

Gender Difference When Predicting the Effect of Procedural Injustice on Collective Action

Liuzhan Jia

School of Management
Henan University of Technology
Zhengzhou, China
psyliuzhan@haut.edu.cn

Abstract—Purpose: This study was devised to investigate the predict effect of procedural injustice on collective action and gender differences in predicting collective action. **Procedures:** a situational experiment of how the students' reaction to the increasing of food price was conducted with 288 university students (88 male, 200 female). **Results:** the results showed that male students had higher collective action than female students ($t=2.034$, $p<0.05$), procedural injustice had positive effect on collective action with standardized regression coefficients of .420 ($p<0.000$). **Conclusion:** the male had stronger collective action when compared with female.

Keywords- gender difference; procedural injustice; collective action; physical aggression; relationship aggression

I. INTRODUCTION

Generally speaking, male had more physical aggression than female while female had more relationship aggression than male on account of gender difference and social role norms. Lagerspetz et al. (1988) found that female made greater use of indirect means of aggression, where male tended to use direct aggression [1]. Burbank et al. (1992) had found that male tend to use most dangerous weapons in aggression behavior and female were more likely to use moderately tools such as sticks in aggression, women were more likely than men to use verbal aggression [2]. Further, the research of Cao et al. (2010) had found that boys inclined to conduct physical aggression, and girls tended to show relational aggression [3]. So we can draw the conclusion that the aggression of male is explicitly and female has aggression in interpersonal relationship and implicitly. Is this true in the collective action which is best expression of aggressive?

Collective action refers a group member engages in any time she or he acts as a representative of the group and where the action is directed at improving the condition of the entire group, comparing to individual action which is directed at improving one's personal condition [4]. Because it is difficult to predict the actual collective action, the research usually took collective action intention as indicator of collective action. The method was often seen in similar researches [5-7], which has been widely used and proved valid. Many researchers found that social protest was caused by injustice. Justice could be categorized as distributive justice and procedural justice. Wright and Taylor found that procedural injustice can influence all the

collective members that suffered injustice to cause collective action [8], so the procedural injustice would be direct factors of collective action. This research was aimed to test the gender difference of collective action intention and examine the effect of procedural injustice on collective action intention.

Procedural justice refers to the opinion of fairness in the processes that resolve disputes and allocate resources [4]. The researches about procedural justice often use the manipulation of voice to offer or deprive the voice of subject who was influenced in the process of decision. This manipulation of procedural justice has popular accepted in the research of procedural justice. Thibaut and Walker found that subjects would perceive higher fairness when they were provided voice in the decision than deprived voice; this phenomenon was called "Voice Effect" [9]. This manipulation of procedural justice by voice has widely accepted in the research of procedural justice. So this research adopted offer or deprive the voice as manipulation method of procedural justice.

II. METHOD

A. Participants

This research was conduct in one university of China. Among the participant, 88 (29.33%) was male and 200 (66.67%) was female. The mean age was 19.95 years, SD was 1.26. At last, 146 participants (54 male; 90 female) gave the response in the procedural justice condition while 139 participants (33 male; 106 female) gave the response to the procedural injustice condition.

B. Procedure and Questionnaire

Procedural injustice was independent variable in this research. It included two conditions that were procedural justice and procedural injustice. This research processed through experiment situation and followed by questionnaire survey. The experiment condition, which was increase of food price of university dinner could draw great attention from students. The condition of justice was to provide students with voice in the increase decision of food price, while deprived voice of students was injustice condition. Experimenter told participants that for the price of commodities and CPI (Consumer Price Index) has climbing, so the dinner management plan to increase food price to cope the difficult of cost rising. The condition of

procedural justice was to take students' views into account and give their voice its full weight during the decision procedure of food price; the condition of procedural injustice was to deprive the voice of students and refuse to give students opportunity to express their opinion and make the decision by dinner management arbitrarily. Then students under different conditions were asked to rate the degree they had in applying the items of questionnaires to themselves. This research firstly took a pilot study by choosing 70 students (23 male; 44 female) whose average age was 19.89 years in a university. In the pilot study, it was found that subjects reported higher collective action intention ($t=2.133$, $p<0.05$) and procedural injustice ($t=2.139$, $p<0.05$) under injustice condition than justice condition. It showed that the situational experiment conducted was proved valid.

The questionnaire of procedural injustice was taken from Van Zomeren et al.(2008) with three items [6], such as the manner of dinner management was unfairness and neglect the practical difficult of students, responses were scored on a 7-point scale from 1 (total disagree) to 7 (total agree), the Cronbach's alpha was .81. The higher scores meant stronger degree of procedural injustice.

The questionnaire of collective action intention was taken from Van Zomeren et al.(2010) with five items [7], such as I would participate in a future demonstration /participate in raising our collective voice/do something together with fellow students/participate in some form of collective action/sing a petition to stop the dinner management, the Cronbach's alpha was 0.93.

C. Data Analysis

In the analysis of the data obtained from research, independent samples t test, correlate analysis and regression analysis were used by SPSS15.0.

III. RESULTS

The descriptive statistics results of variables were shown in table 1. To test the difference of collective action intention on procedural injustice, the result showed that participants experienced higher collective action intention ($t=2.056$, $p<0.05$) and procedural injustice ($t=2.409$, $p<0.05$) in procedural injustice condition than procedural injustice condition. What's more, there is a significantly positive relationship between collective action intention and procedural injustice. ($r= 0.450$, $p< 0.01$).

TABLE I. DESCRIPTIVE RESULT A COEFFICIENT, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, CORRELATIONS BETWEEN VARIABLES

Variable	a	M	SD	Correlations
Procedural injustice	0.882	14.47	4.157	
Collection Action Intention	0.832	19.73	4.930	.450(**)

Note. ** $p<0.01$.

To make sure that the manipulation of procedural injustice was valid, this research took two methods. Firstly,

the researcher set one item in questionnaire and request participants to evaluate the reality of experiment situation, the result showed that the average score of this item ($M=5.07$, $SD=1.32$) was higher than the middle value. Secondly, this research took procedural injustice scale to test the experiment condition, the data showed that participants who were assigned to injustice condition report higher score of procedural injustice ($t=2.409$, $p<0.05$) than justice condition. So the manipulation of procedural injustice was success and valid.

This research runs the regression analysis with procedural injustice as independent variable and collective action intention as dependent variable. Firstly, researchers took age and gender as control variable to run hierarchical regression. The regression analysis showed that standard coefficient of procedural injustice on collective action intention was .416 ($p<0.000$). So the conclusion was draw that procedural injustice had positive effect on collective action intention.

Then the gender difference in collective action intention was examined with t test. The result showed that male had higher score than female in collective action intention ($t=2.034$, $p<0.05$).

IV. CONCLUSION

This experiment confirmed that procedural injustice had positive significant effect on collective action intention and male had higher collective action intention than female. Participants assigned to injustice condition were more likely to join in collective action comparing with ones of justice condition. This result agreed with the conclusion of the research of Zomeren et al. [6]. Pettigrew et al. found that the ranks of lower social class standing were more easily suffered injustice [10]. The lower social ranks were most numerous among that have limited incomes, have no own homes or apartments or live in smaller quarters. Subjects who suffered injustice tend to take protest to resume injustice, and collective action was the very typical and easier available protest behavior comparing with other forms protest. It will easily for them to join collective action when suffered more serious injustice.

This research found that gender difference in collective action intention. Male were more likely to participant in collective action compare with female subjects. The gender difference in collective action was the topic that attracts less attention from researchers. The male participants suffered injustice had stronger protest intention, but concerned the female, the social comply of female were higher, so their protest intention were lower than male. Persson (2005) has found that the antisocial behavior of male such as physical and explicit aggression were more frequent than female; the aggression of female were more frequently displayed interpersonal and implicit [11]. So the male treated unfair would be likely to express by means of behavior protest, but the female suffered injustice more intend to demonstration interpersonal aggression. The real protest intention of female may be higher than the score point on the scale. So the forward research of collective action may be developing particular survey for female. This was the first study in

China to explore the influence of procedural injustice on collective action, and the research of gender difference in collective action was also to make up the neglect aspect in collective action research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Supported by Foundation of Henan University of Technology Doctoral Program (NO: 2012BS022), Supported by Natural Science of Key Program Foundation of He'nan Educational Committee (NO: 13A630167).

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Lagerspetz, K. Björkqvist, and T. Peltonen, "Is indirect aggression typical of females," *Aggr. Beha* vol. 14, pp. 403–411, 1988.
- [2] Burbank, "Sex, gender, and difference: dimensions of aggression in an Australian aboriginal community," *Hum. Natu* vol. 3, pp. 251–260, 1992.
- [3] R. Cao, M. Wang, "Preschoolers' beliefs about gender differences in aggression: evidence from implicit measure," *Chin. Jour. of Clin. Psy* vol. 18, pp. 281–301, 2010.
- [4] S. Wright, D. Taylor, F. Moghaddam, "The relationship of perceptions and emotions to behavior in the face of collective inequality," *Soci. Just. Res* Vol. 4, pp. 229–239, 1990.
- [5] B. Klandermans, J. van der Toorn, J. van Stekelenburg, "Embeddedness and identity: how immigrants turn grievances into action," *Ame. Soci. Revi* Vol. 73, pp. 992–1021, 2008.
- [6] M. van Zomeren, T. Postmes, R. Spears, "Toward an integrative social identity model of collective action," *Psy. Bull* Vol. 134, pp. 504–512, 2008.
- [7] S. Sturmer, B. Simon, "Pathways to collective protest: calculation, identification, or emotion," *Jour. of Soci. Iss* vol. 65, pp. 681–692, 2009.
- [8] M. Taylor, F. Moghaddam, I. Gamble, "Disadvantaged group responses to perceived inequality," *Jour. of Soc. Psy* vol. 127, pp. 259–270, 1987.
- [9] J. Thibaut, L. Walker, *Procedural justice: a psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, Earlbaum, 1975.
- [10] M. van Zomeren, W. L. Colin, S. Russell, "Does group efficacy increase group identification," *Jour. of Expe. Soc. Psy* vol. 46, pp. 1055–1072, 2010.
- [11] G.B. Persson, "Developmental perspectives on prosocial and aggressive motives in preschoolers' peer interactions," *Inter. Jour. of Beha. Deve* vol. pp. 80–92, 2005.