

WHO DO I HELP? AN EXPERIMENTAL EXAMINATION OF DOMINANT  
IDEOLOGY THREAT, GROUP MEMBERSHIP, AND PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR

by

Kristin Elizabeth Hawkinson

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Science

in

Psychological Science

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
Bozeman, Montana

April 2010

©COPYRIGHT

by

Kristin Elizabeth Hawkinson

2010

All Rights Reserved

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Kristin Elizabeth Hawkinson

This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citation, bibliographic style, and consistency and is ready for submission to the Division of Graduate Education.

Dr. Jessi L. Smith

Approved for the Department of Psychology

Dr. Ruth Striegel-Moore

Approved for the Division of Graduate Education

Dr. Carl A. Fox

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

If I have indicated my intention to copyright this thesis by including a copyright notice page, copying is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this thesis in whole or in parts may be granted only by the copyright holder.

Kristin Elizabeth Hawkinson

April 2010

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
The American Dream Ideology .....	2
What is an Ingroup .....	4
Ingroup Favoritism .....	5
Outgroup Derogation .....	6
Factors Influencing Intergroup Bias .....	7
Consideration of Outgroup Favoritism and Ingroup Derogation .....	8
Derogation of Those Who Violate the American Dream Ideology .....	8
A Focus on Prosocial Behavior .....	9
Project Overview .....	11
Pilot Testing Overview .....	12
2. PILOT STUDY 1: VICTIM SCENARIO SELECTION AND DEPENDENT MEASURES SELECTION .....	14
Participants and Procedure .....	16
Dependent Measures .....	17
Results .....	18
Success of Manipulations .....	18
Examining the Ways of Helping Measures .....	19
Discussion .....	20
3. PILOT STUDY 2: AMERICAN DREAM IDEOLOGY MANIPULATION .....	22
Participants, Procedure, and Results .....	23
4. STUDY 1: INGROUP VS. OUTGROUP VICTIM AND AMERICAN DREAM IDEOLOGY VIOLATION .....	24
Overview .....	24
Hypotheses .....	24
Hypothesis 1: Victim Violation of American Dream Hypothesis .....	24
Hypotheses 2a, 2b, & 2c: Interaction with Ingroup/Outgroup Status .....	24
Helping the Ingroup Victim (2a & 2b) .....	25
Helping the Outgroup Victim (2c) .....	25
Participants and Design .....	25
Cover Story .....	25
Procedure .....	27
Reminder of the American Dream Ideology .....	27
Manipulation of the American Dream Ideology .....	27
Manipulation of Ingroup/Outgroup Victim .....	29
Dependent Measures .....	29

## TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED

Results.....	30
Willingness to Help .....	30
Exploratory Analysis .....	32
Results for Men.....	33
Results for Women .....	34
Discussion.....	36
5. PILOT STUDY 3: PARTICIPANT-VIOLATION OF THE AMERICAN DREAM IDEOLOGY MANIPULATION .....	43
Participants and Procedure .....	44
Results and Discussion .....	44
6. STUDY 2: INGROUP VS. OUTGROUP VIOLATION AND SPECIFIC ROLE OF AMERICAN DREAM IDEOLOGY .....	45
Overview .....	45
Hypotheses .....	46
Hypothesis 1: Gender .....	46
Hypothesis 2: American Dream Ideology .....	46
Hypothesis 3: Participant Violation of the American Dream Ideology .....	46
Hypotheses 4 & 5: Participant Violation of the American Dream Ideology Interaction with Prime .....	46
Women Participant-Violation in Neutral Prime Condition .....	46
Women Participant-Violation in American Dream Ideology Prime Condition .....	46
Participants and Design .....	47
Participants.....	47
Procedure.....	47
Dependent Variables.....	49
Results.....	52
Results for Men.....	53
Helping Measures.....	53
Victim Perceptions .....	55
Results for Women .....	57
Willingness to Help.....	57
Victim Perceptions .....	59
Relationships among Variables (By Gender).....	62
Discussion.....	64
7. GENERAL DISCUSSION .....	71
Limitations and Future Directions .....	76
Conclusions .....	78

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED

REFERENCES CITED.....80

APPENDICES .....91

    APPENDIX A: Manipulation of the American Dream Ideology .....92

    APPENDIX B: Piloted Victim Scenarios .....94

    APPENDIX C: Pilot Tested Helping Measures .....96

## LIST OF TABLES

Table.....	Page
1. Helping as a function of victim ADI violation and victim group membership.....	31
2. Men's helping as a function of victim ADI violation and victim ingroup membership.....	34
3. Women's helping as a function of victim ADI violation and victim group membership.....	36
4. Men's helping as a function of prime type and participant ADI violation .....	54
5. Men's perceptions of the victim as a function of prime type and participant ADI violation .....	57
6. Women's helping as a function of prime type and participant ADI violation.....	59
7. Women's perceptions of the victim as a function of prime type and participant ADI violation .....	62
8. Correlations among helping and victim perception measures for men participants .....	63
9. Correlations among helping and victim perception measures for women participants .....	64

## ABSTRACT

The American dream ideology (ADI) consists of working hard, taking responsibility for oneself, and being rewarded for those efforts. Therefore, the ADI precludes asking for help. The current project investigated the possibility that if a victim violates the ADI (in this case by asking for help), this violation may result in others withholding resources. Additionally, the current project investigated whether characteristics of the victim (e.g., a victim's ingroup (American) or outgroup (international) membership) and characteristics of the helper (as someone who had violated the ADI or not) influenced amount of help offered to a victim. In Study 1, participants ( $n = 60$ ) were reminded of the ADI, then read about and rated a fellow ingroup or outgroup victim who was violating the ADI by asking for help (or not). Participants then reported willingness to help that victim. Results showed that men participants were relatively unwilling to help the victim regardless of condition, whereas women were only willing to help a victim who did not violate the ADI. Unexpectedly, the victim's group membership had no effect on amount of help offered. By including a control prime, Study 2 ( $n = 61$ ) extended these findings by testing whether a reminder of the ADI was necessary to inflict the withholding of positive resources to a victim who violated the ADI. Additionally, to explore a way to increase helping to a victim asking for help, participants were made to perceive themselves as violating the ADI (or not). Results showed that again women were more likely to help the victim than were men, but only when women were not reminded of the ADI. Results further showed that women were more likely to derogate the victim when they were both primed with the ADI and perceived themselves as violating the ADI. Taken together, results suggest that although women may be willing to help an ingroup and outgroup member equally, they will still enact subtle prejudice (e.g., the withholding of positive resources) against victims who ask for help if the American dream ideology is salient. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

## INTRODUCTION

There are those, I know, who will say that the liberation of humanity, the freedom of man and mind, is nothing but a dream. They are right. It is the American dream.

- Archibald MacLeish

Most Americans have grown up with sayings such as “the early bird catches the worm,” “if at first you don’t succeed then try, try again,” “keeping up with the Joneses,” and “pull yourself up by the bootstraps.” Such sayings capture the essence of the “American dream,” which dictates that any one person can make a better life for his or her self; because if a person works hard, he or she will be rewarded. The American dream took root among those who immigrated to the United States in search of “something better.” Thus, what started as an outsider’s perspective of America has now translated into the dominant American way of thinking—and may be a measure by which Americans judge the plights of others. Given that the American dream stresses individual responsibility for one’s own betterment within society, the American dream thus precludes asking for help. The question therefore remains; does the American dream discourage people from helping victims who ask for help? Are all victims who ask for help disregarded, or might asking for help only penalize those who are American? The current project examined the conditions under which the American dream discourages people from helping victims in need as a function of the characteristics of the victim (as American or not, Study 1) and characteristics of the helper (as personally adhering to the American dream or not, Study 2). The project focused specifically on the gendered nature of helping; to the extent that asking for help particularly violates the American male

gender role on one hand, but endorses the nurturing caring proscriptions that women should be helpful on the other.

### The American Dream Ideology

The American dream stresses reliance on one's own self, personal achievement, self-enhancement, and individualism (Lalwani, Shrum, & Chiu, 2009; Triandis, 1995); in other words, "independence" (Markus & Katyama, 1999). Additionally, the American dream maintains that those people who engage in hard work, dedication, dependability, and productivity will be more successful and of better moral character than those who do not engage in such concepts (Furnham, 1996), a construct often referred to as the "Protestant work ethic" (PWE). Finally, the American dream also includes meritocracy, or the notion that a person's hard work will be reflected in their status in life (Kluegel & Smith, 1986; McCoy & Major, 2007). Although people can differ in how much they do or do not endorse each of these individual values (e.g., meritocracy, PWE, individualism), these three concepts together reflect the dominant American ideology; namely, the American dream (Kaiser, 2006). Certainly, there is merit in unpacking each of the individual components, but for purposes here, it is important to think of them collectively as reflecting the overall American dream ideology (ADI).

The American dream ideology claims to provide opportunity for success for those who work for it. Thus, seeking out and taking advantage of "opportunities" is a top priority in American society and allows individuals to move upward in hierarchical social status (Greenberg, Solomon, & Pyszczynski, 1997). One of the benefits of having and adhering to the established tenants of a given society—in this case the American dream

ideology—is that those preestablished expectations allow individuals to believe that their world is a predictable and equitable place, in which they will be rewarded for adhering to the dominant ideology (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Katz & Hass, 1988; Kluegel & Smith, 1981, 1986; Lerner 1971; Major, 1994; Major et al., 2002; Quinn & Crocker, 1999; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Indeed, those who do strongly endorse the ADI tend to perceive their worlds as something that is predictable and controllable, which in turn increases likelihood of societal benefits such as increased well-being (Lambert, Burroughs, & Nguyen, 1999), performance (Mirels & Darland, 1990), and motivation (Greenberg et al., 1997)—namely, “success” as defined by American culture (Kaiser, 2006).

In the past, much of the research involving ideologies and those who adhere to those ideologies focus on intergroup bias, or the systematic inclination to favor a fellow member of one’s own ingroup over an outgroup member (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002). Furthermore, much of this research has focused on ingroup bias and derogation of outgroup members when those members violate an ideology (e.g., Garcia et al., 2005; Marques et al., 1998, 2001). However, as can be seen from the review below, there may be times when an ingroup member violates the dominant ideology as well. Moreover, the focus on negative punishments (e.g., not hiring an individual, discrimination, etc.; Kaiser & Miller, 2003; Maass et al., 2003; Kaiser, Dyrenforth, & Hagiwara, 2005) for those who violate or threaten the dominant ideology might miss the additional arena of derogation: the withholding of positive resources. Therefore, in order to extend the existing literature on intergroup bias, violation to the American dream, and the effects of both of these factors on withholding prosocial behavior, the current project will examine what happens

when members of various groups (i.e., ingroup vs. outgroup) threaten the American dream ideology (in this case by asking for help).

### What is an Ingroup?

People can identify with a number of social groups and derive meaning and esteem from these group memberships (Greenberg et al., 1997; Harmon-Jones et al., 1996, Sani, Herrera, & Bowe, 2009). Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1974; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 2004) suggests that people will belong to social groups that share common attitudes, etc., (i.e., ingroups). When a person engages in such a social group with similar individuals, they in turn receive validation for those attitudes and worldviews that they share, often bolstering that individuals' self-esteem. Moreover, people will use different social strategies (e.g., liking, attribution of positive characteristics, social distancing, resource allocation, etc; Nigbur & Cinnirella, 2007; Perdue et al., 1990; Tajfel, 1987) to maintain and bolster their current social identity (Turner et al., 1987). For example, Walsh and Smith (2007) demonstrated that women who were trying to maintain their American ingroup identity were more likely to downplay their collective traits, and preferred instead to select activities and objects that signified independence. Walsh and Smith (2007) interpret their findings using cultural norms for acceptable American (versus feminine) behavior.

In order to maintain their status in an ingroup, individuals must adhere to the set of prescriptive norms that are in place for that particular ingroup. And for good reason. Group members who follow prescriptive norms are often positively valued (leading to group cohesion), whereas group members who do not follow prescriptive norms are often

negatively valued (Marques et al., 1998; Marques et al., 2001). Thus, fellow ingroup members who violate the social norms of their group may be derogated as a means of protecting the positive identity of that group (Garcia et al., 2005). These self-esteem enhancing and protecting motivations are one explanation for why individuals may favor one social group over another (Leary & Cox, 2008). Thus, as an individual's identification with any certain ingroup increases, positive bias towards that group (and away from other outgroups) also increases (Brewer, 1999). Within the framework of the American dream ideology, then, this theory predicts that Americans will favor fellow Americans and be biased against non-Americans. Below, a review is first presented on this ingroup favoritism, followed second by a review of outgroup derogation.

### Ingroup Favoritism

As previously stated, individuals may attempt to bolster their own self-esteem by attempting to fit in as best as possible within the prescribed norms of their ingroup (Marques et al., 2001). It follows, then, that in order to maintain positive ingroup relations, fellow members of one's own ingroup may be favored in order to sustain the cohesion of that ingroup (Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992). For example, Halevy, Bornstein, and Sagiv (2008) created a game paradigm in which participants were given tokens that they could either allocate to members of an ingroup (at an individual cost) or outgroup (at less personal cost, but to the cost of the entire ingroup). Results showed that participants were more willing to inflict personal cost to themselves in order to support the ingroup rather than support the outgroup at a lesser cost on the individual level. This suggests that individuals strive to support fellow members, even when options of inflicting lesser personal consequence are available. Similarly, Correia, Vala, and Aguiar

(2007) investigated ingroup favoritism by presenting participants with either an ingroup or outgroup victim who had befallen an accident. Results showed that participants cared more about seeking justice and reparation for an ingroup rather than outgroup victim, again suggesting a bias toward helping ingroup over outgroup members.

Outgroup Derogation: Given that people strive to sustain their membership to ingroups by assimilating towards or remaining close to the established norms of that group (e.g., Smith & Lewis, 2009; Walsh & Smith, 2006), it follows that people may also choose to derogate those fellow members who do not similarly strive to maintain those standards. Outgroup members may be perceived as deviating from the norms of one's own ingroup, suggesting an alternative, differentiated way of living. Therefore, an outgroup member who does not subscribe to the norms of the ingroup may be seen as threatening and subsequently elicit emotions such as disgust, fear, hostility, and resentment from members of the ingroup (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002, Stephan & Stephan, 2000).

Take, for example, one study of racial discrimination from Kaiser, Dyrenforth, and Hagiwara (2005). In their study, White participants read about and rated a (fictional) Black person (an outgroup member) who cited performing poorly on a test due to either internal (e.g., lack of effort), external (e.g., difficult test), or discriminatory reasons. Results showed that White participants only derogated the Black test taker complaining of discrimination. Presumably, this discrimination was due to the fact that in the American dream ideology, if a person works hard then he or she should be rewarded; a statement which directly contradicts the premise of discrimination. Similarly, Maass et al., (2003) found that when participating in a computer harassment paradigm and exposed to threat to their identity as men, men harassed a woman interaction partner (an outgroup

member) who was complaining of discrimination more than when he wasn't exposed to threat—especially when the men were highly identified with the masculine identity.

Another example of outgroup derogation comes from an extension of Correia et al.'s, (2007) study investigating ingroup bias for victims. In their study, Aguiar et al., (2008) investigated whether ingroup members were simply excessively favored, or whether outgroup victims were particularly derogated. To test this question, Aguiar et al., included a victim who carried no explicit group membership information. Results showed that the ingroup victim was judged as most deserving of justice, and that both the outgroup and noncategorized victim were derogated equally more than the ingroup victim. Taken together, these results suggest that it is in fact due to excessive ingroup favoritism (as opposed to outgroup hate) that an ingroup victim may receive more help than an outgroup (or noncategorized) victim.

#### Factors Influencing Intergroup Bias

Despite the abundance of research supporting ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation, it is important to note that ingroup love does not always equal outgroup hate. For example, maintaining positive attitudes toward members of one's own ingroup does not necessitate negative attitudes towards outgroup members, for attitudes can be completely independent (Brewer, 1999). Although it is possible that ingroups and outgroups can indeed be at odds with each other (e.g., competition over resources, etc), this is not always the case (Brewer, 1999). For instance, emotions such as disgust and contempt for outgroups are not always enacted actively, but instead avoidance may occur. However, when a situation becomes threatening, higher levels of contempt, blame, scapegoating, and prejudice may arise against the outgroup, while ingroup identification

itself is bolstered (Brewer, 1999). This absence of positive attitudes towards groups (rather than a blatant negative sentiment) is a form of subtle prejudice that can be seen in intergroup relations (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1993; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). As stated above, an ingroup member who does not adhere to the prescriptive group norms may be derogated. But would such an ingroup derogation translate to outgroup favoritism?

### Consideration of Outgroup Favoritism and Ingroup Derogation

There are instances when *ingroup* members are derogated. For instance, if an ingroup member does not identify with the norms and beliefs dictated by their ingroup, they may show outgroup favoritism and ingroup hate (Eidelman & Biernat, 2003). Much of the empirical research investigating such a phenomenon comes from studies involving stigmatized and low status participants. For example, low socioeconomic status group members may derogate fellow ingroup members, and instead apply more positive ratings and attributions to higher socioeconomic status group members in order to distance themselves from their current status or group identification (Genesee & Holobow, 1989; Jones, 2002). Similarly, stigmatized groups (e.g., racial minorities) are often more willing to derogate members of other stigmatized groups as well as members of their own shared stigmatized group (Shapiro, Mistler, & Neuberg, 2010). The above example illustrates that indeed, ingroup derogation can occur.

### Derogation of Those Who Violate the American Dream Ideology

On the whole, the above studies support the idea that individuals may be biased to derogate outgroup members more often than ingroup members. It remains to be seen, however, if this derogation takes the shape of more subtle prejudice such as refusing to

help others. Further, it remains to be seen if this derogation (in the form of withholding positive resources) could extend to preferring to help an outgroup member at the expense of helping an ingroup member who violates the American dream ideology. The current project examined these questions within the context of prosocial behavior. To the extent that withholding helping is a form of subtle prejudice (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1997), the current project will shed light on whether or not an ingroup vs. outgroup victim violating the ADI results in derogation, in addition to exploring a potential way to mitigate that derogation. In order to investigate these questions, it is important to understand relevant research involving prosocial behavior itself, which is presented below.

#### A Focus on Prosocial Behavior

Although a broad topic heavily investigated over the past half century (Batson, 1989; Darley et al., 1994; Dovidio & Penner, 2004; Hartshorne et al., 1929; Kaplan, 1972; Mussen & Eisenberg-Berg, 1977; Radant, 1985; Rosen, 1971; Vinacke, 1980), most research in prosocial behavior investigates the circumstances when people will or will not help others in their own ingroup (for a review see Frey & Gaertner, 1986; Gaertner, Dovidio, & Johnson, 1982). For instance, Batson and Shaw (1991) posit that people are more likely to help when they feel empathy for the person in need. Empathy, then, is the ostensible underlying mechanism which motivates prosocial acts. Similarly, the social conduct model (Weiner, 1995) suggests that peoples' willingness to help is dependent on their beliefs about the causes of a victims plight. For instance, if the helper perceives the victim as in a situation not of their own doing, they will be more likely to feel sympathy or empathy for the victim, leading to increased helping. If the helper

perceives the victim to be personally responsible for their situation, on the other hand, feelings such as anger and annoyance may be elicited, leading to reluctance to help (Blazina & Marks, 2001). Another reason for why people may choose to help others is the self-esteem maintenance model (Cialdini, Darby, & Vincent, 1973), which suggests that people help others in order to make themselves feel good. In a similar vein, Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, Schroeder and Clark (1991) speculate that acts of prosocial behavior are simply a tool used by people as a means of reducing distress for one's self.

For any individual who plans to help another person, there exists a certain psychological cost of helping. Indeed, one major theory in prosocial research is that the benefits of helping the person in need must be greater than the psychological cost to the helper (Dovidio et al., 1991). For example, a person is more likely to help if they are likely to get some sort of reward (e.g., an increase in self-esteem, social recognition, material benefits, etc; Kayser, Farwell, & Greitemeyer, 2008) that outweighs the cost of helping itself (e.g., monetary loss, heightened emotional costs such as annoyance or concern, etc.; Greitemeyer et al., 2006). Therefore, unless the benefits of helping outweigh the costs to do so, prosocial behavior is less likely to occur (Dovidio & Penner, 2004).

In addition to the helper-characteristics for engaging in prosocial behavior, victim characteristics also matter as well. For instance, victim similarity to the helper is highly predictive of increased levels of helping. The more similar in traits an innocent victim is to the person making a judgment about them, the more subject they are to victimization. For example, when participants are not allowed to intervene and try and stop a victims suffering, participants may avoid the victims who were similar to themselves more than

they do dissimilar victims (Novak & Lerner 1968). Another important determinant is the gender of the victim. Because asking for help is assumed to show weakness, incompetence, femininity, and vulnerability (O'Neil, 1981), men are less likely than women to seek help for personal problems (Blazina and Marks, 2001; Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Good, Dell, & Mintz, 1989) as asking for help is not seen as part of “the masculine mystique” (Kasten, 1972).

As mentioned earlier, a central reason proposed for why victims of varying group membership are subject to more or less discrimination is that outgroup victims often lack the positive emotions that a helper has towards members of one's own ingroup (Brewer, 1999). This suggests that if positive emotions can be created (e.g., empathy) then increased helping may be elicited from individuals, regardless of what group membership the victim maintains. Therefore, in addition to testing when victim group status effects amount of help received, the current project also tested if empathy would offset these group effects as well.

### Project Overview

The American dream ideology consists of working hard, getting rewarded and moving up in society, and taking responsibility for one's own successes and failures (Kluegel & Smith, 1981). This ADI thus precludes “asking for help”. Indeed, asking for help might be viewed as a threat to the ADI and people who ask for help might be the least likely to receive it. The current project tested the conditions under which Americans will or will not engage in prosocial behavior towards ingroup members who violate this dominant ideology, and whether or not this ingroup bias is associated with outgroup

favoritism or derogation. Study 1 tested whether fellow ingroup members may be subject to subtle prejudice (as demonstrated by the withholding of positive resources) more so than an outgroup member when people are reminded of the ADI. Study 1 also investigated whether or not the withholding of positive resources is contingent upon the victim violating the ADI. Therefore, participants were randomly assigned to a 2 (victim group membership: ingroup vs. outgroup) X 2 (victim-ADI violation vs. no victim-ADI violation) design in which they made decisions about helping a victim in need.

Study 2 then investigated whether decreased helping would still occur if the ADI was not made salient to participants by including a control prime condition. Additionally, I sought to examine ways to reduce the withholding of positive resources by inducing empathy in participants (i.e., reminding participants of times when they themselves have violated the ADI by asking for help). As such, Study 2 participants were randomly assigned to a 2 (participant ADI-violation vs. no participant ADI-violation) x 2 (American dream prime vs. control) between participants design in which they made decisions about helping an American victim in need.

### Pilot Testing Overview

To determine appropriate and effective experimental stimuli for the proposed studies, three pilot studies were conducted. First, I needed to determine a victim scenario and identify a range of prosocial dependent measures; second, I needed to determine the best way to manipulate the American dream ideology violation, and finally for Study 2, I needed to determine that Schwarz et al.'s (1991) original ease of retrieval manipulation

(using 6 vs. 12 examples) would be appropriate for examples of individuals' experiences with asking for help. Each pilot study is discussed in detail below.

## PILOT STUDY 1: VICTIM SCENARIO SELECTION AND DEPENDENT MEASURE SELECTION

One important issue when measuring victim judgments in experiments is that of victim characteristics. Therefore, the first goal of pilot study 1 was to determine how best to present the victim in need of helping—to ensure I did not have ceiling or floor effects on feelings of closeness, and that the ingroup/outgroup membership manipulation results in equally likeable victims. Because of the complicated nature of the determination of the victim, a review is presented below of the relevant research.

The internal or external cause of the victim's plight is important in determining who gets helped. For example, Kanekar and Shariffa (2001) found that people are more likely to help another person if their victimization stems from an outside, uncontrollable cause (e.g., illness, non-fault accident, etc.) than a controllable cause (e.g., drunkenness, laziness, etc.). In one study involving victim characteristics, Haynes and Olson (2006) manipulated the amount of personal responsibility a victim had in their victimization in addition to their perceived likeability. Interestingly, when faced with an unlikeable victim who had little responsibility for their situation, participants tried to maintain their justice beliefs by derogating the character of the victim. For a highly likeable victim who was highly responsible for their situation, on the other hand, participants blamed the victim for their circumstances. Namely, this means that if a person is likeable, bad things should not happen to them. However, if something bad does happen to them, they should be held responsible for their circumstances, otherwise they will be violating the tenants of a “just world” (Hafer, 2000).

Research further shows that members of outgroups are less likely to be helped in ambiguous situations than are members of one's own ingroup (Frey & Gaertner, 1986; Gaertner, Dovidio, & Johnson, 1982), will be judged as less deserving of public benefits (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995), will be seen as more aggressive (Baron, 1979; Rogers & Pentice-Dunn, 1981), and are more likely to be blamed personally for their misfortune (Weber, 1994). Similarity is also important to prosocial behavior, such that the more similar in traits an innocent victim is to the person making a judgment about them, (e.g., sharing ingroup traits) the more likely they will be to be helped. For instance, when participants are not allowed to intervene and try and stop a victim's suffering, participants may avoid the victims who were similar to themselves more than they did dissimilar victims (Novak & Lerner 1968). Even when viewed as "similar" and of ingroup status, the gender of the victim is also important. For example, asking for help is not seen as part of "the masculine mystique". Thus, for men, asking for help is stereotypically associated with weakness, incompetence, femininity, and vulnerability (O'Neil, 1981; 1986).

Taken together, these findings suggest that beyond just ingroup or outgroup status, selection of a victim scenario to use for this project must consider the gender, likability, and similarity of the victim as well as the personal responsibility of the event. Therefore, several adaptations of victims used in previous research (described below) needed to be pilot tested for these specific characteristics, both with ingroup and outgroup targets, before making a final selection for use in Study 1 and Study 2.

### Participants and Procedure

Seventy three students (69% female) from Montana State University took part in a study supposedly about “Media Psychology: Insights into Self and Other.” Participants were asked to participate in a pilot study that was being conducted to ostensibly investigate a potential newspaper story regarding how different people form impressions of students who are at risk for dropping out of college. This information was given not only as a cover story to avoid drawing attention to the direct purpose of the study, but also to relay the information that the individuals in the scenarios were similar to the participant in their age, student status, and college identification (Montana State University). After being briefed about the nature of the pilot study, participants read and signed an informed consent form, then were presented with a packet of surveys. Within each packet, each participant read about the plight of two different victims who were at risk for dropping out of college due to various circumstances—these scenarios are presented in the Appendix A. Participants were randomly assigned to read two of five different scenarios that I identified from past research as possibilities for this project (reviewed below). The order and pairing of scenarios were counterbalanced. Importantly, due to the fact that men tend to ask for help less often than women (Blazina & Marks, 2001; Good, Dell, & Mintz, 1989) all of the victims used in the current scenarios were male in order to increase the violation to the American dream ideology.

- Manipulation of victim circumstance: Participants read two of five scenarios that have been modified from previous studies: a student with a 6 month old son whose girlfriend abandoned him (Miller, 1976); a student who failed a class because of a sexist TA (Kaiser & Miller, 2001); a student with cancer (Finlay &

Trafimow, 1998); a student whose scholarship was revoked (Jonas et al., 2008); or a student who may be faced with putting his younger brother and sister up for adoption (Batson, 1991).

- Manipulation of ingroup/outgroup status: All details of the scenarios used were the same with the exception of one detail; in order to manipulate ingroup/outgroup status, the following manipulation was made to the beginning of each scenario: “This person is a hometown student at Montana State University in Bozeman...” to present the victim as an ingroup member, and “This person is an international student at Montana State University in Bozeman...” to present the victim as an outgroup member. All other details of the scenarios remained identical.

After reading one of these scenarios, participants answered several questions about the victim which measured how much they saw the victim as violating the prescribed norms of American society, how similar (to the participant) they were perceived, how likeable they were, how much help they needed/deserved, and questions about the characteristics of the victim. After repeating this process with another vignette and survey, participants then completed a measure of how strongly they felt toward their ingroup, and finally completed a demographics form.

### Dependent Measures

To determine which scenario to use for the project, ratings of how similar to themselves participants viewed each victim, (e.g., how many characteristics they thought they shared with the victim) how close they wanted to be with them, and also how likable they found each victim were assessed.

The second goal of this pilot study was to investigate which “helping” dependent variables would be best to use in the current project; some of these variables were created for specific use in this study, and others were adopted from existing literature. For example, in order to measure how willing other people were to help each victim, measures such as “how willing would you be to volunteer to help this student?”, and “how much would you give to this student if you had 60 dollars at your disposal?” were asked on a 1 (not at all willing/etc) to 7 (very willing/etc) likert scale, unless otherwise specified. A list of all the piloted helping measures is available in Appendix B.

## Results

### Success of Manipulations

Results showed participants felt “close” to (and wanted to be friends with) the hometown student (ingroup member) who had cancer ( $M = 5.25$ ); the caretaker ( $M = 5.18$ ) and the single-father ( $M = 4.75$ ) compared to the other ingroup members, whereas participants felt the least close to the international student (outgroup member) who had cancer; ( $M = 3.78$ ); caretaker ( $M = 4.00$ ) and the TA ( $M = 4.27$ ),  $F(4, 134) = 2.55, p = .04$ . Thus, given that the manipulation of hometown and international student in the cancer and the caretaker scenarios had the desired effects of closeness; results thus far suggest that one of these two vignettes would be best for the upcoming study.

In the same vein as closeness, another measure that needed to be analyzed from the pilot study was how similar participants felt to each victim. The hometown student (ingroup member) with cancer was seen as the most similar to participants ( $M = 5.67$ ), then the caretaker ( $M = 5.42$ ), the TA ( $M = 3.36$ ), the scholarship recipient ( $M = 3.29$ ),

and the single-father ( $M = 1.83$ ). The international student was seen as considerably less similar to participants: the cancer victim, though seen as the most similar, was significantly less similar than the ingroup cancer victim ( $M = 3.21$ ), followed by the single-father ( $M = 3.15$ ), the scholarship recipient ( $M = 3.10$ ) the victim of the TA ( $M = 2.73$ ), and the caretaker ( $M = 2.50$ ). These results further support using vignettes of the hometown and international students in either the cancer or caretaker scenarios for the actual study.

Finally, it was necessary that the ingroup and outgroup victims for each scenario were equally likeable. Therefore, upon investigating the cancer and caretaker victim scenarios, it was found that participants equally liked the ingroup ( $M = 4.75$ ) and outgroup ( $M = 4.71$ ) cancer victims. Interestingly, the ingroup caretaker ( $M = 4.68$ ) was seen as more likeable than the outgroup caretaker ( $M = 4.17$ ), but only marginally ( $p = .069$ ). From this data, then, results suggest that the cancer victim is the best victim scenario to use in the proposed study, given the high levels of feelings of closeness and similarity to the ingroup member, as well as the equal ratings of likeability for both ingroup and outgroup victims.

### Examining the Ways of Helping Measures

Upon examining the various measures of helping for the cancer scenario victim, an independent samples t-test revealed that only one helping dependent measure reached significance: participants were significantly more willing to give more money from an available 60 dollars to an ingroup cancer victim than an outgroup cancer victim ( $t(23) = 2.67, p = .014$ ). However, two other measures had a similar pattern, although not significant: the measure of a participant's willingness to spend their own money to

support the student  $t(24) = 1.42, p = .167$ , and participant's willingness to hand out flyers to help the student  $t(24) = 1.09, p = .286$ .

An independent samples t-test revealed no significant differences between the dependent measures for the caretaker scenario, but did follow a similar pattern as the results from the cancer victim scenario. For instance, the available 60 dollars measure produced the most significance  $t(34) = 1.23, p = .227$ . Similarly, the next two measures with the most difference between ingroup and outgroup victims was again the measure of a participant's willingness to spend their own money to support the student  $t(34) = .889, p = .380$ , and participant's willingness to hand out flyers to help the student  $t(34) = .850, p = .401$ .

### Discussion

The results of pilot testing revealed that the cancer scenario and the sibling scenario were the most appropriate of the 5 scenarios for use in the primary studies. However, further comparisons of these two scenarios showed that the ingroup and outgroup victims of cancer were seen as equally likeable compared to the slightly larger differences in likeability of the sibling caretaker scenario. Therefore, for current project, the cancer victim was chosen because it met the criteria that the victim was male, was likeable, and differed in closeness as a function of ingroup/outgroup status.

Additionally, upon inspecting the dependent variables of helping, several of the dependent measures maintained little variability and proved to be insensitive measures of helping. Therefore, the only measures used in the proposal were the significant measure between the ingroup/outgroup victim (how much would you give if you had 60 dollars at

your disposal) and the two that approached significance and followed the expected pattern of results (the participant's willingness to spend their own money to support the student and participant's willingness to hand out flyers to help the student).

## PILOT STUDY 2: AMERICAN DREAM IDEOLOGY MANIPULATION

While a variety of constructs make up the dominant American ideology, the three used in the current project are taken from Kaiser's (2006) description of the American dream. Those three constructs are the Protestant work ethic, meritocracy, and individualism. In the past, a combination of sentence scramble tasks and word scramble tasks have been used to prime each of these three constructs individually, but at present, neither format is available for all three constructs, nor have they all been used in concert. Therefore, in order to manipulate all three constructs of the American dream ideology in the same format, a list of words used to prime these constructs in previous literature (albeit used in a different format) was gathered and was pilot tested to ensure that all words were correctly unscrambled. The following are the word lists that were taken from past research:

- Protestant work ethic (Furnham, 1953; Cherrington, 1980; Christopher et al., 2003): Surplus, ambition, industrious, employed, success, wealth, cultivate, hard work, and proactive.
- Individualism (Oyserman & Lee, 2008): Distinct, different, competitive, free, unique, dissociate, assertive, unusual, autonomy, alone, apart, autonomous, detached, different, dissimilar, distinct, diverge, independence, individual, isolate, separate, split, solitude and unique.
- Meritocracy (McCoy & Major, 2007): Mobility, merit, earn, excellence, worthy, deserving, talent, warrant, reward, skill, able, status, and advance.

In addition to the above 15 ADI and 5 neutral words used to prime the American dream, 20 neutral words were also selected to compose the neutral prime as well as five

neutral words to supplement the American dream prime. All neutral words chosen were matched for length and frequency via the English Lexicon Project Web Site (<http://elexicon.wustl.edu/>). (e.g., ‘merit’ matched with ‘album’, etc). For a complete list of the neutral words, please see Appendix C.

### Participants, Procedure, and Results

Students at Montana State University ( $n = 19$ , Mean age = 19.5 years) were asked to take part in a study investigating word unscrambling skills. Randomly ordered surveys with a list of all three constructs as well as neutral words were presented to each participant. Ten minutes were given to participants to finish the scramble. Results of pilot testing showed that participants were able to unscramble the majority of words correctly (89%) within the 10 minute time limitation. Due to their high rate of being either skipped or completed incorrectly, the words “diverged” “dissociate” and “autonomous” (all from the individualism scale) were not used in the current project. The fact that the individualism word list was the longest renders the decision to drop these items as appropriate. After taking out these words, five words from each list were selected on the basis of their comparably high amount of times being correctly unscrambled. The final American dream ideology word unscramble task is presented in Appendix C (with the correct answer in parentheses).

## STUDY 1: INGROUP VS. OUTGROUP VICTIM AND AMERICAN DREAM IDEOLOGY VIOLATION

### Overview

Study 1 was conducted to investigate whether ingroup or outgroup victims who violated the American dream ideology were helped less by participants. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions and were provided with information about either an ingroup or outgroup victim who was asking for help or not. Next, participants completed the measures of helping (e.g., how willing would you be to hand out flyers to help this student?). Additionally, participants answered questionnaires probing participant characteristics such as MSU identification and demographic information. Finally, participants completed three manipulation checks (was the student you read about male/female; did they contact the newspaper or did the newspaper contact them; were they a hometown or international student).

### Hypotheses

#### Victim Violation of American Dream Ideology Hypothesis

1. Compared to victims who adhere to the ADI, victims who violate the ADI will receive the least amount of help from participants.

#### Interaction with Ingroup/Outgroup Membership Hypotheses

2. The victim violation of the ADI will be qualified by an interaction with the victim's ingroup/outgroup status.

- a. Ingroup victims who violate the ADI will receive the least amount of help, compared to all other victims.
- b. Ingroup victims who do not violate the ADI will receive the most amount of help, compared to all other victims.
- c. Outgroup victims who do not violate the ADI will receive an equally moderate amount of help compared to outgroup victims who violate the ADI.

### Participants and Design

Sixty-five American born students at Montana State University took part in the present study in exchange for partial course credit. Five participants were removed from analyses due to either 1 incorrect or 2 'unsure' responses on the three final manipulation checks. The resulting 60 participants (53.30% female) were at predominantly the sophomore level with a mean student age of 20.33. All participants responded to being American citizens (by birth), the majority of which (88.30%) identified themselves as Caucasian. Participants were randomly assigned to the conditions of a 2 (victim group membership: ingroup vs. outgroup) X 2 (victim ADI violation vs. no ADI violation) between participants design. Importantly, in an effort to hold constant similarity with the MSU victim (except for ingroup/outgroup status), we assessed participants' group identification with MSU. A one-sample t-test revealed that participants' identification scores ( $M = 4.74$ ,  $SD = .90$ ) were indeed significantly greater than the scale midpoint (4),  $t(59) = 40.38$ ,  $p < .001$ .

### Cover Story

Participants in Study 1 were told they would be participating in a study investigating “Media Psychology: Insights into Self and Other”. Upon entering the lab, participants were told that the current study was being conducted in conjunction with a “local newspaper” who was interested in generating more interest in print media (given the propensity of students often favoring online media). Therefore, participants would be asked to engage in a number of “media-related activities” to measure the effectiveness and interest that such activities were able to produce. In addition to activities, participants were told that a main interest of this newspaper was to investigate “students’ attitudes towards a possible column that may be run in the paper during the following school year.” This proposed column would be a monthly highlight of students who are at risk for dropping out of school due to various circumstances, as well as a measure of different ways that students may be interested in community involvement after reading such columns. Because of the student focus of the paper, then, the paper needed to have a better idea of what kind of stories are of interest to MSU students to gauge how to present this column. Participants were then told that they would be asked to read about a student who was in need of help, make judgments about that student, and see how much help they would be willing to offer to the student in need of help.

### Procedure

After being informed of the cover story and the procedures involved in the study, participants read and signed informed consent forms. Next, participants engaged in a short activity requiring them to fill out some word scramble activities, presumably to see if the words in the scramble were usable for a headline scramble that readers of the paper

could fill out. In reality, this “headline scramble” was actually the mechanism by which the American dream ideology was presented to participants (explained in further detail below).

Following the ADI word scramble, participants read about either a hometown (ingroup) or international (outgroup) student at MSU who was struggling to pay for his cancer treatments and was in need of help from his fellow students (violation is described below). Participants were then given the opportunity to ‘help’ the victim (described below).

#### Reminder of the American Dream Ideology.

To make the ADI salient, all participants unscrambled words associated with meritocracy, individualism, and the Protestant work ethic (Kaiser, 2006; Furnham 1953; Cherrington, 1980; Christopher et al., 2005; Oyserman & Lee, 2008; McCoy & Major, 2007) Specifically, participants unscrambled 15 words priming the three American dream constructs, including: distinct, surplus, merit, different, reward, industrious, able, individual, work, wealth, earn, unique, employed, mobility, and competitive, as well as the 5 filler (neutral) words.

#### Manipulation of American Dream Ideology Violation

One of the major goals of Study 1 was to investigate how people react to those who violate the American dream ideology by asking for help. Thus, half of the participants were exposed to a student who has sought out the newspaper and its readers to ask for help (violation), while the other half were exposed to a student who had been

sought out by the newspaper to ask for help on their behalf (no violation). Specifically, participants read:

- Victim-ADI-Violation Condition: “This person, who is a 20 year old international (hometown) student at Montana State University in Bozeman, has recently been diagnosed with Hodgkin’s disease, a form of cancer commonly found in young adults. He must work and attend college simultaneously, as he supports himself. Because of his illness, he is no longer able to work at his job, and therefore cannot afford all of the fast-accumulating medical bills that are a result of his treatments. Because of his circumstances, this student is asking for help offsetting the cost of these treatments.”
- Victim-No-ADI-Violation Condition: “This person, who is a 20 year old international (hometown) student at Montana State University in Bozeman, has recently been diagnosed with Hodgkin’s disease, a form of cancer commonly found in young adults. He must work and attend college simultaneously, as he supports himself. Because of his illness, he is no longer able to work at his job, and therefore cannot afford all of the fast-accumulating medical bills that are a result of his treatments. Because of his circumstances, our newspaper has contacted this student and is asking him to be highlighted in our potential feature. This allows us to ask for help from his fellow students to offset the costs of these treatments on his behalf.

### Manipulation of Ingroup/Outgroup target

To manipulate ingroup or outgroup status, the only delineation between the two scenarios was the replacement of the word ‘international’ for ‘hometown’ in the aforementioned paragraph.

### Dependent Measures

- **Willingness to Help:** Participants were asked to respond 3 items assessing willingness to engage in prosocial behavior. Specifically, participants were asked how likely they would be to spend their own money to support the student and how likely they would be to hand out flyers in the street on a 1 (not at all likely) to 7 (very likely) likert scale, as well as how much they would give to the student if they had 60 dollars at their disposal on a 0 – 60 ratio scale.
- **Ingroup Identification:** Due to the interest in both MSU identification and identification as an American citizen, two ingroup identification scales were included (Brewer, 1999). Participants thus responded to questions such as, “Being a Montana State University student is an important part of my identity”, and “I am glad to belong to the United States” on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) likert scale. Summary scores are calculated by averaging participants’ responses such that higher scores indicate higher levels of ingroup (MSU or USA) identification.

## Results

In order to test the hypotheses that individuals would offer less help to a victim when that victim violated the American dream ideology (Hypothesis 1) and to test if that help was attenuated by ingroup/outgroup membership (Hypothesis 2), separate 2(victim group membership: ingroup x outgroup) X 2(victim ADI violation vs. no victim ADI violation) ANOVAs were conducted on each of the three helping measures.

### Willingness to Help

1. How likely would you be to spend your own money to support this student?

Results from a 2(victim group membership: ingroup x outgroup) X 2(victim ADI violation vs. no victim ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant main effects of victim group membership ( $F[1, 56] = .02, p = .88, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ) or victim violation ( $F[1, 56] = .782, p = .38, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ) on this measure of helping. No statistically significant interaction between victim group membership and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 56] = .894, p = .35, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ).

2. How likely would you be to hand out flyers to people in the street to help this student?

Results from a 2(victim group membership: ingroup x outgroup) X 2(victim ADI violation vs. no victim ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant main effect of victim group membership ( $F[1, 56] = .02, p = .89, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ). However, a marginal main effect of victim ADI violation emerged ( $F[1, 56] = 3.20, p = .08, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ). The pattern of means for this marginal main effect suggested that people were somewhat less likely to help the victim who violated the ADI compared to the victim who did not violate the ADI (see Table 1). No

statistically significant interaction between victim group membership and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 56] = .00, p = .99, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ).

3. How much would you give to this student if you had 60 dollars at your disposal?

A 2(victim group membership: ingroup x outgroup) X 2(victim ADI violation vs. no victim ADI violation) ANOVA was conducted on how much participants would give the victim if they had \$60 at their disposal. Results revealed no significant main effects of victim group membership ( $F[1, 56] = .44, p = .51, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ) or victim ADI violation ( $F[1, 56] = .44, p = .51, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ) on this measure of helping. Moreover, no statistically significant interaction between victim group membership and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 56] = .08, p = .78, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ).

Table 1

Study 1: Helping as a function of victim ADI violation and victim group membership

	Victim violates ADI		Victim does not violate ADI	
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)
<b>SPEND OWN MONEY</b>				
Ingroup victim	3.89	(1.52)	4.71	(1.77)
Outgroup victim	4.38	(1.76)	4.36	(1.86)
<b>LIKELIHOOD TO HAND OUT FLYERS</b>				
Ingroup victim	4.00	(1.91)	4.86	(1.88)
Outgroup victim	4.08	(1.89)	4.93	(1.59)
<b>60 DOLLARS AT DISPOSAL</b>				
Ingroup victim	36.87	(21.66)	40.00	(22.19)
Outgroup victim	40.00	(17.68)	42.14	(19.68)

*Note:* All values within dependent measures were statistically equal. Both the likelihood to spend own money and hand out flyers were measured on a 1 (highly unlikely) to 7 (highly likely) scale, whereas the final helping measure (giving a certain amount out of predisposed money) was measured on a \$0 to \$60 ratio scale.

### Exploratory Analysis

Previous research has shown that men and women may engage in different amounts and types of prosocial behavior (Batson, 1998; Sprecher et al., 2007), likely because of different gender stereotypes that prescribe women as generally helpful and nurturing and men as more “knight in shining armor” helpers (Eagly & Crowley, 1986). Therefore, exploratory analyses were conducted to examine gender differences on each of the helping measures. To do this, the above analyses were each run again, this time adding gender as a third factor. This resulted in a 2(victim group membership: ingroup x outgroup) X 2(victim ADI violation vs. no victim ADI violation) X 2(participant gender: male vs. female) ANOVA.

Results showed a main effect for gender on likelihood to spend one’s own money, ( $F[1, 52] = 6.40, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .11$ ) in addition to a significant gender and victim ADI violation interaction ( $F[1, 52] = 5.60, p = .022, \eta_p^2 = .10$ ). Follow up comparisons revealed that women were significantly more likely to help the victim who did not violate the ADI than were men. Interestingly, no main effect of gender occurred on the helping measure of likelihood to hand out flyers ( $F[1, 52] = 2.78, p = .10, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ), a similar gender effect pattern remained. However, a significant interaction did occur between victim ADI violation and gender ( $F[1,52] = 6.56, p = .013, \eta_p^2 = .11$ ), such that women were significantly more willing to help the victim who did not violate the ADI than were men. Finally, a main effect of gender was also found on amount of money (out of \$60) given to the victim ( $F[1,52] = 11.88, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .19$ ), although no significant victim ADI violation occurred ( $F[1,52] = 2.90, p = .095, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ).

To better interpret these main effect and interactions with gender on helping, analyses were re-conducted separately for men and women. It is important to note, however, that the following analyses were subject to a low and sometimes unequal N (approximately 8 per condition), and thus sustain low statistical power. As such, results should be interpreted with caution.

### Results for Men

1. How likely would you be to spend your own money to support this student?

Results from a 2(victim group membership: ingroup x outgroup) X 2(victim ADI violation vs. no victim ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant effects of victim group membership ( $F[1, 24] = .00, p = .959, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ) or victim violation ( $F[1, 24] = 1.84, p = .19, \eta_p^2 = .07$ ) on likelihood to spend one's own money. No statistically significant interaction between victim group membership and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 24] = .70, p = .41, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ).

2. How likely would you be to hand out flyers to people in the street to help this student? Results from a 2(victim group membership: ingroup x outgroup) X 2(victim ADI violation vs. no victim ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant main effects of victim group membership ( $F[1, 24] = .83, p = .37, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ) or victim violation ( $F[1, 24] = .31, p = .58, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ) on likelihood to hand out flyers to help the victim. Moreover, no statistically significant interaction between victim group membership and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 24] = .31, p = .58, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ).
3. How much would you give to this student if you had 60 dollars at your disposal?

A final 2(victim group membership: ingroup x outgroup) X 2(victim ADI

violation vs. no victim ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant effects of victim group membership ( $F[1, 24] = 2.04, p = .17, \eta_p^2 = .08$ ) or victim violation ( $F[1, 24] = ., p = .91, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ) on amount of money offered to the victim. Once again, no statistically significant interaction between victim group membership and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 24] = 1.45, p = .24, \eta_p^2 = .06$ ).

Table 2

Study 1: Men's helping as a function of victim ADI violation and victim group membership

	Victim violates ADI		Victim does not violate ADI	
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)
<b>SPEND OWN MONEY</b>				
Ingroup victim	3.83	(1.58)	3.50	(1.52)
Outgroup victim	4.40	(1.82)	3.00	(1.41)
<b>LIKELIHOOD TO HAND OUT FLYERS</b>				
Ingroup victim	4.58	(1.68)	3.83	(2.31)
Outgroup victim	3.60	(1.14)	3.60	(.89)
<b>60 DOLLARS AT DISPOSAL</b>				
Ingroup victim	29.17	(24.85)	18.33	(11.69)
Outgroup victim	31.00	(15.17)	40.00	(20.00)

*Note:* All values within dependent measures were statistically equal. Both the likelihood to spend own money and hand out flyers were measured on a 1 (highly unlikely) to 7 (highly likely) scale, whereas the final helping measure (giving a certain amount out of predisposed money) was measured on a \$0 to \$60 ratio scale.

### Results for Women

1. How likely would you be to spend your own money to support this student?

Results from a 2(victim group membership: ingroup x outgroup) X 2(victim ADI violation vs. no victim ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant main effect of victim group membership ( $F[1, 28] = .01, p = .91, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ). However, a

significant main effect of victim ADI violation did emerge on this item of helping ( $F[1, 28] = 4.15, p = .051, \eta_p^2 = .13$ ). Follow-up pairwise comparisons revealed that women were significantly less willing to spend their own money to help the victim who violated the ADI, compared to the victim who did not violate the ADI (See Table 3). No statistically significant interaction between victim group membership and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 28] = .59, p = .45, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ).

2. How likely would you be to hand out flyers to people in the street to help this student? Results from a 2(victim group membership: ingroup x outgroup) X 2(victim ADI violation vs. no victim ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant main effect of victim group membership ( $F[1, 28] = 1.33, p = .26, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ) on this item of helping. However, similar to results for spending their own money, a significant main effect for victim ADI violation emerged ( $F[1, 28] = 10.18, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .27$ ). Follow-up pairwise comparisons revealed that women were significantly less willing to hand out flyers to help the victim who violated the ADI than victims who did not violate the ADI (see Table 3). No statistically significant interaction between victim group membership and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 28] = 1.18, p = .29, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ).
3. How much would you give to this student if you had 60 dollars at your disposal? A final 2(victim group membership: ingroup x outgroup) X 2(victim ADI violation vs. no victim ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant effects of victim group membership ( $F[1, 28] = .82, p = .37, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ) or victim violation ( $F[1, 28] = .57, p = .46, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ) on amount of money offered to the victim.

Similarly, no statistically significant interaction between victim group membership and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 28] = 1.24, p = .28, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ).

Table 3

Study 1: Women's helping as a function of victim ADI violation and victim group membership

	Victim violates ADI		Victim does not violate ADI	
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)
<b>SPEND OWN MONEY</b>				
Ingroup victim	4.00 <sup>a</sup>	(1.53)	5.63 <sup>b</sup>	(1.41)
Outgroup victim	4.38 <sup>a</sup>	(1.85)	5.11 <sup>a,b</sup>	(1.69)
<b>LIKELIHOOD TO HAND OUT FLYERS</b>				
Ingroup victim	3.00 <sup>a</sup>	(1.09)	5.63 <sup>b</sup>	(1.06)
Outgroup victim	4.38 <sup>a</sup>	(2.26)	5.67 <sup>a,b</sup>	(1.41)
<b>60 DOLLARS AT DISPOSAL</b>				
Ingroup victim	44.29 <sup>a</sup>	(21.50)	56.25 <sup>a</sup>	(10.61)
Outgroup victim	45.63 <sup>a</sup>	(17.61)	43.33 <sup>a</sup>	(20.62)

*Note:* Rows and columns lacking a shared superscript indicates a difference at  $p < .05$ . Both the likelihood to spend own money and hand out flyers were measured on a 1 (highly unlikely) to 7 (highly likely) scale, whereas the final helping measure (giving a certain amount out of predisposed money) was measured on a \$0 to \$60 ratio scale.

### Discussion

A major goal of Study 1 was to investigate whether violating the American dream ideology—by explicitly asking for help—would result in individuals receiving less help. As can be seen from Study 1 results, this hypothesis was only partially supported. Overall, no differences in helping emerged as a function of victim's ADI violation. However, exploratory follow-up analyses revealed a more nuanced picture; gender of the helper appeared to influence helping in this case. Specifically, women were less willing to offer help in the form of their own money or time to a victim who violated the ADI. In

essence, for women helpers the mere act of someone asking for help was in fact the very thing that resulted in less help actually being offered (Hypothesis 1). Men, on the other hand, were relatively unwilling to help the victim regardless of whether the victim was violating the ADI or not.

Yet another goal of Study 1 was to identify whether the group membership of the victim (ingroup/outgroup) would influence how much help those victims received from participants (Hypothesis 2). Results from Study 1 failed to support this hypothesis, such that victim group membership had no significant influence on how much help was received across all three possible avenues for participant help (i.e., giving their *own* money, giving money readily at participants' disposal, handing out flyers). This lack of group membership effect in general or as a function of the gender of the helper is in contrast to much existing prosocial literature, in which an ingroup victim (who was not violating the ADI) typically received the most help. This is especially true for males, as they would have been most highly similar with the male victim (e.g., Dovidio & Johnson, 1982; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995).

One possible explanation for this null finding is that the particular victim(s) created for the present project were all MSU students, thus the otherwise outgroup victim may have all been seen as equally ingroup to our American, MSU participants. Alternatively, there remains a potent societal sex-role expectation barring men from asking for help (O'Neil, 1981; 1986). Whereas women tend to be more receptive to having others ask for their help in addition to asking for help themselves, men do not share this perception as often. Thus, women may not see a male outgroup victim as any more or less threatening than a fellow ingroup victim, and thus would be equally likely to

offer help, so long as he was not violating the ADI. Men, on the other hand, may overlook ingroup/outgroup membership simply because of the fact that it was a man in need of help. Thus, men may offer equally low amounts of help regardless of the context. A final possibility is that the dominant ideology threat literature simply might not extend to derogation of an ingroup member further than an outgroup member (within the arena of withholding positive resources).

In order to further explain why gender was such a predominant factor in the helping results of the current study, one must consider how, when, and why gender plays a role in helping. To begin, prescriptive norms exist in determining when men and women should typically help others (Eagly, 2009). As mentioned earlier, men may tend to engage more in “heroic” types of behavior (e.g., being the ‘knight in shining armor’) due to cultural expectations surrounding the masculine ideology prevalent in many Western cultures (e.g., being a daring risk taker, standing up under pressure, etc) (Diekmann & Eagly, 2000). Women, on the other hand, are subject to the female gender role of being nurturing, comforting, and caring and may thus be expected to help more often in situations necessitating more of those types of behaviors (e.g., being a ‘shoulder to cry on’). Additionally, women are often expected to put the needs of others before their own (Becker & Eagly, 2004; Chodorow, 1978). How might these expected behaviors contribute to when gender matters to helping?

New data from the 2009 Carnegie Hero Fund Commission (an organization who recognizes North American individuals for their heroic efforts in saving the lives of others) stated that over 90% of reward recipients were men. However, the particular type of prosocial behavior that this commission rewards taps into the types of behavior that are

congruent with the masculine ideology (putting one's own self at risk for another). A more empirical example of this idea comes from Levine and Crowther (2008), who experimentally investigated gender as a factor in bystander intervention. They found that when gender identity was made salient and participants were alone, men—compared to women—were most likely to help a victim in need. However, as group size increased, men helped the victim less, implicating that they may have felt less need to engage in what could be construed as 'hero' behavior. Women on the other hand were *more* likely to help a victim in a group situation. These results suggest that men and women may indeed easily fall into the expectations of gender stereotypes in helping situations.

Although this data is important, the very nature of both the Carnegie award and the Levine and Crowther (2008) study require willingness to engage in risk and danger, employ high amounts of assertiveness, and other characteristics more resonant with the male gender role (Vandello et al., 2008). In a meta-analysis of the early onslaught of prosocial behavior studies that followed the seminal work of Darley and Latane (1968), Eagly and Crowley (1986) found that both men and women reported that women should be more likely to help than men (on average). Despite these perceptions, Eagly and Crowley's analyses revealed the opposite: that men tend to help others more than women do. Importantly, however, this research has often come from studies that provide avenues more suited the male gender role. For example, the majority of the studies in the meta-analysis involved assessing the amount of short-term help offered to a woman victim. (Interestingly, Eagly and Crowley also found that the more dangerous a situation, the less likely women were to help—an effect that was completely nonexistent for men.) Indeed, if the male gender norm in helping is to be chivalrous and engage in acts of extreme

heroism to rescue the damsel in distress, the current study most certainly would not encourage such behavior.

Eagly and Crowley (1986) found that situational cues are involved in determining helping behaviors, such that women help more in long-term, relationship-based situations whereas men help more in short-term, emergency situations necessitating instrumental acts. Therefore, it is important to look at other environments for helping as well. Take, for example, prosocial behavior within close social relationships. Within this context, women tend to help more often. For example, not only do women tend to spend more time as the main caregiver for older family members and children (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008), but they are also more likely to be sought for emotional support by both friends and spouses (Burlison & Kunkel, 2006; Neff & Karney, 2005). For an in-depth review of gender roles and prosocial behavior, see Eagly (2009).

The above evidence regarding differences between men and women's willingness to engage in prosocial behavior may help account for the differences found in Study 1. Because the victim was subject to a long-term, ostensibly emotional plight, it is possible that this may be the reason that women were more responsive to the victim's situation and more willing to offer help. For instance, the victim created for the present study was a chronically ill student who needed money for his treatments to avoid dropping out of college in order to fund himself. Thus, not only was this particular scenario not one requiring fast action in the face of clear and present danger, but it was one involving a need for help over a long period of time. Consequently, the context of this situation may have been set to elicit increased helping from women but not men. However, given that overall men help more often than women (Eagly & Crowley, 1986) and the heightened

gender identity similarity between the male victim and male participants should make men more willing to help the victim than women (Hamilton, 1964; Tajfel, 1974; Tajfel & Turner, 2004), it follows that more research is needed to determine the role of the helper's gender in predicting prosocial behavior toward a male ingroup member. As such, one goal of Study 2 was to further investigate prosocial behavior whilst focusing only on the male ingroup victim. Furthermore, due to these gender differences in amounts of helping in Study 1 as a function of ADI victim violation, it follows that gender would also be an important variable to consider in Study 2.

Although Study 1 afforded various means of measuring helping, it lacked attention to perceptions of the victim. Thus, a second goal of Study 2 was to include additional items to assess some of the views that participants had about the ingroup male victim. In order to investigate this, however, additional attention needs to be paid to this key target: the fellow ingroup member who violates the American dream ideology. Importantly, because previous literature posits that people will be predominantly biased towards helping members of their own ingroup (e.g., Halevy et al., 2008), the focus on this ingroup victim allows us to test the strength of ingroup hate under various conditions (discussed below).

Lastly, a final limitation of Study 1 was that all participants were exposed to the American dream ideology prime. Thus, in addition to the ADI prime used in Study 1, the inclusion of a control prime was necessary to distinguish if exposure to the ADI was in fact a major component of why or why not participants (particularly women) chose to withhold resources from the victim.

Study 2 was conducted with four aims in mind: 1) to replicate the gender differences found in Study 1, 2) to extend the findings found in Study 1 to perceptions of the victim, 3) to test a possible way to attenuate participants' unwillingness to help the ingroup victim who violated the American dream ideology and 4) to see if the ADI prime was integral to participants' unwillingness to help the ingroup victim. To achieve these aims, Study 2 used similar stimuli, dependent measures, and procedures as Study 1 with several additional components, described below. But first, in order to ensure that the original mechanism to be used (ease of retrieval) would be appropriate for the current study, pilot testing was once again warranted.

PILOT STUDY 3: PARTICIPANT-VIOLATION OF THE AMERICAN DREAM  
IDEOLOGY MANIPULATION

The availability heuristic suggests that the more available information is, the more readily a person will be biased towards that information (Tversky & Kahneman, 1973). Using this as the framework for priming feelings of assertiveness via ease of retrieval, Schwarz et al., (1991) asked participants to recall either 6 or 12 distinct instances when they had enacted assertive behaviors. Schwarz et al. found that recalling 6 instances was easier for participants than was recalling 12 instances. Therefore, when participants were asked to think of 6 instances of assertive behavior and found it easy to do so, participants judged themselves as being *more* assertive than average. Those participants who were asked to list 12 times that they had been assertive, however, found the task difficult to complete, and—despite having the opportunity to actually list more words than the 6-instance condition—thus judged themselves as *less* assertive than average. This finding supports Tversky and Kahneman’s (1973) theory that it is not any actual differences in the number of instances participants in either group were able to conjure, but the subjective ease of retrieval that induces bias in the future. Therefore, the goal of this pilot test was to determine if a similar instruction of varying number of times when one asked for help would serve to prime participants into feeling that they themselves had violated the American dream ideology (or not). If I was successful in priming feelings of participant ADI violation, I could then determine what role empathy might have for a person who has asked for help (Study 2).

### Participants and Procedure

In order to ensure that the same activity could be used for recalling instances when participants had themselves asked for help, 41 students from Montana State University (61% female) participated in a pilot test regarding “the availability of memories.” Participants were asked to take part in a pilot study that was being conducted to investigate how able people are to remember, in a limited amount of time, instances when they themselves have asked help. Following the same procedure as Schwarz et al., (1991), participants were asked to recall either 6 or 12 times when they had asked for help. An equal amount of time was afforded each group to recall these instances. The total number of instances was recorded.

### Results and Discussion

Despite the significantly different results between 6 and 12 instances of aggressiveness recall availability in Schwarz et al. (1991), participants in the current pilot study were consistently able to recall the requested number of instances in which they had asked for help, both in the 6 instance condition as well as the 12 instance condition. These results suggest that for the current project, being asked to list 12 instances of asking for help was not difficult for participants. As such, in the current project (Study 2) the number of instances in the non-availability condition was doubled to 24 to ensure that the participant does not perceive that they have personally violated the ADI.

## STUDY 2: PARTICIPANT-ADI VIOLATION AND SPECIFIC ROLE OF AMERICAN DREAM IDEOLOGY

Study 1 revealed that violating the American dream ideology does indeed affect how much help individuals are willing to offer to a victim in need, although specifically with helping, group membership to an ingroup vs. an outgroup did not seem to matter. Despite these results, one limitation of Study 1 was the lack of a condition in which participants did not receive the ADI prime. Therefore, one goal of Study 2 was to determine if derogation of the ingroup member who asked for help was specific to situations in which the ADI was salient, or if the American dream ideology was already operating (among our American participants) and thus not a necessary condition. A second goal of Study 2 was to examine a possible moderator that might offset the negative effects of not helping the ingroup victim who violated the ADI; namely we assessed whether the ease with which the helper brought to mind instances in which they themselves violated the ADI might increase helping.

To reach these goals, participants were again told that they would be participating in a study investigating “Media Psychology: Insights into Self and Other”. First, participants were told they would be asked to engage in various activities to investigate how to generate interest in a potential newspaper via various media-related activities, and that they would be asked to read about and rate a student in need. In Study 2, however, participants were asked to make judgments about an ingroup, American victim only in need of help after being exposed to the ADI prime (or not). Additionally, participants were made to perceive themselves as either violating the ADI (or not). Then, participants responded to how much help they would be willing to offer that target in addition to their

perceptions of the victim. Finally, participants filled out the same MSU identification, demographic information, and manipulation checks described in Study 1.

### Hypotheses

#### Gender Hypothesis

1. There will be a main effect of gender in helping, such that women will offer more help to the victim than will men.

#### American Dream Ideology Hypothesis

2. Compared to women in the neutral condition, women primed with the ADI will offer less help to the victim

#### Participant-Violation of the American Dream Ideology Hypothesis

3. Women who perceive themselves as violating the ADI will offer the victim more help, regardless of prime condition.

#### Participant-Violation of the American Dream Ideology Interaction with Prime Hypotheses

4. Women's amount of helping in the neutral prime condition will be unaffected by the self-violation condition
5. Women under the ADI prime who do not perceive themselves as violating the ADI will offer the least amount of help to the victim.

## Participants and Design

### Participants

Sixty-three students at Montana State University participated in the present study in exchange for partial course credit. Two participants were removed from analyses due to either one incorrect or two 'unsure' responses on the three final manipulation checks. Analyses thus contained 61 participants, (59.00% female). Most students were sophomores and the mean student age was 21.17. All participants responded to being American citizens (by birth), nearly all of which (98.40%) identified themselves as Caucasian. Again, a one-sample t-test was conducted on participants' identification with Montana State University to ensure that they were more highly identified with MSU than what would be expected from the general population. Results again revealed that participants' scores ( $M = 5.55$ ,  $SD = 1.02$ ) did indeed differ significantly from the scale midpoint (4),  $t(62) = 43.27$ ,  $p < .001$ . Participants were randomly assigned to one of 4 conditions in a 2 (participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) x 2 (prime type: ADI vs. neutral) between subjects design.

### Procedure

As previously stated, participants were given the same 'Media Psychology: Insights into Self and Other' cover story described in Study 1. In Study 2, however, all participants were given the ADI threat information whereby they were told that they would be asked to read about a student who has "sought out the newspaper to ask for help," thus all participants were exposed to the same ingroup victim who always violated the ADI by asking for help.

After being informed of the cover story and the procedures involved in the study, participants read and signed informed consent forms. Next, participants engaged in a short activity requiring them to fill out some word scramble activities, again presumably to see if the words in the scramble were usable for a headline scramble that readers of the paper could fill out. In reality, this “headline scramble” was actually the mechanism by which the American dream ideology (or a neutral control condition) was manipulated. Next, participants were given the self-violation manipulation by engaging in the participant ADI-violation reminder vs. no participant ADI-violation reminder portion of the study. Specifically, participants were told that the newspaper was interested in how various student experiences may affect how they perceive the stories that they read about. Therefore, each student was asked to generate a list of personal experiences (described below) regarding the subject of interest that was randomly assigned to them. In reality, all participants were asked to generate either 6 or 24 instances in which they had asked someone for help.

Following the participant ADI-violation manipulation, participants read about a hometown (ingroup) student at MSU who was struggling to pay for his cancer treatments and was therefore asking for help from his fellow students. All participants were given the ingroup/violation scenario used in Study 1:

“This person, who is a 20 year old hometown student at Montana State University in Bozeman, has recently been diagnosed with Hodgkin’s disease, a form of cancer commonly found in young adults. He must work and attend college simultaneously, as he supports himself. Because of his illness, he is no longer able to work at his job, and therefore cannot afford all of the fast-accumulating medical bills that are a result of his

treatments. Because of his circumstances, this student is asking for help offsetting the cost of these treatments.”

After reading over the scenario, participants were then asked to make several judgments about this victim, and were also given the opportunity to help the victim (described below).

Manipulation of the American Dream Ideology: To make the ADI salient, half of the participants unscrambled words associated with meritocracy, individualism, and the Protestant work ethic (Kaiser, 2006; Furnham 1953; Cherrington, 1980; Christopher et al., 2003; Oyserman & Lee, 2008; McCoy & Major, 2007) described in study 1. In the neutral condition, participants were given 8 minutes to unscramble 20 neutral words—a full list of these words can be seen in Appendix C. Importantly, all ADI and control words were matched on length and frequency using the English Lexicon Project Web Site (<http://elexicon.wustl.edu/>).

Manipulation of Participant ADI Violation vs. No Participant ADI Violation: As shown in pilot study three, the reminder of a participant violating the norm themselves was accomplished via the ease-of-retrieval techniques of Schwarz et al., (1991). Specifically, participants were given a sheet of paper with either 6 (or 24) numbered lines with the written instructions to recall 6 (or 24) instances in which they have asked someone for help. All participants were given 4 minutes to complete this activity.

### Dependent Measures

- Willingness to Help: Identically to Study 1, participants were asked to respond to various questions measuring willingness to engage in different helping behaviors.

Specifically, participants were asked how likely they would be to spend their own money to support the student and how likely they would be to hand out flyers in the street on a 1 (not at all likely) to 7 (very likely) likert scale, as well as how much they would give to the student if they had 60 dollars at their disposal on a 0 – 60 ratio scale.

- **Empathy for Victim: The Empathy and Personal Distress (Batson et al., 1997)** scale is a state measure of emotional empathy and personal distress, as these two adjectives are highly similar. It asks participants to respond on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) to how much they felt each emotion (e.g., troubled, upset, sympathetic, compassionate, etc.) toward the student in need as they read about them. Importantly, responses to the distress items are responses of empathetic distress for the target, rather than distress of the direct situation itself (in this case, having cancer). Summary scores are calculated by averaging participants' responses such that higher scores indicate higher empathy.
- **Similarity to Victim: The Kaiser (2006) victim similarity scale** consists of three questions probing participant similarity to the victim on a 1 to 7 likert scale. Participants are asked, "How many characteristics do you share with this student?," "How similar do you think you are to this student?," and "How close to you see yourself to this person?". Summary scores are calculated by averaging participants' responses such that higher scores indicate higher perceptions of participant similarity to the victim.
- **Victim Likeability: The Reysen Likeability scale (Reysen, 2005)** measures how likeable a target is. It asks participants to rate (on a scale ranging from 1: very

strongly disagree to 7: very strongly agree) 15 statements assessing likeability of a target. For instance, participants rate their agreement with statements such as “This person is friendly”, and “I would like to be friends with this person”.

Summary scores are calculated by averaging participants’ responses such that higher scores indicate higher levels of target likeability.

- **Victim Derogation:** The Victim Derogation (Hafer, 2000) scale measures how much a participant derogates a victim based on their perceptions. It asks participants to respond to 6 questions such as “How responsible is this person?” and “How careful is this person?” on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all responsible, careful, etc) to 7 (very responsible, careful, etc). Summary scores are calculated by averaging participants’ responses such that higher scores indicate higher levels of victim derogation.
- **Victim Responsibility Avoidance:** The victim responsibility avoidance scale (Garcia et al., 2005) assesses both how responsible the target is for their circumstances. For instance, participants are asked to response to 4 questions such as “how often do you think this person blames others for their failures?” and, “how often do you think this takes responsibility for their own actions?” on a 1 (not often at all) to 7 (very often) likert scale. Summary scores are calculated by averaging participants’ responses such that higher scores represent higher perceptions of victim responsibility avoidance.
- **Ingroup Identification:** Two ingroup identification scales were included to assess both MSU identification and identification as an American citizen (Brewer, 1999). Participants thus responded to 10 total questions such as, “Being a

Montana State University student is an important part of my identity” and, “I am glad to belong to the United States” on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) likert scale. Summary scores are calculated by averaging participants’ responses such that higher scores indicate higher levels of ingroup (MSU or USA) identification.

### Results

One goal of Study 2 was to examine if the gender differences found in Study 1 would be replicated among participants in Study 2. A second goal of Study 2 was to test whether women primed with the American dream ideology would offer help less than women in the neutral condition. Finally, Study 2 tested if amount of help offered was attenuated by participants (especially women) perceiving themselves as also violating the ADI.

First, a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant-ADI violation vs. no participant-ADI violation) X 2(gender: male vs. female) ANOVA was conducted on each of the three helping measures. Results revealed a main effect of gender on likelihood to hand out flyers ( $F[1,53] = 10.76, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .17$ ). Similarly, a main effect of gender occurred on amount of money given out of 60 dollars ( $F[1, 53] = 6.23, p = .016, \eta_p^2 = .11$ ), in addition to a significant gender by prime type interaction ( $F[1, 53] = 5.26, p = .026, \eta_p^2 = .09$ ). Follow up comparisons revealed that women were more likely than men to help the victim when they were prime with the neutral (compared to ADI) prime. Although no significant effect of gender occurred on likelihood to spend one’s own money ( $F[1,53] = 2.00, p = .16, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ), the pattern of gender effects found once again on helping variables indicated that running separate analyses for men and women

participants would be appropriate. To better interpret these effects of gender, analyses were re-run separately for men and women. It is important to note, once again, that the following analyses were subject to a low and sometimes unequal N (approximately 8 per condition), and thus sustain low statistical power. As in Study 1, results should be interpreted with caution.

### Results for Men

#### Helping Measures

1. How likely would you be to spend your own money to support this student?

Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant effects of prime type ( $F[1, 21] = .74, p = .40, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ) or ADI violation ( $F[1, 21] = .74, p = .40, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ) on likelihood to spend one's own money. A marginally significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 21] = 3.57, p = .07, \eta_p^2 = .14$ ). The pattern of means for this marginal interaction suggested that men primed with the ADI (compared to the neutral prime) were somewhat less likely to help the victim when they perceived themselves as violating the ADI (see Table 4).

2. How likely would you be to hand out flyers to people in the street to help this student? Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant effects of prime type ( $F[1, 21] = .02, p = .89, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ) or ADI violation ( $F[1, 21] = .80, p = .38, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ) on likelihood to hand out flyers to help the victim. No

significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 21] = 1.54, p = .23, \eta_p^2 = .07$ ).

3. How much would you give to this student if you had 60 dollars at your disposal?

Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant effects of prime type ( $F[1, 21] = 1.66, p = .21, \eta_p^2 = .07$ ) or ADI violation ( $F[1, 21] = .20, p = .66, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ) on amount of money men offered to the victim. No significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 21] = .98, p = .34, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ).

Table 4

Study 2: Men's helping as a function of prime type and participant ADI violation

	Participant violates ADI		Participant does not violate ADI	
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)
<b>SPEND OWN MONEY</b>				
Prime: ADI	4.00	(1.15)	5.00	(.71)
Prime: Neutral	5.00	(.93)	4.63	(.74)
<b>LIKELIHOOD TO HAND OUT FLYERS</b>				
Prime: ADI	4.75	(1.26)	3.20	(1.30)
Prime: Neutral	3.75	(1.75)	4.00	(2.07)
<b>60 DOLLARS AT DISPOSAL</b>				
Prime: ADI	37.50	(15.00)	42.00	(16.43)
Prime: Neutral	35.00	(23.75)	23.13	(19.07)

*Note:* All values within dependent measures were statistically equal. Both the likelihood to spend own money and hand out flyers were measured on a 1 (highly unlikely) to 7 (highly likely) scale, whereas the final helping measure (giving a certain amount out of predisposed money) was measured on a \$0 to \$60 ratio scale.

### Victim Perceptions

1. Empathy for Victim: Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no effects of prime type ( $F[1, 21] = .36, p = .55, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ) or ADI violation ( $F[1, 21] = .41, p = .53, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ) on men's levels of state empathy. No significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 21] = .15, p = .70, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ).
2. Similarity to Victim: Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no effects of prime type ( $F[1, 21] = .71, p = .41, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ) or ADI violation ( $F[1, 21] = .45, p = .51, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ) on men's perceived similarity to the victim. No significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 21] = .79, p = .39, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ).
3. Victim Likability: Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no effects of prime type ( $F[1, 21] = .55, p = .47, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ) or ADI violation ( $F[1, 21] = 1.08, p = .31, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ) on victim likability (e.g., how friendly, warm, approachable, etc is this person). No significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation ( $F[1, 21] = .17, p = .69, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ) on victim likability occurred.
4. Victim Derogation: Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no effects of prime type  $F[1, 21] = .16, p = .69, \eta_p^2 = .01$  or ADI violation ( $F[1, 21] = .16, p =$

.69,  $\eta_p^2 = .01$ ) on victim derogation. No significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 21] = .04, p = .85, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ).

5. Perceptions of Victim Responsibility Avoidance: Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no effects of prime type ( $F[1, 21] = .01, p = .95, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ) or ADI violation ( $F[1, 21] = .38, p = .54, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ) on perceptions of victim responsibility avoidance (e.g., ‘how often do you think this person takes responsibility for their actions’, and ‘how often do you think this person blames others for their circumstances’). Once again, no significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 21] = .01, p = .95, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ).

Table 5

Study 2: Men's perceptions of the victim as a function of prime type and participant ADI violation

	Participant violates ADI		Participant does not violate ADI	
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)
<b>EMPATHY FOR VICTIM</b>				
Prime: ADI	5.00	(.30)	5.13	(1.85)
Prime: Neutral	4.48	(1.25)	5.02	(1.09)
<b>SIMILARITY TO VICTIM</b>				
Prime: ADI	2.50	(1.29)	3.40	(1.82)
Prime: Neutral	3.50	(1.51)	3.38	(.92)
<b>VICTIM LIKABILITY</b>				
Prime: ADI	4.68	(.62)	4.36	(.41)
Prime: Neutral	4.43	(.64)	4.29	(.38)
<b>VICTIM DEROGATION</b>				
Prime: ADI	5.13	(.75)	5.30	(.97)
Prime: Neutral	5.06	(.62)	5.13	(.58)
<b>VICTIM RESPONSIBILITY AVOIDANCE</b>				
Prime: ADI	2.75	(.96)	2.50	(1.41)
Prime: Neutral	2.75	(1.13)	2.44	(.86)

*Note:* All values within dependent measures were statistically equal. All variables were measured on a 1 (highlight disagree) to 7 (highly agree) scale. For all measures, higher means indicate higher amounts of that measure (e.g., 6.5 = high levels of victim likability, derogation, and perception of the victim avoiding responsibility).

### Results for Women

#### Helping Measures

1. How likely would you be to spend your own money to support this student?

Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs.

no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant effects of prime

type ( $F[1, 32] = .01, p = .93, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ) or participant's ADI violation ( $F[1, 32] =$

.08,  $p = .78$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .00$ ) on likelihood to spend one's own money to help the victim.

No significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 32] = .19$ ,  $p = .70$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .01$ ).

2. How likely would you be to hand out flyers to people in the street to help this student? Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no significant effects of prime type ( $F[1, 32] = .42$ ,  $p = .52$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .01$ ) or ADI violation ( $F[1, 32] = .15$ ,  $p = .71$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .01$ ) on likelihood to hand out flyers to help the victim. No significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 32] = .00$ ,  $p = .99$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .00$ ).
3. How much would you give to this student if you had 60 dollars at your disposal? Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed a main effect of prime type ( $F[1, 32] = 4.18$ ,  $p = .049$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .12$ ). Pairwise comparisons revealed that women primed with the ADI were less likely to offer money to the victim than were women in the neutral prime condition. No effect of ADI violation ( $F[1, 32] = .38$ ,  $p = .54$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .01$ ) or significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 32] = .19$ ,  $p = .67$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .01$ ) on amount of money offered to the victim (see Table 6).

Table 6

Study 2: Women's helping as a function of prime type and participant ADI violation

	Participant violates ADI		Participant does not violate ADI	
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)
<b>SPEND OWN MONEY</b>				
Prime: ADI	5.18	(1.47)	5.10	(1.91)
Prime: Neutral	5.00	(1.29)	5.38	(1.41)
<b>LIKELIHOOD TO HAND OUT FLYERS</b>				
Prime: ADI	5.45	(1.92)	5.20	(1.99)
Prime: Neutral	5.86	(1.46)	5.63	(2.00)
<b>60 DOLLARS AT DISPOSAL</b>				
Prime: ADI	44.09	(18.82)	37.50	(24.86)
Prime: Neutral	54.29	(11.34)	53.13	(13.35)

*Note:* All values within dependent measures were statistically equal. Both the likelihood to spend own money and hand out flyers were measured on a 1 (highly unlikely) to 7 (highly likely) scale, whereas the final helping measure (giving a certain amount out of predisposed money) was measured on a \$0 to \$60 ratio scale.

### Victim Perceptions

1. Empathy for Victim: Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no effects of prime type ( $F[1, 32] = 2.47, p = .13, \eta_p^2 = .07$ ) or ADI violation ( $F[1, 32] = .01, p = .94, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ) on women's levels of state empathy. No significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 32] = .06, p = .81, \eta_p^2 = .00$ ).
2. Similarity to Victim: Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed no effects of prime type ( $F[1, 32] = 3.04, p = .09, \eta_p^2 = .09$ ) or ADI violation ( $F[1, 32] = .21, p = .65, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ) on women's perceived similarity to the victim. No

significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation was found ( $F[1, 32] = .76, p = .39, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ).

3. Victim Likability: Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed a main effect of prime type ( $F[1, 32] = 6.19, p = .018, \eta_p^2 = .16$ ). Follow up pairwise comparisons revealed that compared to women in the neutral prime condition, women primed with the ADI reported the victim as less likable (see Table 7). No significant effect of participant's ADI violation ( $F[1, 32] = .78, p = .38, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ) or significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation ( $F[1, 32] = .18, p = .68, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ) on victim likability occurred.
4. Victim Derogation: Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation) ANOVA revealed a marginally significant main effect of prime type on victim derogation,  $F[1, 32] = 3.84, p = .059, \eta_p^2 = .11$ . Pairwise comparisons revealed that women primed with the ADI derogated the victim more than women in the neutral condition. No main effect of ADI violation ( $F[1, 32] = .133, p = .26, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ) on victim derogation occurred. However, a significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation occurred ( $F[1, 32] = 4.21, p = .048, \eta_p^2 = .12$ ). Follow up pairwise comparisons revealed that women were significantly more likely to derogate the victim when they were both primed with the ADI and when they perceived themselves as having violated the ADI (see Table 7).
5. Perceptions of Victim Responsibility Avoidance: Results from a 2(prime type: ADI vs. neutral) X 2(participant ADI violation vs. no participant ADI violation)

ANOVA revealed no effects of prime type ( $F[1, 32] = 1.37, p = .25, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ) or participant's ADI violation ( $F[1, 32] = .47, p = .50, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ) on perceptions of victim responsibility avoidance. A marginally significant interaction between prime type and ADI violation occurred ( $F[1, 32] = 3.61, p = .067, \eta_p^2 = .10$ ).

Pairwise comparisons revealed that women were somewhat less likely to perceive the victim as avoiding taking responsibility for their situation when they were both primed with the neutral prime and when they did not perceive themselves as violating the ADI (see Table 7).

Table 7

Study 2: Women's perceptions of the victim as a function of prime type and participant ADI violation

	Participant violates ADI		Participant does not violate ADI	
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)
<b>EMPATHY FOR VICTIM</b>				
Prime: ADI	5.47 <sup>a</sup>	(.92)	5.37 <sup>a</sup>	(1.10)
Prime: Neutral	5.90 <sup>a</sup>	(.98)	5.96 <sup>a</sup>	(.82)
<b>SIMILARITY TO VICTIM</b>				
Prime: ADI	3.36 <sup>a</sup>	(1.12)	3.20 <sup>a</sup>	(1.14)
Prime: Neutral	3.71 <sup>a</sup>	(.95)	4.25 <sup>a</sup>	(1.49)
<b>VICTIM LIKABILITY</b>				
Prime: ADI	4.31 <sup>a</sup>	(.29)	4.39 <sup>a</sup>	(.33)
Prime: Neutral	4.67 <sup>a,b</sup>	(.79)	4.90 <sup>b</sup>	(.65)
<b>VICTIM DEROGATION</b>				
Prime: ADI	5.75 <sup>b</sup>	(.38)	4.90 <sup>a</sup>	(.46)
Prime: Neutral	5.07 <sup>a</sup>	(.98)	5.09 <sup>a</sup>	(.63)
<b>VICTIM RESPONSIBILITY AVOIDANCE</b>				
Prime: ADI	2.41 <sup>a</sup>	(1.14)	2.80 <sup>a</sup>	(.98)
Prime: Neutral	2.64 <sup>a</sup>	(1.03)	1.81 <sup>b</sup>	(.37)

*Note:* Rows and columns within dependent measure not sharing a superscript indicates a difference at  $p < .06$ . All variables were measured on a 1 (highlight disagree) to 7 (highly agree) scale. For all measures, higher means indicate greater amounts of that measure (e.g., 7 = high levels of victim likability, derogation, and perception of the victim avoiding responsibility).

#### Relationship among Variables (By Gender)

Tables 8 and 9 present the correlation matrixes summarizing the relationships among the helping and victim perception measures across conditions. It is clear that for both men and women, the different ways of helping were positively (and often significantly) related to each other. However, when observing the comparisons between helping measures and victim perception measures, it can be seen that certain measures are

negatively related to one another. For instance, as might be expected, victim responsibility avoidance is negatively correlated with victim likability, as victim derogation is negatively correlated with perceived similarity to the victim. Willingness to help the victim (as measured through variables 1-3), on the other hand, was positively correlated with victim likeability, as would be expected from previous literature (e.g., Batson, 1991).

Table 8

Study 2: Correlations among helping and victim perception measures for men participants

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Spend Own Money	-						
2 Hand Out Fliers	.06	-					
3 \$60 Dollars at Disposal	.42*	.12	-				
4 Similarity to Victim	.31	-.19	-.03	-			
5 Victim Likability	.43*	.51*	.31	.07	-		
6 Victim Responsibility Avoidance	-.49*	.14	.28	-.07	-.62**	-	
7 Victim Derogation	.42*	.20	.40*	-.16	.52**	-.70**	-

Note: \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Table 9

Study 2: Correlations among helping and victim perception measures for women participants

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Spend Own Money	-						
2 Hand Out Fliers	.63**	-					
3 \$60 Dollars at Disposal	.42*	.31	-				
4 Similarity to Victim	.13	.14	-.08	-			
5 Victim Likability	.20	.14	.39*	.33	-		
6 Victim Responsibility Avoidance	.06	.08	.01	.25	-.08	-	
7 Victim Derogation	.17	.20	.28	.15	.53**	-.30	-

Note: \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

### Discussion

Study 2 sought to replicate the gender differences found in Study 1 whereby women were more likely to help the victim than men, and this was confirmed (Hypothesis 1). Another goal of Study 2 was to investigate whether women participants would only withhold resources from the ingroup victim violating the American dream ideology when those participants were primed with the ADI (Hypothesis 2), or if this prime was unnecessary given that all participants were American. Only partial support for Hypothesis 2 was found. A third goal was to examine a possible way to increase

helping by manipulating whether participants saw themselves as violating the ADI (via the ease of retrieval manipulation; Schwarz et al., 1991), but no evidence was found to suggest that this manipulation influenced helping.

Through investigating willingness to help a victim in need, Study 2 revealed that once again, men were relatively unwilling to offer help to the victim, regardless of condition. Women primed with the American dream ideology, on the other hand, were sensitive to the ADI prime, such that they were less likely to offer certain kinds of help to the victim than women who were not primed with the ADI. One reason women might be more sensitive to the ADI prime manipulations is because of differences in empathy levels between men and women when faced with a victim. To test this possibility, an independent samples t-test revealed that women participants ( $M = 5.63$ ,  $SD = .96$ ) were, in fact, significantly more empathic (state) than were men participants ( $M = 4.87$ ,  $SD = 1.21$ )  $t(59) = 2.76$ ,  $p = .008$ . These empathy results are in alignment with previous literature stating that women tend to be more empathetic in general (whether because of socialized expectations or not, Lewis, Smith & Hawkinson, in press) and tend to engage in empathic concern more than men (Eisenberg & Lenin, 1983; George et al., 1998; Harton & Lyons, 2003, Ickes et al., 2000).

In addition to investigating propensity to withhold resources from the victim, Study 2 also measured participant's perceptions of the victim. It is important to note that several of the measures of victim perceptions did not follow the pattern consistent with the pattern of helping behavior results. For instance, victim derogation was positively correlated (albeit not significantly) with willingness of participants to spend their own

money to help the victim. At present, I am unaware of any existing literature that might explain this anomaly.

One similarity between helping measures and victim perceptions that did exist, however, was the nearly identical pattern in Study 1 and Study 2, such that men's perceptions of the victim were virtually unaffected by the manipulations. Women, on the other hand, again showed significant effects of prime type, such that being primed with the ADI (compared to neutral prime) caused women to derogate the victim, and for the victim to be perceived as less likable.

Another goal of Study 2 was to identify whether having participants perceive themselves as violating the ADI could mitigate unwillingness to help the victim who violated the ADI. Results from Study 2 failed to support this hypothesis, such that both men and women remained unwilling to help the victim when they perceived themselves as violating the ADI. Notably, research on dominant ideology threat (Kaiser, 2006) would predict that the victim asking for help should challenge the ADI (PWE, individualism, etc) thus threatening the participant, which would result in derogation of the victim. Yet, this was not the case. Because we did not have a measure of dominant ideology threat it is difficult to determine exactly why this interaction would occur in the direction it did.

One effect of interest from Study 2, however, was the interaction between prime type and participant ADI violation on women's perceptions of the victim. Although the ADI prime type interacted with the ease of retrieval manipulation (which was indeed predicted), it did so in the opposite direction as expected, such that women were more likely to derogate the victim when they perceived themselves as having violated the

ADI—however, this interaction occurred only in victim perceptions; not within women’s willingness to help.

Importantly, the purpose of the ease-of-retrieval mechanism in Study 2 was to create mitigation of victim derogation. Remember that in Schwarz et al’s., (1991) ease of retrieval experiment, participants were asked to think of either 6 (easy) or 12 (difficult) instances when they acted aggressively. Subsequently, participants in the 6 instance condition rated themselves as more aggressive than did participants in the 12 instance condition. Thus, it follows that in the current experiment, participants in the “easy” condition would perceive themselves as violating the ADI, feel less threat, and subsequently derogate the victim less. However, the opposite emerged with women participants who perceived themselves as violating the ADI, such that they derogated the victim more in this particular condition (when in concert with the ADI prime).

Why might this effect be reversed from what would be predicted from past research? One possibility is that feelings of similarity with the victim were not increased as a function of the ease of retrieval manipulation. Pretesting showed that the victim was seen as highly similar to participants. Because similarity to a victim is usually positively correlated with victim empathy and negatively associated with attributions of blame (Grubb & Harrower, 2009), having participants perceive themselves as violating the ADI should ostensibly lead them to feel even *more* similar to the victim. Thus, increased feelings of similarity should have resulted in less derogation. However, results showed that the ease-of-retrieval manipulation in the current study did not produce any additional feelings of similarity. In the future, perhaps one way to address this possibility would be to have participants recall instances that they have asked for help that are more specific to

the current projects helping measures (e.g., asking participants to think of times when they themselves had asked for *money* from another person).

A second possible explanation for why participants perceiving themselves as violating the ADI led to increased victim derogation is that ease of retrieval manipulation did not increase feelings of empathy as was predicted. Instead of producing feelings of empathy, perhaps participants felt frustration for violating the ADI themselves. Due to all the benefits of adhering to a dominant ideology (e.g., predictability, control, etc), it is possible that when perceiving the self as violating the ADI, participants experienced increased feelings of threat and frustration rather than empathy or feelings of similarity to the victim. If so, participants may have aggressed against someone else who was also violating the ADI (e.g., the victim) (Dollard et al., 1939). A third possibility is that rather than aggressing toward the other ADI violator through derogation, perhaps participants felt that since they themselves had “gotten through” the ordeal in which they needed help (and the victim should be expected to do the same) they therefore did not feel obligated to feel empathic, thus resulting in increased derogation (Zitek et al., 2010).

A fourth explanation for why participants perceiving themselves as violating the ADI (in concert with being primed with the ADI) led to increased victim derogation may simply be in the self-aggrandizing nature of participants who adhere to the ADI. People tend to want to see themselves in the best light possible (e.g., more athletic, intelligent, polite, etc) and as less likely to befall negative events (e.g., illness, being a victim, etc) than their peers (Alicke, 2000; Chambers & Windschitl, 2004). Thus, when the discomfort of thinking that they themselves violate the ADI is juxtaposed with the

competing motivation to see themselves as better than others, participants may derogate the victim due to an underlying motivation for self-enhancement (Kruglanski, 1996).

Consider the experimental example of this type of self-promotion from Fein and Spencer (1997). Their research showed that participants were more likely to derogate a member of a stereotyped group (e.g., a Jewish-American woman) when they did not receive feedback about their own performance compared to when they received positive feedback about their performance. Their data also showed that participants who received threatening information about their self-image gave more negative evaluations of the stereotyped group member and that making such negative evaluations of another individual led to significant increases in participants' self-esteem. Taken together, Fein and Spencer suggest that when threatened, individuals may derogate others as a means to bolster their own feelings of self-worth. Applying this to the current study, then, participants who perceived themselves as violating the ADI may have felt the need to further derogate someone in order to offer a means of self-promoting themselves away from the discomfort of their own violation. To test this in the future, researchers could include a measure of self-worth.

Finally, although the self-violation hypothesis was not supported, an interesting interaction did occur that merits future research. Although the current study has demonstrated that the ease-of-retrieval mechanism may not be as straightforward as may be first thought (e.g., cannot be used as an automatic elicitor of similarity or empathy), it is surely worth future investigation to explore not only when such a mechanism will elicit certain types of behavior (whether in judgments of others or of the self), but also how this mechanism may—in certain situations such as in Study 2—actually bring about different

results for victim perceptions (and how this may or may not translate to actual helping intentions and behaviors).

## GENERAL DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current project was to investigate how violation of the American dream ideology (ADI) may result in the withholding of positive resources to an ingroup member who needs help. More specifically, the current project tested whether withholding resources may be influenced by the characteristics of both the victim in need and the perceiver who is in the position to offer help. Traditionally, research on ideology threat has largely focused on derogation towards outgroup members and favoritism towards fellow ingroup members. Additionally, much of this past research has focused on the negative ramifications of violations of the ADI such as discrimination. The current study both extends and bridges gaps in the existing literature by exploring if ingroup and outgroup victims are helped differently when violating (or not) the ADI. In general, it was expected that ingroup members who violated the ADI would receive the least amount of help; even less than an outgroup member.

To begin with, Study 1 investigated if the amount of help victims were offered was contingent on the victim's ingroup or outgroup membership as well as whether that victim was violating the American dream ideology or not (by asking for help versus having someone ask on their behalf). Results showed that men participants were relatively unwilling to help *any* victim, regardless of whether the victim was violating the ADI or whether the victim was an ingroup or outgroup member. Women's willingness to help, on the other hand, *was* affected by whether the victim violated the ADI or not, such that women were more willing to help a victim who did not ask for help. The victim's group membership (ingroup vs. outgroup), however, did not significantly influence helping.

Initial results from Pilot Study 1 suggested that the victim was seen as most similar to participants when the victim was presented as an ingroup versus outgroup member. It is possible, however, that group membership did not influence helping because the outgroup victim was not seen as a distinctive outgroup member because of their status as an ingroup MSU student. If so, participants might have minimized the differences between themselves and the outgroup member, recategorizing them as an ingroup member and extending the positive feelings associated with ingroup favoritism to that otherwise outgroup member (Dovidio et al., 1997, Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). It is possible that participants may not have felt similar to the outgroup victim in Study 1 while still perceiving the victim as an ingroup member due to their MSU status. However, perceptions of similarity were not measured in Study 1 with the ingroup and outgroup victims, so I am unable to decipher if this was indeed the case.

Because ingroup and outgroup status did not significantly influence helping in Study 1, Study 2 further focused on the ingroup victim who violated the American dream ideology because of the counterintuitive hypothesis that individuals may withhold resources at a particularly high level for an ingroup member (for a fellow ingroup member may pose the greatest threat to the ADI as they are the very ones expected to uphold the tenets of the ADI). In Study 2, participants were the ones violating (or not) the ADI via an ease of retrieval mechanism (Schwarz et al., 1991). Presumably, this mechanism would induce higher feelings of similarity and empathy toward the victim which would subsequently result in increased levels of helping. Unexpectedly, results revealed that this was not the case. Neither women nor men participants were more likely to help a victim in need if they perceived themselves as violating the ADI. Although

helping was not affected, when both under the ADI prime *and* perceiving themselves as violating the ADI, women were more likely to derogate the victim (e.g., see them as avoiding taking responsibility for themselves). Because this derogation only occurred within participant perceptions of the victim and not within helping measures, it is important to return to the correlations of measures themselves (see tables 10 and 11).

In Study 1, both women's willingness to hand out fliers and willingness to spend their own money were the two dependent measures that were significantly affected by the victim's violation of the ADI, whereas amount of predisposed money did not (although it followed the same pattern of results). In Study 2, however, the opposite was true (e.g., amount of predisposed money was significantly affected by ADI prime whereas willingness to give out fliers and spend one's own money were not (although again the pattern of means was in the same direction). Importantly, Pilot Study 1 revealed a pattern similar to Study 2, such that amount of predisposed money was the only measure that was significantly affected by group membership status, such that participants were more willing to help an ingroup victim than an outgroup victim. Willingness to spend one's own money and hand out fliers, on the other hand, were marginally affected, such that participants were moderately more willing to help an ingroup vs. outgroup victim. Importantly, a reliability analysis from pilot testing revealed that these three helping measures retained an alpha of .78. In Study 1, the same analysis revealed an alpha of .62, and Study 2 had an alpha of .68. Therefore, although the variables in Study 1 were not significantly correlated with each other, nor were significantly correlated in Study 2, the three variables in both studies did follow the same pattern as in pilot testing (where the alpha level was indeed significant).

It is possible that the measure “how much would you give this person if you had \$60 at your disposal” would have been the most likely to elicit the highest levels of helping, given that there is no psychological cost of helping associated with giving away money that is not from a participant’s own pocket. Therefore, ceiling effects may have been produced by this particular measure. However, because such effects were not found in Study 2, future research could address these differences in helping measures by testing exactly when certain types of helping opportunities will be taken vs. when they will not.

Yet another important finding in the current project was that the significant gender differences from Study 1 were again found in Study 2. But why did the gender of the helper matter? One explanation is that women tend to help victims in more long-term, emotional situations requiring care and nurturing (Becker & Eagly, 2004), possibly because of the societal expectation to be caring and compassionate towards those in need (Davis, 1996). On the other hand, men tend to engage in larger levels of “defensive distancing” than women do, particularly when the plight of a victim is quite distressing (Pyszczynski et al., 1995, Whitehead & Smith, 2002). As a result, the plight of a young victim being stricken with cancer in the current project may help explain men’s comparatively lower levels of helping. Unfortunately, results from the current project do not clearly reveal whether women were particularly high in levels of helping, or if men were particularly low in levels of helping. In order to better understand the gendered nuances in helping, future research needs to address this question.

Another important result found in Study 2 was that women were also more sensitive to the American dream ideology prime, such that the prime resulted in the withholding of resources to a victim who asked for help. This is a significant finding, for

had Study 2 not included the ADI vs. neutral prime conditions, it would remain unknown whether participants were unwilling to help a victim who violated the ADI simply by their nature of being an American, or if the constructs of the American dream had to be salient. Importantly, components of one's American identity (e.g., patriotism, nationalism, etc.) are not always engaged, but rather can be activated via different situations (Li & Brewer, 2004). In larger applications of this research, then, this suggests that Americans as a whole may indeed be willing to help others who ask for help, but may only do so when the constructs of the American dream are not salient.

Taken together, results from the current project add to the threat and prosocial behavior literature in several ways. Previous patterns of behavior in ideology research focus on the negative behaviors usually elicited from others who are threatened. However, the current project shows that this pattern can be similarly applied to positive behaviors as well (e.g., prosocial ones)—in this case, by the withholding or offering of positive resources. Additionally, as well as replicating previous research on gender effects found in helping, the current project extends this literature by adding a dimension where more subtle nuances may have otherwise been missed, such as men's lack of sensitivity to certain situational cues that may guide helping behaviors.

Finally, the current project also specifically compared how individuals react to an ingroup vs. outgroup member who violates the ADI. Although much previous research has shown derogation of outgroup members (i.e., outgroup hate) and favoritism towards ingroup members (i.e., ingroup love) in various contexts (Brewer, 1999), the current project suggests that in certain situations (e.g., a victim in need asking for help) group membership may not be as important of a factor in determining helping as previously

assumed. Notably, however, because of the current outgroup victim's potential to be recategorized as an ingroup member (e.g., Hornsey & Hogg, 2000; Jetten et al., 1998), they may not have produced differential results that otherwise may have existed without MSU similarity. Despite this, the results of the current project suggests that group membership may not be integral to feelings of threat when someone violates the ADI.

### Limitations and Future Directions

A major limitation of the current project arose from men's lack of sensitivity to our manipulations. Although past literature does predict that women would be more helpful than men in a situation such as the one used for the victim scenario, it was unexpected that such gender differences in sensitivity to our manipulations would occur. For example, in the current project, one possibility for the lacking ADI violation influence is that men were threatened by any similar male being a victim in need of help (regardless of asking for help or not) and therefore derogated the victim accordingly. Due to the low statistical power in the current project, however, future research needs to include more participants to further tease apart what is specifically driving these effects.

Another possibility is that using a dichotomous split of gender identity (participants in both studies were asked if they identified as male or female) limited the realm in which the gendered nuances of helping could be seen. For example, although the current project tested gender effects via the separate analyses between men and women, it would also be beneficial to test participants' identification with their particular sex-role, rather than mere gender itself. Future research could thus investigate the role this identification plays by including measures such as the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem,

1974) to elucidate the possibility of identification playing a part in willingness to help a victim in need. Should such a measure be included in a future study utilizing the same stimuli used in the present project (and given the results from the current project), it is predicted that higher levels of masculine identification may be negatively correlated with helping, whereas higher levels of feminine identification may be positively correlated with helping.

In addition to investigating the unexpected insensitivity of men to the ADI violation of asking for help, further investigation into what specific types of manipulations *are* perceived by men as a violation to the ADI is needed. Furthermore, given the significant gender effects found in both Studies 1 and 2, research needs to further investigate the gendered perceptions of what constitutes a threat to the American dream ideology, and why those gender effects may exist. It may be that women are simply more attuned to the situational cues surrounding a victim in need, or that men are not as sensitive to the particular type of prime used in the current project. Further research on the gendered nature of helping, norm salience, and ideology threat might prove useful for understanding these possibilities.

Finally, another possible limitation of the current project was the relatively young age of participants. For example, although college students may be willing to hand out flyers in the street to help a victim in need, they may be less willing (or able) to spend their own money (or even money that is not theirs) to help a victim than would, for example, an older American with higher income levels, etc. For instance, just as prescriptive norms exist to dictate types of helping between genders, so may there also be a sense of civic duty of sorts for Americans who are older than our college aged

participants (e.g., Oliner, 2005). If this is the case, differential results may indeed be found such that an older sample would indeed be more willing to help the victim in need than would college students.

### Conclusions

The present research indicated that women will offer less help to a victim if the constructs of the American dream ideology are made salient to them. Although the current research failed to find a new way of promoting greater levels of helping when this ideology is made salient, it did suggest that American women will not always refuse to help others—that there are certain circumstances which must be present in order for derogation and the withholding of positive resources to occur. Consider the following example:

Within two weeks of the devastating earthquake in Haiti in January, 2010, private American donors had sent over 560 million dollars in monetary aid to the people of Haiti. In response to the victims of Louisiana's hurricane Katrina in 2005, however, only 105 million dollars were given by Americans in the same period of time (Chronicles of Philanthropy, 2010). Why might such a disparity exist between these two tragic disasters? Given the results from the current study, one possible explanation for the discrepancy is that a major cry of help from the victims of Katrina came directly from the victims themselves to the American people (thus violating the ADI). Additionally, many of these victims cited discrimination as the reason for the lack of help that they were sent; a claim which also opposes the mantra of the ADI in a time when Americans nationalism may have been particularly peaked (e.g., the relatively recent onset of war in Iraq, etc). The

victims of Haiti, on the other hand, did not make such claims of discrimination nor did they directly ask other Americans for help. They had others asking for help for them.

Take the offering made to Americans by President Barack Obama in response to the plight of Haitian victims: "...above all, we act for a very simple reason: in times of tragedy, the United States of America steps forward and helps. That is who we are. That is what we do. For decades, America's leadership has been founded in part on the fact that we do not use our power to subjugate others, we use it to lift them up... At no time is that more true than in moments of great peril and human suffering" (Obama, 2010). Perhaps these words from President Obama do, in fact, resonate with the tenet that at least American women may be willing to help those who are in need, regardless of whether those victims are fellow Americans or not. Unfortunately, however, the current project also suggests that American women's willingness to help victims in need will only occur so long as the very constructs that the American dream is founded upon (meritocracy, the Protestant work ethic, and individualism), are not invoked into the call for help.

REFERENCES CITED

- Aguiar, P., Vala, J., Correia, I., & Pereira, C. (2008). Justice in our world and in that of others: Belief in a just world and reactions to victims. *Social Justice Research, 21*(1), 50-68.
- Alicke, M. D. (2000). Culpable control and the psychology of blame. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(4), 556-574.
- Baron, R. A. (1979). Effects of victim's pain cues, victim's race, and level of prior instigation upon physical aggression. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 9*(2), 103-114.
- Batson, C. D. (1989). Personal values, moral principles, and a three-path model of prosocial motivation. In N. Eisenberg, J. Reykowski & E. Staub (Eds.), *Social and moral values: Individual and societal perspectives*. (pp. 213-228). Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Batson, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question: Toward a social-psychological answer*. Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Batson, C. D. (1998). *Who cares? when? where? why? how?*. US: American Psychological Association.
- Batson, C. D., Polycarpou, M. P., Harmon-Jones, E., Imhoff, H. J., Mitchener, E. C., Bednar, L. L., Klein, T. R., & Highberger, L. (1997). Empathy and attitudes: Can feeling for a member of a stigmatized group improve feelings toward the group? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(1), 105-118.
- Batson, C. D., & Shaw, L. L. (1991). Evidence for altruism: Toward a pluralism of prosocial motives. *Psychological Inquiry, 2*(2), 107-122.
- Bern, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42*, 155-162.
- Becker, S. W., & Eagly, A. H. (2004). The heroism of women and men. *American Psychologist, 59*(3), 163-178.
- Blazina, C., & Marks, L. I. (2001). College men's affective reactions to individual therapy, psychoeducational workshops, and men's support group brochures: The influence of gender-role conflict and power dynamics upon help-seeking attitudes. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 38*(3), 297-305.
- Blazina, C., & Watkins, J.,C.Edward. (2000). Separation/individuation, parental attachment, and male gender role conflict: Attitudes toward the feminine and the fragile masculine self. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1*(2), 126-132.

- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues. Special Issue: Prejudice and Intergroup Relations: Papers in Honor of Gordon W. Allport's Centennial*, 55(3), 429-444.
- Burleson, B. R., & Kunkel, A. W. (2006). Revisiting the different cultures thesis: An assessment of sex differences and similarities in supportive communication. In K. Dindia, & D. J. Canary (Eds.), *Sex differences and similarities in communication*, 2nd ed. (pp. 137-159). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Chambers, J. R., & Windschitl, P. D. (2004). Biases in social comparative judgments: The role of nonmotivated factors in above-average and comparative-optimism effects. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(5), 813-838.
- Chodorow, N. J. (1975). Family structure and feminine personality: The reproduction of mothering. ProQuest Information & Learning). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 36 (1-A), 565-565.
- Christopher, A. N., Marek, P., & May, J. C. (2003). The protestant work ethic, expectancy violations, and criminal sentencing. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(3), 522-535.
- Cialdini, R. B., Darby, B. L., & Vincent, J. E. (1973). Transgression and altruism: A case for hedonism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 9(6), 502-516.
- Correia, I., Vala, J., & Aguiar, P. (2007). Victim's innocence, social categorization, and the threat to the belief in a just world. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43(1), 31-38.
- Darley, J. M., & Latane, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8(4), 377-383.
- Darley, J. M., Latané, B., Batson, C. D., Ferrari, J. R., & Leippe, M. R. (1994). *Prosocial behavior*. Needham Heights, MA, US: Allyn & Bacon.
- Davis, K. (1996). *Families: A handbook of concepts and techniques for the helping professional*. Belmont, CA, US: Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Diekmann, A. B., & Eagly, A. H. (2000). Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and men of the past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(10), 1171-1188.
- Dollard, J., Miller, N. E., Doob, L. W., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. New Haven, CT, US: Yale University Press.

- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1993). Stereotypes and evaluative intergroup bias. In D. M. Mackie, & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception*. (pp. 167-193). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Validzic, A., & Matoka, K. (1997). Extending the benefits of recategorization: Evaluations, self-disclosure, and helping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33(4), 401-420.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Penner, L. A. (2004). Helping and altruism. In M. B. Brewer, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Emotion and motivation*. (pp. 247-280). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Gaertner, S. L., Schroeder, D. A., & Clark, R. D.,. (1991). The arousal: Cost-reward model and the process of intervention: A review of the evidence. In M. S. Clark (Ed.), *Prosocial behavior*. (pp. 86-118). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Eagly, A. H. (2009). The his and hers of prosocial behavior: An examination of the social psychology of gender. *American Psychologist*, 64(8), 644-658.
- Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100(3), 283-308.
- Eidelman, S., & Biernat, M. (2003). Derogating black sheep: Individual or group protection? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39(6), 602-609.
- Eisenberg, N., & Lennon, R. (1983). Sex differences in empathy and related capacities. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94(1), 100-131.
- Fein, S., & Spencer, S. J. (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self through derogating others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(1), 31-44.
- Finlay, K. A., & Trafimow, D. (1998). The relationship between the private self and helping victims of AIDS. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(19), 1798-1809.
- Frey, D. L., & Gaertner, S. L. (1986). Helping and the avoidance of inappropriate interracial behavior: A strategy that perpetuates a nonprejudiced self-image. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(6), 1083-1090.
- Furnham, A. (1996). Attitudinal correlates and demographic predictors of monetary beliefs and behaviours. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17(4), 375-388.

- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. New York, NY, US: Psychology Press.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., & Johnson, G. (1982). Race of victim, nonresponsive bystanders, and helping behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 117*(1), 69-77.
- Garcia, D. M., Reser, A. H., Amo, R. B., Redersdorff, S., & Branscombe, N. R. (2005). Perceivers' responses to in-group and out-group members who blame a negative outcome on discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(6), 769-780.
- George, D. M., Carroll, P., Kersnick, R., & Calderon, K. (1998). Gender-related patterns of helping among friends. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*(4), 685-704.
- Genesee, F., & Holobow, N. E. (1989). Change and stability in intergroup perceptions. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 8*(1), 17-38.
- Good, G. E., Dell, D. M., & Mintz, L. B. (1989). Male role and gender role conflict: Relations to help seeking in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*(3), 295-300.
- Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., & Pyszczynski, T. (1997). Terror management theory of self-esteem and cultural worldviews: Empirical assessments and conceptual refinements. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology, vol. 29*. (pp. 61-139). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press.
- Greitemeyer, T., Schulz-Hardt, S., Popien, G., & Frey, D. (2005). Der einfluss versunkener monetärer und zeitlicher kosten auf ressourcenallokationen. / sunk cost effect and the allocation of resources. *Zeitschrift Für Arbeits- Und Organisationspsychologie, 49*(1), 35-43.
- Grubb, A. R., & Harrower, J. (2009). Understanding attribution of blame in cases of rape: An analysis of participant gender, type of rape and perceived similarity to the victim. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 15*(1), 63-81.
- Hafer, C. L. (2000). Do innocent victims threaten the belief in a just world? evidence from a modified stroop task. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(2), 165-173.
- Halevy, N., Bornstein, G., & Sagiv, L. (2008). "In-group love" and "out-group hate" as motives for individual participation in intergroup conflict: A new game paradigm. *Psychological Science, 19*(4), 405-411.

- Harmon-Jones, E., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., & Simon, L. (1996). The effects of mortality salience on intergroup bias between minimal groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 26*(4), 677-681.
- Harton, H. C., & Lyons, P. C. (2003). Gender, empathy, and the choice of the psychology major. *Teaching of Psychology, 30*(1), 19-24.
- Hartshorne, H., May, M. A., & Maller, J. B. (1929). *Preliminary efforts to study altruistic tendencies*. New York, NY, US: MacMillan Co.
- Haynes, G. A., & Olson, J. M. (2006). Coping with threats to just-world beliefs: Derogate, blame, or help? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*(3), 664-682.
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 575-604.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000). Intergroup similarity and subgroup relations: Some implications for assimilation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*(8), 948-958.
- Ickes, W., Gesn, P. R., & Graham, T. (2000). Gender differences in empathic accuracy: Differential ability or differential motivation? *Personal Relationships, 7*(1), 95-109.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1998). Defining dimensions of distinctiveness: Group variability makes a difference to differentiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(6), 1481-1492.
- Jonas, E., Martens, A., Niesta Kayser, D., Fritsche, I., Sullivan, D., & Greenberg, J. (2008). Focus theory of normative conduct and terror-management theory: The interactive impact of mortality salience and norm salience on social judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1239-1251.
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology. Special Issue: Stereotypes: Structure, Function and Process, 33*(1), 1-27.
- Kaiser, C. R. (2006). Dominant ideology threat and the interpersonal consequences of attributions to discrimination. In S. Levin, & C. van Laar (Eds.), *Claremont symposium on applied social psychology, 21st, 2004, claremont, CA, US* (pp. 45-64). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Kaiser, C. R., Dyrenforth, P. S., & Hagiwara, N. (2006). Why are attributions to discrimination interpersonally costly? A test of system- and group-justifying motivations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(11), 1523-1536.

- Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2003). Derogating the victim: The interpersonal consequences of blaming events on discrimination. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6(3), 227-237.
- Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Reacting to impending discrimination: Compensation for prejudice and attributions to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(10), 1357-1367.
- Kanekar, S., & Merchant, S. M. (2001). Helping norms in relation to religious affiliation. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 141(5), 617-626.
- Kaplan, J. (1972). A legal look at prosocial behavior: What can happen for failing to help or trying to help someone. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28(3), 219-226.
- Kasten, K. (1972). Toward a psychology of being: A masculine mystique. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 12(2), 23-43.
- Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and american value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(6), 893-905.
- Kayser, D. N., Farwell, L., & Greitemeyer, T. (2008). A comparison of help giving to individuals versus humanitarian organizations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38(12), 2990-3008.
- Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1986). *Beliefs about inequality: Americans' views of what is and what ought to be*. Hawthorne, NY, US: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1981). Beliefs about stratification. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 7, 29-56.
- Kruglanski, A. W. (1996). A motivated gatekeeper of our minds: Need-for-closure effects on interpersonal and group processes. In R. M. Sorrentino, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition, vol. 3: The interpersonal context*. (pp. 465-496). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Lalwani, A. K., Shrum, L. J., & Chiu, C. (2009). Motivated response styles: The role of cultural values, regulatory focus, and self-consciousness in socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(4), 870-882.
- Lambert, A. J., Burroughs, T., & Nguyen, T. (1999). Perceptions of risk and the buffering hypothesis: The role of just world beliefs and right-wing authoritarianism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(6), 643-656.
- Leary, M. R., & Cox, C. B. (2008). *Belongingness motivation: A mainspring of social action*. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

- Lerner, M. J. (1971). Observers evaluation of a victim: Justice, guilt, and veridical perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 20(2), 127-135.
- Levine, M., & Crowther, S. (2008). The responsive bystander: How social group membership and group size can encourage as well as inhibit bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1429-1439.
- Li, Q., & Brewer, M. B. (2004). What does it mean to be an american? patriotism, nationalism, and american identity after 9/11. *Political Psychology*, 25(5), 727-739.
- Maass, A., Cadinu, M., Guarnieri, G., & Grasselli, A. (2003). Sexual harassment under social identity threat: The computer harassment paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(5), 853-870.
- Major, B. (1994). From social inequality to personal entitlement: The role of social comparisons, legitimacy appraisals, and group membership. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, vol. 26. (pp. 293-355). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press.
- Major, B., Gramzow, R. H., McCoy, S. K., Levin, S., Schmader, T., & Sidanius, J. (2002). Perceiving personal discrimination: The role of group status and legitimizing ideology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(3), 269-282.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1999). *Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation*. New York, NY, US: Psychology Press.
- Marques, J., Abrams, D., Paez, D., & Martinez-Taboada, C. (1998). The role of categorization and in-group norms in judgments of groups and their members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(4), 976-988. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.4.976
- Marques, J., Abrams, D., & Serôdio, R. G. (2001). Being better by being right: Subjective group dynamics and derogation of in-group deviants when generic norms are undermined. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(3), 436-447.
- McCoy, S. K., & Major, B. (2007). Priming meritocracy and the psychological justification of inequality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43(3), 341-351.
- Miller, D. T. (1977). Altruism and threat to a belief in a just world. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 13(2), 113-124.
- Mirels, H. L., & Darland, D. M. (1990). The protestant ethic and self-characterization. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11(9), 895-898.

- Mullen, B., Brown, R., & Smith, C. (1992). Ingroup bias as a function of salience, relevance, and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22(2), 103-122.
- Mussen, P., & Eisenberg-Berg, N. (1977). *Roots of caring, sharing, and helping: The development of pro-social behavior in children*. Oxford, England: W. H. Freeman.
- Neff, L. A., & Karney, B. R. (2005). Gender differences in social support: A question of skill or responsiveness? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(1), 79-90.
- Nigbur, D., & Cinnirella, M. (2007). National identification, type and specificity of comparison and their effects on descriptions of national character. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(4), 672-691.
- Novak, D. W., & Lerner, M. J. (1968). Rejection as a consequence of perceived similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9(2), 147-152.
- Oliner, S. P. (2005). Altruism, forgiveness, empathy, and intergroup apology. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations. Special Issue: Altruism, Intergroup Apology and Forgiveness: Antidote for a Divided World*, 29(2), 8-39.
- O'Neil, J. M. (1986). Gender-role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles*, 14(5-6), 335-350.
- O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Male sex role conflicts, sexism, and masculinity: Psychological implications for men, women, and the counseling psychologist. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 9(2), 61-80.
- Oyserman, D., & Lee, S. W. S. (2008). Does culture influence what and how we think? effects of priming individualism and collectivism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(2), 311-342.
- Perdue, C. W., Dovidio, J. F., Gurtman, M. B., & Tyler, R. B. (1990). Us and them: Social categorization and the process of intergroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(3), 475-486.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in western europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25(1), 57-75.
- Pyszczynski, T., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., & Cather, C. (1995). Defensive distancing from victims of serious illness: The role of delay. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(1), 13-20.

- Quinn, D. M., & Crocker, J. (1999). When ideology hurts: Effects of belief in the protestant ethic and feeling overweight on the psychological well-being of women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(2), 402-414.
- Radant, N. (1985). From jerusalem to jericho revisited: A study in helping behavior. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 4(1), 48-55.
- Reysen, S. (2005). Construction of a new scale: The reysen likability scale. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 33(2), 201-208.
- Rogers, R. W., & Prentice-Dunn, S. (1981). Deindividuation and anger-mediated interracial aggression: Unmasking regressive racism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41(1), 63-73.
- Rosen, B. (1971). Evaluation of help by a potential recipient. *Psychonomic Science*, 23(4), 269-271.
- Sani, F., Herrera, M., & Bowe, M. (2009). Perceived collective continuity and ingroup identification as defence against death awareness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(1), 242-245.
- Schwarz, N., Bless, H., Strack, F., Klumpp, G., Rittenauer-Schatka, H., & Simons, A. (1991). Ease of retrieval as information: Another look at the availability heuristic. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 195-202.
- Scott-Jones, D. (2002). The complexities of gender and other status variables in studies of schooling. *Human Development*, 45(1), 54-60.
- Shapiro, J. R., Mistler, S. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2010). Threatened selves and differential prejudice expression by white and black perceivers. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(2), 469-473.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press.
- Sprecher, S., Fehr, B., & Zimmerman, C. (2007). Expectations for mood enhancement as a result of helping: The effects of gender and compassionate love. *Sex Roles*, 56(7-8), 543-549.
- Tajfel, H. (. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. Oxford, England: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Science Information/sur Les Sciences Sociales*, 13(2), 65-93.

- Tajfel, H. (1987). *The formation of cognitive and affective attitudes*. Oxford, England: Walter De Gruyter.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). *The social identity theory of intergroup behavior*. New York, NY, US: Psychology Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts*. New York, NY, US: New York University Press.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Cambridge, MA, US: Basil Blackwell.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1973). Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. *Cognitive Psychology*, 5(2), 207-232.
- Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1325-1339.
- Vinacke, W. E. (1980). Prosocial behavior. *Academic Psychology Bulletin*, 2(3), 259-286.
- Walsh, P. E., & Smith, J. L. (2007). Opposing standards within the cultural worldview: Terror management and american women's desire for uniqueness versus inclusiveness. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(1), 103-113.
- Weber, J. G. (1994). The nature of ethnocentric attribution bias: Ingroup protection or enhancement? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 30(5), 482-504.
- Weiner, B. (1995). *Judgments of responsibility: A foundation for a theory of social conduct*. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Whitehead, G. I., III, & Smith, S. H. (2002). When illnesses or accidents befall others: The role of gender in defensive distancing. *Sex Roles*, 46(11-12), 393-401.
- Zitek, E. M., Jordan, A. H., Monin, B., & Leach, F. R. (2010). Victim entitlement to behave selfishly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(2), 245-255.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PILOTED VICTIM SCENARIOS

This person is a 19 year old international (hometown) student at Montana State University in Bozeman, who has a 6 month old son. Recently, his girlfriend has abandoned him and has left him to support himself and his child, so he has re-enrolled in school in order to acquire more marketable skills. While attending school, however, he is only able to maintain a part-time job that is not meeting the financial needs of his family.

This person is a 21 year old international (hometown) student at Montana State University in Bozeman who recently failed a class because of a poor final paper grade. He put a great deal of effort into the paper, yet received a poor grade and rude treatment from the TA when he went to discuss the grade. After reporting this to other friends, he learned that the TA was rude to male, but not female, students and has a history of such complaints. Because of this TA, he must now pay to retake the class next semester, but doesn't have enough money to do so, meaning he will not receive his degree.

This person, who is a 20 year old international (hometown) student at Montana State University in Bozeman, has recently been diagnosed with Hodgkin's disease, a form of cancer commonly found in young adults. He must work and attend college simultaneously, as he supports himself. Because of his illness, he is no longer able to work at his job, and therefore cannot afford all of the fast-accumulating medical bills that are a result of his treatments.

This person is a 19 year old international (hometown) student at Montana State University in Bozeman who has, until recently, been a recipient of the "Better Future for College Students" scholarship. Because of the recent downturn in the economy, this scholarship is no longer able to receive the federal funding that it once did, and as a result must cut 70% of its recipients. Aside from this scholarship, he otherwise supports himself and puts himself through college; subsequently, this scholarship termination has left him unable to pay his remaining tuition.

This person is a 21 year old international (hometown) student at Montana State University in Bozeman who puts himself through school by paying his own college tuition and other associated fees. In addition to supporting himself, however, he is also desperately struggling to take care of his surviving younger brother and sister while he finishes his last year of college. If he does not finish, he will not be able to earn enough money to support his brother and sister and will have to put them up for adoption.

APPENDIX B

PILOT TESTED HELPING MEASURES

1. How willing would you be to volunteer to help this student?  
Not at all willing    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very willing
2. How many hours would you be willing to work to raise money for this student?  
0\_\_\_\_\_    1-3\_\_\_\_\_    4-6    \_\_\_\_\_    7-10\_\_\_\_\_    15+\_\_\_\_\_
3. How much would you give to this student if you had 60 dollars at your disposal?  
\$\_\_\_\_\_
4. How likely would it be that you would spend your own money to support this student?  
Not at all likely    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very likely
5. How likely would you be to hand out flyers to people in the street to help this student?  
Not at all likely    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very likely
6. To what extent do you feel socially obligated to help this student?  
Not at all obligated 1 2    3    4    5    6    7    Very obligated
7. One of the ways the psychology is able to raise money is to donate \$10.00 for every study that participants volunteer to take part in next semester. Would you be willing to participate in future studies to raise money for this student?  
Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX C

MANIPULATION OF THE AMERICAN DREAM IDEOLOGY

## American dream ideology prime (unscrambled word in parentheses)

Protestant work ethic

Eplomeyd (employed)  
 Korw (work)  
 Ustinidrous (industrious)  
 Eawtlh (wealth)  
 Usprusl (surplus)

Individualism

Pettiiivecom (competitive)  
 Renteidff (different)  
 Indvuilaid (individual)  
 Qinuue (unique)  
 Stintcid (distinct)

Meritocracy

Blea (able)  
 Nare (earn)  
 Merit (merit)  
 Obitilym (mobility)  
 Werrad (reward)

## Neutral prime (unscrambled word in parentheses)

Bluam (album)  
 Seel (else)  
 Infomraiotn (information)  
 Sluctre (cluster)  
 Cornceet (concrete)  
 Mrtutep (trumpet)  
 Rowar (arrow)  
 Vruce (curve)  
 Fitelr (filter)  
 Cultntasoan (consultant)  
 Confercnee (conference)  
 Torveniyn (inventory)  
 Botl (bolt)  
 Zorfne (frozen)  
 Latielyvr (relatively)  
 Mianod (domain)  
 Ylear (yearly)  
 Specultivea (speculative)  
 Donswre (wonders)  
 Dismolerng (smoldering)