deservingness argument in procedural justice.

A final comment is in order regarding the positive main effects for each of the measures of “treatment received” in this study—an effect which is qualified by deservingness perceptions, but not eliminated even when entitlement is low. In its strongest form, the deservingness argument suggests that fairness should result exclusively from the fit between what is deserved and what is received, rather than from any direct effect of what is received. We think at least two explanations for this effect are possible. First, equity theorists suggest that fairness is likely to result from satisfaction of a variety of motives, including hedonic ones as well as the justice motive. So, for example, Adams (1965) suggested that the threshold for inequity distress was higher when the inequity worked to our advantage rather than our disadvantage. One possibility is that a similar process affects the relationship between positive treatment and procedural justice.

Alternatively, we think another process, one that is consistent with the deservingness argument advanced here, is likely. The argument is advanced most clearly by Major (1994) who summarizes theoretical and empirical evidence (e.g., Berger et al., 1972; Deutsch, 1985; Heider, 1958; Homans, 1974) suggesting that people tend to legitimate the status quo, whether it is advantageous or disadvantageous to the self. As Major points out, this legitimating effect can work in two ways—people can come to view their overly favorable and their overly unfavorable outcomes as deserved. So, for example, Major suggests that this legitimating effect is part of the reason that women who are clearly disadvantaged relative to men fail to perceive their relative deprivation as unfair. On the other hand, Lerner’s Just World hypothesis (e.g., Lerner 1975; Lerner & Miller, 1978; Lerner et al, 1976) argues that the motivation to believe in a just world
can lead people to infer that those who are advantaged must be more deserving. Just as we think
the deservingness argument extends to procedural justice, we suspect such reasoning about
legitimating processes are likely to affect peoples’ beliefs about the nature of their treatment.
Such processes are capable of explaining the positive main effects of favorable treatment
observed in our data, independent of the matching effect observed in the interactions.

Overall, we think these findings considerably strengthen our claim that procedural justice
researchers should integrate notions of entitlement into their procedural justice models. At the
same time, we think the findings underscore the importance of Lerner’s early claims about the
centrality of entitlement to justice judgments. Our findings merely apply Lerner’s insights about
entitlement to the domain of procedural justice.
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Table 1
Beta weights obtained from principal component regression of perception of fairness on received, deserved and received X deserved variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Effects</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received Intra-group</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deserve Intra-group</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Inter-group</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deserve Inter-group</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received VOB</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deserve VOB</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received SSE</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deserve SSE</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Terms</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deserve X Received Intra-group</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deserve X Received Inter-group</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deserve X Received VOB</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deserve X Received SSE</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Standardized coefficients for treatment received at high and low levels of treatment deserved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deservedness</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received Intra-group</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Inter-group</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received VOB</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received SSE</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Endnotes

i All correlations between the unit-weighted composite measures and the respective principal component were > .9 (p < .001). The coefficient alpha for the items on every construct employed exceeded .7.

ii Since for each deserved-received pair employed highly similar items, we report the received items for the first dimension only. The wording of all items employed for each of the constructs employed in this study are available from the second author upon request.