

Intergroup helping relations

Arie Nadler

Individuals empathize more and give more to ingroup than outgroup members. Help to the outgroup can represent ingroup members' motivation to gain or amend group's prestige. In structurally unequal contexts the advantaged and disadvantaged groups seek, give and are receptive to outgroup help as ways to maintain or challenge existing hierarchy. The security of the hierarchy, and the autonomy or dependency nature of the assistance determine these dynamics. Low status group members are given help that reinforces dependency and high status help that reinforces independence. Collective guilt, pride, and moral outrage affect readiness to help the outgroup.

Address

Tel Aviv University, Israel

Corresponding author: Nadler, Arie (arie@post.tau.ac.il)

Current Opinion in Psychology 2016, 11:64–68

This review comes from a themed issue on **Intergroup relations**

Edited by **Jolanda Jetten** and **Nyla R Branscombe**

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.05.016>

2352-250/© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Intergroup helping relations, giving seeking and receiving help across group boundaries, is a relatively recent research area in a field dominated by a focus on interpersonal helping [1,2]. One reason for this growing interest is the realization, originating in the social identity perspective [3], that when helper's and recipient's social identities are salient an interpersonal helping interaction is experienced, and needs to be analyzed, as an intergroup interaction [4^{*}]. For example, when racial identities are salient, help given by a black person to a white individual constitutes an interracial helping encounter. Another reason for this growing interest is that in a globalizing world cross-group helping interactions are increasingly frequent (e.g. international aid [5^{*}]) and understanding their dynamics is essential. The present paper outlines dominant research themes in this area especially as it has developed over the past 5 years.

Giving across group boundaries

People help ingroup *more* than outgroup members. One explanation for this is that people feel more empathy toward

an ingroup than an outgroup member, and this translates to more helpfulness directed at an ingroup member [6]. In this line, empathy drives giving help to an ingroup member, and self-focus reasons (e.g. attraction felt toward the other) drives giving to outgroup members [7,8]. In an experimental demonstration, fans of a football club intervened more on behalf of an individual identified as a fan of the same club than one identified as a fan of a rival club [9].

The second explanation focuses on the tendency to extend *less* help to outgroups, especially when perceived negatively. The lesser helpfulness of White Americans toward African Americans, when costs for non-helping are low (e.g. other bystanders are present), demonstrates this discriminatory non-helping [10^{*}]. Thus, the more negative attitudes were toward the victims of Hurricane Katrina and the Haiti earthquake, the more victims were blamed, the more the severity of their emergency was downplayed, and the lower the willingness to help them. [11]. The tendency to de-humanize outgroup members (i.e. assigning more uniquely human attributes to ingroup than outgroup members [12]), is also associated with lesser readiness to help them. The de-humanization of victims of earthquakes in Japan and Haiti by Italian participants (i.e. assigning machine-like and animal-like attributes to them, respectively) led to lower readiness to help them [13]. Interestingly, the reverse is also true. Because people need to justify their group's positive behavior toward an adversarial outgroup, Israelis who had learned that their group had helped Palestinians, later re-humanized Palestinians by viewing them as more human-like [14].

Inducing a common identity that includes both the ingroup and outgroup reduces the reluctance to restrict helpfulness to ingroup members. During the Second World War the description by Bulgarian leaders of Jews as sharing a common Bulgarian identity encouraged popular resistance to the expulsion of Jews to Nazi death camps [15]. In a less dramatic demonstration of the same phenomenon, when people had been induced to view fans of their favorite football club and fans of the rival club as sharing the common identity of 'football lovers' they were as likely to intervene on behalf of a person of either group [9]. Finally, for children of the majority group (i.e. longtime Italians), feelings of common identity with minority group children (i.e. newly arrived immigrants) who had shared with them the traumatic experience of the 2013 earthquake in Northern Italy, predicted their willingness to help them [16].

Strategic helping

Giving to others results in higher status in the group [17], and acting generously can be a strategy to gain prestige in

the group [18]. Similar dynamics operate in intergroup relations. In a seminal work Mauss described how clan leaders in the American Northwest acted generously toward other clan leaders to increase their group's prestige (i.e. the custom of potlatch [19]).

Recent work in social psychology has documented the strategic and impression management aspects of giving across group borders. To amend threat to their group's image Dutch and Scottish participants who had been exposed to unflattering statements about their group subsequently gave more generously to a third party [20,21]. In another demonstration of strategically motivated helping across group borders, children gave more to an outgroup that they knew was liked by their group, and when giving was public [22]. Giving to the outgroup can be a strategy of communicating the group's preference to an outgroup. To communicate their desire to maintain the national identity of Indonesia intact, participants belonging to the majority acted generously toward a minority group that had separatist intentions [23]. Seeking help can also be a strategy to amend threat to the group's image. To dispel outgroup's view of the ingroup as 'passive' and 'non cooperative', group members sought more help from it [24].

Intergroup helping and structural inequality

The Intergroup Helping as Status Relations (IHSR) model proposes that intergroup helping relations between structurally unequal groups constitute implicit mechanisms whereby groups reinforce or challenge existing inequality [25]. In a secure social hierarchy that is perceived as stable and legitimate (e.g. men's privileged status in previous centuries), high status group members are expected to give to the lower status group dependency-oriented help, (i.e. consisting of full solution) — for which the latter is expected to be receptive and grateful. Such helping interactions reinforce existing inequality. In an insecure hierarchy that is perceived as unstable and illegitimate (e.g. gender relations in modern Western societies), members of the disadvantaged group view inequality as changeable and desire equality and are expected to resent dependency on the high status group. They are expected to be receptive only to autonomy-oriented help (i.e. tools with which the needy can solve the problem on their own). Experiments using ad-hoc and real-world groups supported these predictions [26].

In insecure hierarchies the low status group's suspicious view of the high status group's generosity [27] and the anger felt by high status group members who may feel that their generosity is spurned, constitutes a fertile ground for intergroup misunderstandings [28]. This is not likely to occur when the low status group views the hierarchy as stable and legitimate. People's scores of System Justification is a dispositional proximate of the degree to which they legitimize the unequal hierarchy

and their place in it [29]. Consistent with the model's predictions, low status group members with higher endorsement of system justification sought dependency-oriented help from the high status group, while those whose scores were lower sought only autonomy oriented help from them [30]. Similarly, members of low status group (i.e. Romanian students in Britain) who perceived their ingroup's low status as unstable and changeable approached members of the high status group (i.e. British students) with requests for autonomy oriented help [31]. Similar findings occur when ingroup members feel inferior to the outgroup on a moral dimension. German participants who had been told that France takes care of its elderly better than Germany does were later reluctant to seek French assistance in this domain [32]. Finally, the disadvantaged group's reluctance to depend on the advantaged group was ameliorated by a trustworthy apology that the advantaged group had delivered to the disadvantaged group for the wrongdoings it had inflicted on it [33].

High status group defend against threat to their ingroup's advantaged position (posed by the perceived closing of the hierarchical gap by the low status group), by giving it dependency-oriented help, even if the outgroup has no need for it [34]. Such 'defensive helping' occurred when longtime Canadians, who perceived immigrants to Canada as a threat to their economic status, recommended giving them dependency — rather than autonomy-oriented assistance (i.e. financial grants vs. professional training) [35]. Another demonstration of how dependency-oriented help is used to devalue the disadvantaged is the finding that prejudices against Latinos were associated with recommendations to provide them with dependency oriented help [36].

The closing of the hierarchical gap by the low status group was no longer viewed as a threat when the common identity of the high and low status groups had been made salient. Under these conditions the high status group dispensed autonomy-oriented assistance to the low status group, thereby paving the way to greater future equality [34]. In another demonstration of the positive impact of perceived common identity on disarming status concerns in intergroup helping interactions, high status group members were willing to depend on the low status group, that is, seeking dependency-oriented help, only if they had been induced to view the two groups as sharing a common identity [37].

What do advantaged groups do when social change had already occurred and their advantaged position had already been delegitimized? Intergroup relations in post-apartheid South Africa constitutes such an example. A linguistic analysis of interactions between black domestic laborers and white employers in post apartheid South Africa indicates that the advantaged white employers reframe the relationships with their black domestic

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/879245>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/879245>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)