University of Lynchburg
Digital Showcase @ University of Lynchburg

Undergraduate Theses and Capstone Projects

Spring 4-2012

Factors that Influence Helping Behaviors: Does Race and Socioeconomic Status of a Victim Influence Whether Others Help?

M'keba Barksdale
Lynchburg College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalshowcase.lynchburg.edu/utcp

Part of the Civic and Community Engagement Commons, Other Sociology Commons, and the Race and Ethnicity Commons

Factors that Influence Helping Behaviors: Does Race and Socioeconomic Status of a Victim

Influence Whether Others Help?

M'keba Barksdale

Lynchburg College

This senior thesis by M'keba Barksdale is accepted in its present form by the Department of

Psychology as satisfying the psychology departmental honors requirements

Date: 4/2/12   Faculty Advisor: _____
                                                 Alisha Walker Marciano, PhD

Date: 4/3/2012   Faculty Member: _____
                                                 Keith Corodimas, PhD

Date: 4/3/2012   Faculty Member: _____
                                                 Donald Werner, PhD

Date: 4/3/12   Faculty Member: _____
                                                 Bianca Sumutka, PhD

Date: 4/3/12   Faculty Member: _____
                                                 Domenica Favero, PhD

Personal Factors that Influence Helping Behaviors

The murder of Kitty Genovese played an historic role in promoting research on helping

behavior (Manning, Levine & Collins, 2007). For many years research articles, psychology

books, and other references about the murder of Kitty Genovese informed people that she was

stabbed to death in front of her home while 37 witnesses watched and did not help. However,

more recent research has shown that this research was not accurate (Manning, Levine & Collins

2007). There were actually 38 witnesses and some who testified at the murder trial, that at a first

glimpse it did not appear as though a murder was taking place. Regardless of the recent article

correction about the murder, numerous people still believe the story that has been told for many

years. They wonder what caused these 37 witnesses to watch a murder and do nothing to stop it.

Some blame was attributed to the bystander effect, diffusion of responsibility, and pluralistic

ignorance, which are all factors that can determine a persons helping behavior (Manning, Levine

& Collins, 2007).

The bystander effect refers to the phenomenon in which the greater the numbers of

people present the less likely people are to help a person in distress. When an emergency

situation occurs, observers are more likely to take action if there are few or no other witnesses.

The diffusion of responsibility phenomenon is similar to the bystander effect in that people are

less likely to take action or feel a sense of responsibility in the presence of a large group of

people. Essentially, in a large group of people, individual responsibility to intervene is lessened

because it is shared by all of the onlookers. Pluralistic ignorance is a situation where a majority

of group members privately reject a norm, but assume (incorrectly) that others accept it. All

concepts influences helping behavior based on the number of people present at the time of the

incident, and the incorrect assumption that others present will assist.

Research over the years has suggested that in order for a person to provide helping behavior, he or she must notice the emergency, interpret the situation as an emergency, feel personal responsibility to help, decide how to help, and then provide help (Manning, Levine & Collins, 2007). If people are aware of each step and are able to analyze the process of helping, then maybe there will be a chance that they will help a person in need. It is likely that people do not notice emergencies because they are either focused on their own concerns, distracted, or the event is not clear or nearby. People may not interpret situations as emergencies when they are indistinct, when the relationship between the parties involved is unclear, or when pluralistic ignorance occurs. If others do not seem to think there is an emergency, then an individual decides there must not be one. People do not accept responsibility for helping when other people are present (diffusion of responsibility) (Manning, Levine & Collins, 2007). It is likely that people also consider characteristics of the victim before making a decision to help. Whether the victim is similar to or different from the helper may impact likelihood to help.

In-group/out-group behavior and perceptions can also have an effect on helping behavior. Campbell (2011) states that humans favor others seen as similar to themselves (in-group) over people seen as different (out-group), even without an explicitly stated bias. An example of in-group and out-group bias was demonstrated with an experiment conducted by Sherif (1954) as cited by Campbell (2011) called The Robbers Cave Experiment. In this classic experiment, 22 eleven-year-old boys were closely monitored during their time at a summer camp that was run by the experimenters. The boys were placed in one of two groups, the Rattlers or the Eagles. At first, they were unaware of the other group, but over time they began to notice the other group and develop an expressed weariness for the outsiders. The camp staff (experimenters) then began to set up encounters and competitions between the two groups. As the competition wore

on, tempers flared, exchanges escalated and became more hostile, and the boys experienced what Sherif called a spiral model of conflict intensification (group conflict, negative prejudices, and stereotypes as being the result of competition between groups for desired resources). The in-group and out-group bias could easily be seen in the boys' behaviors toward each other. They underestimated the performance of the other group and overestimated the performance of their own group (Campbell, 2011).

Schmader and Major (1999) also examined in-group and out-group activity; they conducted two studies. Study 1 hypothesized that people would value an attribute less when feedback indicated that their in-group scored worse on the attribute than when feedback indicated that their group score better on the attribute. The results showed that participants valued the domain less when their in-group was inferior to the out-group than when the two groups had performed equally. Study 2 hypothesized that individuals would use information about their group's performance to make inferences about their personal standings on the attribute and that these appraisals of personal standing on the attribute would mediate the effect of group feedback on valuing. The results indicated that the participants valued surgency (showing dominance, self-confidence, competitiveness, outgoing, extroverted, and decisive) more when their own sex scored higher than the other sex, but did not value surgency less when their own sex scored lower than the other sex, in comparison to conditions in which men and women scored equally (Schmader & Major, 1999).

Overall in-group and out-groups are of no specific size. An in-group may be as small as a family or as large as the world, or it may be based on race. The out-group would be anyone who is not in the family or is outside of the race. As the two previous studies have shown, if people feel like someone is outside of their group then they may not be willing to help that

person. Finally, people will not be able to decide how to help if they do not have the appropriate

knowledge set for helping or are insecure in that knowledge.

Historical Evidence on Helping Behavior

In order to get a better understanding of what causes people to offer help to one another,

research has examined how observers react to factors related to a single target in need. Dovidio

et al. (2006) mentioned these factors in a book focusing on prosocial behavior. Some of the

factors consisted of one's own responsibility for the need, the nature of the relationship with the

potential helper, the self-target overlap, and the shared group membership. Batson, Chang, and

Orr (2002) demonstrated that if a potential helper feels empathy for the person in need of help,

then the helpers chance of helping the individual in need is enhanced. Kogut and Ritov (2005)

demonstrated another characteristic that increases a victim's chance of being helped. They found

that a highly identifiable victim received more aid than a victim who was relatively

unidentifiable.

Many studies have examined characteristics of the helper and the victim that may

predetermine whether help will be given and received. Researchers Henkel, Dovidio, and

Gaertner (2006) focused on the historical catastrophe brought on by Hurricane Katrina. The

researchers looked at different factors that may have been the deciding elements explaining why

so many people did not receive assistance in a high emergency situation. One of the most

popular accusations that has been made concerning Hurricane Katrina is the blatant allegations

of racism in the government's slow response. On the other hand, there have been adamant

denials that race played any role at all (Henkel et al., 2006). However, New Orleans historically

has been one of the cities with the largest racial differences in income and wealth (Henkel et al.,

2006). The pattern of decision making, or lack of immediate responsiveness that characterized

the official response in the aftermath of Katrina also reflects the subtle biases associated with

aversive racism (Henkel et al., 2006). Researchers Pearson, Dovidio, and Gaertner, (2009)

proposed the theory of aversive racism as attitudes toward members of a racial group that

incorporate egalitarian social values and negative emotions, causing one to avoid interaction with

members of the group.

Evidence has shown that in addition to the slow government responses to the immediate

needs of evacuees, the recovery process continues to be remarkably slow. Whole areas of New

Orleans, particularly the poorer areas, have still not been made functional (Henkel et al., 2006).

Even with the research on the race and the SES of the people horribly affected by this tragedy,

some researchers still suggest that it may be unfair to say that race itself was a conscious

motivator in the government response in providing assistance. They also claim that it is

unreasonable to suggest that individuals knowingly made decisions based on race. Research,

however, shows that lack of empathy and poor perspective taking may be the unintentional factor

contributing to the failure to help (Henkel et al., 2006).

An experiment by Gaetner and Dovidio (1977) showed how subtle racism (so slight as to

be difficult to detect) could have operated unintentionally amongst the initial confusion, both

regarding the magnitude of Hurricane Katrina's impact and who had primary responsibility to

respond among local, state, and national government agencies. They tested 2 hypotheses: (1)

White bystanders are more likely to discriminate against Black victims in situations in which

failure to intervene could be attributable to factors other than the victim's race and (2) there is a

causal relationship between arousal induced by witnessing an emergency and bystander

responsiveness. Hypothesis (1) was supported; however, Blacks and Whites were helped equally

when the participant was the only bystander around. Hypothesis (2) was also supported,

showing that the more arousal the participants experienced, the more quickly they helped. Nevertheless, the results from both hypotheses show that help may not have been given right away because of diffusion of responsibility or maybe even the bystander effect. The government may have assumed that because the world saw what was going on that the government did not feel as pressured as they should have to assist the people in need. If a person knows that he/she is the only one witnessing an event that requires assistance then the chances are the person will be more likely to help than if he/she were not the only one witnessing the event (Gaetner & Dovidio, 1977).

Justification and Helping

People are sometimes able to justify their actions in a situation that they experienced. Being able to justify a situation may be one determining factor of whether a victim receives help or not. Crandall and Eshleman (2003) stated that individuals do not express their genuine levels of prejudice but rather disinhibit their suppressed prejudice when justifications for doing so are available. They also found that if a person's justification for not helping can be explained as anything else except prejudice then prejudice may not be suppressed and the person may not help in that situation. A meta-analysis by Saucier, Miller, and Doucet (2005) suggested that discrimination against Blacks compared to Whites in helping situations is predicted to occur when the situations allow for justification of discrimination and when the individual is not aware that his or her behavior may be perceived as prejudiced. The findings showed that overall discrimination against Blacks was more likely to occur when potential helpers had more opportunities to explain decisions not to help with justifiable explanations having nothing to do with race (Saucier, Miller, & Doucet, 2005).

It seems as though being able to equate not helping people in need based on race alone will not be openly admitted by the potential helper. If the person is able to give some type of justification then the chances are higher that the reason for not helping will be based on race. However, justification has not been the only factor contributing to whether or not people will help a victim in need.

Race and Helping

The relationship between race of the victim, race of the helper and the potential of receiving or giving help has been studied extensively. Researchers Wispe and Freshley (1971) set out to determine the interaction between race, sex, and helping behavior. The researchers used two women (who were confederates) similar in all characteristics except race (Black and White). The women were instructed to stand in front of a supermarket and drop a bag of groceries as the researchers observed who would help the women pick up the dropped groceries. The results showed that men helped more than women. Also, White females helped the White confederates more often than they helped Black confederates. Finally, Black females did not help either confederate, and women tended to ignore the confederate of their own race (Wispe & Freshley, 1971).

Another experiment conducted by Gaertner, Dovidio, and Johnson (1982) focused on the race of the helper and the victim and their ability to help the person in need based on the diffusion of responsibility model. The participants witnessed either a Black or White person falls to the ground and become unresponsive. In some situations there was more than one witness and in other cases only one witness was present. The results showed that victims were helped more quickly when there was only one witness, and overall White victims were helped

more quickly than Black victims. These findings are general trends in behavior and can lend support to the theory of why minority victims of tragedies such as Hurricane Katrina were not helped as quickly as they could have been simply because of the diffusion of responsibility theory and the race of the victims (Gaertner, Dovidio, & Johnson, 1982).

Saucier, Miller, and Doucet (2005) found that racial bias does occur in some situations and is in fact more likely to occur in high emergency situations compared to situations with less severe emergencies. Specifically, they found that when the level of emergency increased, the likelihood of Black victims receiving help relative to White victims actually decreased. In a study conducted by Gaertner and Bickman (1971) participants randomly called people pretending to be calling from a pay phone and voiced the fact that they called the wrong number and had no more change left to make a call to the local mechanic. They found that Whites would discriminate against Blacks by not helping them as frequently as they help their fellow Whites. In addition they predicted that Blacks would not show any discrimination against Whites and that they would help Blacks and Whites equally (Gaertner & Bickman, 1971).

Unlike the previous studies on race and helping behavior where Blacks are helped less, the study by Wegner and Crano (1975) produced conflicting results. The finding from the study showed that Black bystanders helped more Black than White victims, whereas White bystanders helped both races equally. In previous studies the findings showed just the opposite. A study by Graf and Riddell (1972) showed very different results from previous studies as well. In a study looking at Black or White men's ability to hitchhike a ride in either a Black or White community, they found that there was no significant difference in the frequency with which a Black or a White male was able to hitch a ride in Black and White sections of San Diego. These results suggest that race may not be a factor in certain helping situations, or because of the

location of the study race may not have been considered a main issue in deciding if one should

help or not (Graf & Riddell, 1972).

Socioeconomic Status and Helping

Socioeconomic Status (SES) identity influences an individual's life circumstances and

patterns of construal in ways that are similar to other social identity constructs (e.g. ethnicity,

nation of origin) (Blascovich, Mendes, Hunter, Lickel & Kowai-Bell, 2001). For example, a

person's SES is a source of social stigma among people of lower SES and this is a means by

which individuals are categorized during social interaction. Research has shown that upper-class

individuals show more economic independence, elevated personal control and freedoms of

personal choice (Snibbe & Markus, 2005). People of lower SES experience less personal control

and depend on others to achieve desired outcomes (Argyle, 1994). As a result lower SES people

are more likely to be motivated to behave in ways that increase social engagement and

connection with others (Keltner, Piff, Kraus, Cote, & Cheng, 2010). For example, people of

upper SES have demonstrated greater impoliteness in interactions with strangers whereas people

of lower SES have a nonverbal style that involves more socially engaged eye contact, head nods,

eyebrow raises, and laughs (Kraus & Keltner, 2009).

van Kleef et al. (2008) found that there is no direct evidence that links SES to an

increase in prosocial behavior; however, some research supports this theory. In a study by Frank

(1999), people of lower SES reported greater investments in a relationship with a stranger and

higher levels of compassion in response to that stranger's disclosure of suffering. The findings

showed that people of lower SES might have more compassion for the needs of others and act in

a more prosocial fashion. A national survey on likelihood of giving supported the idea that

people of lower SES demonstrate more prosocial behavior. Additionally, the results showed that people of upper SES spend more income on costly goods such as cars and disproportionately less on assisting others in need. These results were reversed for the people of lower SES (Frank, 1999).

In the study by Keltner et al. (2010) participants completed a total of four studies to examine whether people of lower SES act in a more prosocial fashion than people of upper SES. They established that people of lower SES are more generous and prosocial in their resource allocations than people of upper SES. They also studied more closely the mechanisms of class-based differences in prosocial behavior. The findings suggested that people of lower SES are more prosocial toward others than people of upper SES. Findings showed that people of lower SES are more likely than upper SES people to help distressed partners (Keltner et al., 2010).

Finally, Dovidio and Garter (1983) looked at sex, status, and the ability to help. They predicted that female supervisors would receive less help than female subordinates, and male supervisors would get more help than male subordinates. The results showed that female subordinates were helped more than female supervisors and male subordinates were helped slightly less than female subordinates and male supervisors helped more than male subordinates. From the findings it appears as though status, and not ability, influenced prosocial behavior towards females, and ability not status affected prosocial behavior towards males (Dovidio & Garter, 1983). This study among others, suggest that SES of the helper influences helping behavior; thus SES of the victim may also be an important characteristic affecting likelihood of helping. Therefore, this research serves an important purpose by seeing if there may be additional factors that have not yet been researched that may also contribute to factors that influence helping behavior.

The purpose of the present study was to better understand how various personal characteristics of the victim may influence whether the victim receives help as well as the reasoning process behind helping those in need. The independent variable was the race of the victim (Black or White) and the SES of the victim (poor or wealthy), which was varied in a scenario about a victim in need of help. There were four dependent variables measured through self-report: likelihood of helping, the level of justification for helping, positive emotional response to the situation, and negative emotional response to the situation. The hypotheses varied depending on the race of the participant. For White participants it was hypothesized that participants would be more likely to help and have a higher level of justification for helping a White, wealthy victim. White participants were also expected to report more positive emotions when helping a White victim. When the victim was Black, it was hypothesized that regardless of the victim's SES, White participants would be less willing to help and would have a lower level of justification than when the victim was White. Also, it was expected that White participants would report more negative emotional response to helping a Black victim.

For Blacks participants, it was hypothesized that participants would be more likely to help and would report more justification for helping a Black victim and a White victim equally the same, regardless of socioeconomic status. Also, Black participants were expected to report more positive emotions for helping a Black victim and more negative emotions for helping a White victim.

Method

Participants

Two hundred fifty-six students participated in the present study. The students consisted of undergraduate and graduate students from multiple colleges in Virginia, Washington, D.C., Maryland, and North Carolina. There were 67 Black participants and 189 White participants. The ages of participants ranged from 18-68 (M=23.91, SD=8.12). The participants were notified of a request for their participation through email or by survey links posted on college message boards. Participants were asked to only participate once. Depending on the school, some participants received two extra credit points for participating; at other schools there was no compensation for their participation.

Materials and Procedures

The participants completed a survey online through Survey Monkey. The informed consent (See Appendix A) was presented first, and the demographics form consisting of five questions (See Appendix B) followed. The participants' continuation with the survey served as verification that they agreed with the informed consent. After reading the informed consent form and completing the demographics form, the participants proceeded to take the survey. Participants read a brief scenario (See Appendix C) about helping a student at their school find the business building, which would result in being late for their class. There were four scenarios that were identical except for variations in race and SES. The victim in the scenario was either Black and poor, Black and rich, White and poor, or White and rich. Each participant read only one scenario, which was randomly selected by Survey Monkey. Once the participants read the scenario, they proceeded to answer four questions pertaining to the scenario (See Appendix D) as a way of

making sure that they were paying attention to details in the story. Nearly 99% of participants correctly identified details in the scenario such as whether the person in the scenario had grown up wealthy or poor. The likelihood to help index (α=.69) was presented next (See Appendix E) to see how likely the participants were to help the victims in the scenario. Three questions were presented to the participants (e.g. "It was my duty to do something," "I would help the person by walking him/her to the business building") and was rated on a likert scale from 1 to 7 with 1 being not at all applicable, 4 being somewhat applicable, and 7 being completely applicable. The justification index (α=.67) followed (See Appendix F) and was modified from the one used by Kunstman & Plant (2008). Three questions were presented to the participants (e.g. "I would rate the situation as being very serious," "I would feel bad if I did not offer my assistance"). The purpose of the index was to capture participants' reasoning for either helping or not helping the person in need. The justification index was rated on a likert scale from 1 to 7 with 1 being not at all applicable, 4 being somewhat applicable, and 7 being completely applicable. A modified aversion index (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986) containing nine negative words (e.g. uneasy, angry, fear) (α=.83) and nine positive words (e.g. relaxed, cool, helpful) (α=.85) (See Appendix G) was given to see what types of feelings the participants felt towards the situation. This index was rated on a scale from 1 to 7 with 1 definitely does not describe me, 4 somewhat describes me, and 7 definitely describes me. Once the survey was complete, the participants were thanked for their participation and if they were receiving extra credit they were asked to print out the "Thank you" page to verify completion of the survey. Most participants completed the survey in less than 15 minutes.

Results

The hypotheses varied depending on the race of the participant. There were an unequal number of White and Black participants, which required that the data be analyzed separately by race to determine whether race of the participant was related to the dependent variables. For each DV a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to separately analyze the data for White participants and Black participants. It was hypothesized that White participants would be more likely to help White wealthy victims and have more positive emotions and a higher level of justification than they would for Black victims regardless of the SES. The descriptive statistics for White participants are presented in Table 1. For White participants, there was no significant difference between the means for helping $F(3, 179) = 0.51$, $p=0.68$, the means for negative emotion $F(3, 165) = 2.3$, $p= 0.08$, the means for positive emotion $F(3, 171) = 0.01$, $p= 0.10$, or the means for justification $F(3, 179) = 1.75$, $p= 0.16$. None of the hypotheses were supported.

For Black participants, it was hypothesized that they would be more likely to help and would report higher justification and positive emotions for helping a Black victim and a White victim equally. The descriptive statistics for Black participants are presented in Table 2. The hypothesis test did not support the hypotheses demonstrating a non-significant difference between the means for helping, $F(3, 58) = 1.97$, $p = 0.13$, the means for negative emotion $F(3, 55) = .816$, $p= 0.50$, the mean for positive emotion $F(3, 57) = 1.32$, $p= 0.28$, and the means for justification $F(3, 59) = 0.96$, $p= 0.42$.

Discussion

The goal of this study was to determine what personal factors may influence helping behavior. It was hypothesized that Whites would report more positive emotions when helping a

White victim and more negative emotions when helping a Black victim. Secondly, it was expected that when the victim was Black, regardless of their SES, White participants would be less willing to help and would have a lower level of justification than when the victim was White. Also, it was expected that White participants would report more negative emotional response to helping a Black victim. Lastly, it was expected that Blacks would be more likely to help and would report more justification for helping a Black victim and a White victim equally, regardless of SES status. Black participants were also expected to report more positive emotions for helping a Black victim and more negative emotions for helping a White victim.

The results from the study indicated that there was no significant difference for Blacks or Whites in the amount of help given, justification, and positive emotional feelings toward helping Black and White victims of various SES. However, the results were approaching significance for negative emotions, disclosing that White participants felt more negative emotions toward Black poor victims. If significance had been reached then the negative emotional hypothesis would have been supported.

The results from this study are similar to the study by Graf and Riddell (1972) where they found no significant difference in the frequency with which a Black or a White male was able to hitch a ride in Black and White sections of San Diego. Similary, research by Gaertner and Bickman (1971) suggested that Blacks would not show any discrimination against Whites and that they would help Blacks and Whites equally. Wegner and Crano's (1975) findings also related to the present study by showing that White bystanders helped both races equally. The findings from these studies along with the present study suggest that race may not be a factor in certain helping situations.

A meta-analysis by Saucier, Miller, and Doucet (2005) showed that overall discrimination against Blacks was more likely to occur when potential helpers had more opportunities to explain their decision not to help with justifiable explanations having nothing to do with race. These finding were different from what was shown by the present study. The participants were able to justify their reason for helping either a White or Black victim and there was no significant difference for Whites' justification to help Black victims or vice versa. This may suggest that although covert discrimination may have been a factor on whether or not a White person would provide help to a Black victim in the past, it may no longer serve as a factor in helping behavior. The present study combined with previous studies once again shows that race may no longer be a factor in determining if a person will receive help or not (Gaertner & Bickman, 1971; Wegner & Crano, 1975).

The findings for the present study were not significant and may suggest that people are in fact becoming more aware of the importance of providing help to victims regardless of previously researched influencing factors such as race. There were several strengths to the design of the study. First, although there were unequal differences in the number of White participants compared to Black participants, the sample reflects an enhanced representation of the Black population on Lynchburg College campus. There were 72.3% White participants and 27.7% Black participants. Second, manipulation check questions about the scenario were another way of making sure that the participants were aware of the key points of the scenario. This was a strength to the study because it gave confirmation tat the participants were aware of the victim's race and SES. Third, the aversion and justification index were both previously tested measures (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Kunstman & Plant, 2008) and in previous studies have shown that they predict if a person will provide help or not. Using the two tested measures

made sure that what was intended on being measured was actually measured. Fourth, there was experimental manipulation for the race and SES of the victims in each scenario specifying that it was a true experiment.

There were also some weaknesses to this study. First, there were 10 fewer white participants who received the Black/poor scenario. The results for the White participants having more negative emotional feeling toward helping a Black poor victim was reaching significance, and had there been equal participation for each scenario then statistical significance may have been reached. Second, the participants read a scenario about each situation and in fact had time to think and analyze their answers. The scenarios were rather innocuous in that the helper was walking a person across campus and the result would consist of being a few minutes late for class. The hypothetical scenarios were different from the scenarios performed in previous studies in that the scenarios were reality. People may tend to give the pleasant response in hypothetical situations but when they are actually experiencing the situation in reality, the response may be completely different. Fourth, helping the student find the business building may have outweighed the consequence of being late for class because the Professor would probably understand.

There have been many situations mentioned in other articles about different factors that affect the chance of a victim receiving help or not. Historical evidence shows just how much of an impact not providing help to a person in need can have. For example, research on Hurricane Katrina victims demonstrated that characteristics such as race and SES may have been the reason why the victims did not receive help as soon as they should have (Henkel et al., 2006). For many years research demonstrated that a theory called the bystander effect may have been the reason behind Kitty Genovese not receiving help (although later research suggested this may not be the

case) (Manning, Levine & Collins 2007). This research has established important principles about the conditions under which individuals may choose to engage in helping behaviors.

In a future study it would be important to get equal amounts of participants to determine if in fact there is a difference between negative emotional experiences felt between White and Black participants when helping a Black poor victim. The participants should be placed in real-life environments to see if there is a difference in the amount of help given. It would also be important to make sure that the consequence for helping is more threatening. The lack of statistical significance may be evidence that, at least in innocuous situations, people may not consider various personal characteristics prior to helping, although situations that may pose more of a "threat" may still reveal a difference. The non-significance results could also be because people on a college campus are more educated about diversity and may be less likely to think about personal factors in helping situations. In a forthcoming study it would be interesting to compare college students helping behavior to people who are not college students and see if college education plays a role in increasing a person's potential to help. If the study shows that college students do have an increased chance of providing help then this knowledge can be provided in general school education. This would be a way of making sure that people receive the proper knowledge to become aware of factors that influence helping and will be knowledgeable regardless if they attend college or not. The more that people can become aware of different characteristics that influence helping behavior the better the chance that victims will receive help.

References

Argyle, M. (1994). The psychology of social class. London, England: Routledge

Batson, C. D.,Chang, J., Orr, R., Rowland, J. (2002). Empathy, attitudes and action: Can feeling

for a member of a stigmatized group motivate one to help the group. *Personality and*

Social Psychology Bulletin, 28(12), 1656-1666.

Blascovich, J., Mendes, W. B., Hunter, S. B.,Lickel, B., Kowai-Bell, N. (2001). Perceiver threat

in social interactions with stigmatized others. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, 80(2), 253-267.

Campbell MW, de Waal FBM (2011) Ingroup-Outgroup Bias in Contagious Yawning by

Chimpanzees Supports Link to Empathy. PLoS ONE 6(4): e18283.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0018283

Crandall, C. S., Eshleman, A. (2003). A justification-suppression model of the expression and

experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin, 129(3),* 414-446.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L. (1983). The effects of sex, status, and ability on helping behavior.

Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 13(3), 191-205.

Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Schroeder, D. A., Penner, L. A. (2006). *The social psychology of*

prosocial behavior. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Frank, R. H. (1999). Luxury fever: Why money fails to satisfy in an era of excess. New York,

NY: Free Press, Princeton University.

Gaertner, S., Bickman, L. (1971). Effects of race on the elicitation of helping behavior: The wrong number technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 20(2),* 218-222.

Gaertner, S. L.; Dovidio, J. F. (1977). The subtlety of White racism, arousal, and helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35(10),* 691-707.

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.

Graf, R.G., Riddell, J. C. (1972). Helping behavior as a function of interpersonal perception. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 86(2),* 227-231.

Henkel, K. E., Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L. (2006). Institutional Discrimination, Individual Racism, and Hurricane Katrina. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy (ASAP), 6(1),* 99-124.

Keltner, D., Piff, P., Kraus, M., Cote, S., Cheng, B. (2010). Having less, giving more: The influence of social class on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99(5),* 771-784.

Kogut, T., Ritov, I. (2005). The "Identified Victim" Effect: An Identified Group, or Just a Single Individual? *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 18(3),* 157-167.

Kraus, M. W., Keltner, D. (2009). Signs of socioeconomic status: A thin-slicing approach. *Psychological Science, 20(1)* 99-106.

Manning, R., Levine, M., Collins, A. (2007). The legacy of the 38 witnesses and the importance of getting history right. *American Psychologist, 63(6)* 552-563.

Pearson, A., Dovidio, J., Gaertner, S. (2009). The nature of contemporary prejudice: insights

from Aversive racism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 3(3)* 314-338.

Piff, P. K., Kraus, M. W., Côté, S.,Cheng, B. H., Keltner, D. (2010). Having less, giving more:

The influence of social class on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social

Psychology, 99(5),* 771-784.

Saucier, D. A., Miller, C. T., Doucet, N. (2005). Differences in Helping Whites and Blacks: A

Meta-Analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9(1),* 2-16.

Schmader, T, Major B. (1999). The Impact of Ingroug vs Outgroup Performance on Personal

Value. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 35,* 47-67

Snibbe, A. C.; Markus, H. R. (2005). You Can't Always Get What You Want: Educational

Attainment, Agency, and Choice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88(4),*

703-720.

van Kleef, G. A.; Oveis, C.; van der Löwe, I.; LuoKogan, A.; Goetz, J.; Keltner, D. (2008).

Power, distress, and compassion: Turning a blind eye to the suffering of others.

Psychological Science, 19(12), 1315-1322

Wegner, D.M.; Crano, W. D. (1975). Racial factors in helping behavior: An unobtrusive field

experiment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32(5),* 901-905

Wispe, L. G.; Freshley, H. B. (1971). Race, sex, and sympathetic helping behavior: The broken

bag caper. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17(1),* 59-65.

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics for White Participants*

Negative Emotion	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
White/Poor	43	19.14	8.53
Black/Poor	36	21.42	7.33
White/Rich	46	17.02	5.85
Black/Rich	44	19.41	8.10
Positive Emotion	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
White/Poor	44	41.87	11.87
Black/Poor	38	41.53	8.18
White/Rich	46	41.89	11.34
Black/Rich	47	41.70	10.52
Help	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
White/Poor	48	15.85	3.57
Black/Poor	40	15.95	3.26
White/Rich	49	15.14	3.99
Black/Rich	49	15.39	3.60
Justify	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
White/Poor	48	14.50	3.31
Black/Poor	38	13.89	3.55
White/Rich	48	12.85	3.53
Black/Rich	49	13.77	3.59

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics for Black Participants*

Negative Emotion	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
White/Poor	13	20.70	7.60
Black/Poor	20	16.75	10.03
White/Rich	17	21.24	10.64
Black/Rich	9	18.89	8.18
Positive Emotion	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
White/Poor	13	41.38	11.41
Black/Poor	20	48.60	11.24
White/Rich	18	44.83	11.86
Black/Rich	10	42.30	9.81
Help	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
White/Poor	14	16.93	4.39
Black/Poor	20	14.90	3.96
White/Rich	18	15.33	3.77
Black/Rich	10	13.10	2.88
Justify	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
White/Poor	14	14.86	4.91
Black/Poor	21	15.10	4.84
White/Rich	17	13.45	3.50
Black/Rich	11	13.45	4.31

Appendix A

Informed Consent Agreement

Please read this consent agreement carefully before you decide to participate in the study.

Project title: Personal Factors that Influence Helping Behaviors

Purpose of the research study: The purpose of the study is to better understand the reasoning process behind helping those in need.

What you will do in the study: Provide some background information about yourself as well as read a scenario and respond to questions directly related to that scenario (e.g. knowledge of details of scenario, feelings associated with scenario, etc.)

Time required: For most participants, completion of the study will take less than 30 minutes.

Risks: There are no risks.

Benefits: Participants may gain some insight into their own beliefs about helping others.

Confidentiality: Data will be collected anonymously. Your name will not be associated with your responses.

Voluntary participation: Participation is completely voluntary.

Right to withdraw from the study: You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

How to withdraw from the study: If you want to withdraw from the study, then exit out of the survey now. There is no penalty for withdrawing.

Payment: You will receive no payment for this study, although some students may receive extra if predetermined by the instructor.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study: Alisha Walker Marciano, Ph.D., Psychology Department, Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, VA 24501. Telephone: 434/544-8088. E-mail: marciano.a@lynchburg.edu.

Experimenter: Mkeba Barksdale E-mail: barksdale_me@students.lynchburg.edu

Whom to contact about your rights in the study: Beth McKinney, PhD, MPH, CHES, Health Promotion Department, Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, VA 24501. Telephone: 434.544.8962. Email: mckinney.b@lynchburg.edu

Agreement:

I agree to participate in the research study described above, and confirm that I am at least 18 years old. My continuation of the completion of this survey implies consent.

Appendix B

Please tell us some things about yourself

1.   Sex (circle one):   Male   Female

2.   Age:_____

3.   How do you describe your ethnic background? (circle one)

Asian   Indian   Hispanic   Black   White   Other:_____

4.   What is your current class status?

a.   Freshman

b.   Sophomore

c.   Junior

d.   Senior

e.   Graduate Student

5.   What is your household yearly income?

a. $0- $25,000

b. $25,000-$50,000

c. $50,000-$75,000

d. $75,000-$100,000

e. $100,000- up

Appendix C

You are heading to one of your classes, which starts in 10 minutes. As you are about to walk into class you overhear a White student on the phone telling someone that he/she has to give a speech in 10 minutes in the business building, but the person doesn't know where the building is located. The speech is about personal experiences of growing up and living in poverty. You are a business major and know exactly where the business building is located. You know that the business building is in a somewhat hidden location and that you would have to physically walk with the student to the building to show him/her where it is. You are also considering the fact that if you show the student where to go then you will be late for class.

You are heading to one of your classes, which starts in 10 minutes. As you are about to walk into class you overhear a Black student on the phone telling someone that he/she has to give a speech in 10 minutes in the business building, but the person doesn't know where the building is located. The speech is about personal experiences of growing up and living in poverty. You are a business major and know exactly where the business building is located. You know that the business building is in a somewhat hidden location and that you would have to physically walk with the student to the building to show him/her where it is. You are also considering the fact that if you show the student where to go then you will be late for class.

You are heading to one of your classes, which starts in 10 minutes. As you are about to walk into class you overhear a White student on the phone telling someone that he/she has to give a speech in 10 minutes in the business building, but the person doesn't know where the building is located. The speech is about personal experiences of growing up and living in wealth. You are a business major and know exactly where the business building is located. You know that the business building is in a somewhat hidden location and that you would have to physically walk with the student to the building to show him/her where it is. You are also considering the fact that if you show the student where to go then you will be late for class.

You are heading to one of your classes, which starts in 10 minutes. As you are about to walk into class you overhear a Black student on the phone telling someone that he/she has to give a speech in 10 minutes in the business building, but the person doesn't know where the building is located. The speech is about personal experiences of growing up and living in wealth. You are a business major and know exactly where the business building is located. You know that the business building is in a somewhat hidden location and that you would have to physically walk with the student to the building to show him/her where it is. You are also considering the fact that if you show the student where to go then you will be late for class.

Appendix D

Scenario Questions

Please answer the following questions about the scenario. Some questions will ask you to recall details of the scenario while others will ask you to think about how you might respond if you were in this situation.

1. Why was the student on campus?
   A. To study
   B. To give a speech
   C. To meet up with friends
   D. The student wasn't on campus

2. Where was the student going?
   A. the gym
   B. the coffee shop
   C. the business building
   D. the cafeteria

3. What was the speech about?
   A. Personal experiences growing up and living in poverty
   B. Personal experiences growing up and living on a farm
   C. Personal experiences growing up and living in wealth
   D. Personal experiences growing up and living in wealth and on a farm

4. How long until the start of your class?
   A. 5mins
   B. 10mins
   C. 20mins
   D. 30mins

Appendix E

Likelihood to help Index

1. I would help the person by walking him/her to the business building.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all applicable			Somewhat applicable			Completely applicable

2. It was my duty to do something.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all applicable			Somewhat applicable			Completely applicable

3. I felt the person needed my help.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all applicable			Somewhat applicable			Completely applicable

APPENDIX F

Justification Index

1. I would feel bad if I did not offer my assistance.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all applicable			Somewhat applicable			Completely applicable

2. Helping the person in need outweighed the cost of getting to my destination on time.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all applicable			Somewhat applicable			Completely applicable

3.   I would rate the seriousness of the situation.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all applicable			Somewhat applicable			Completely applicable

Appendix G

Aversion Index

Next you will read 18 different terms that describe a feeling/emotion. Think about how you would feel if you experienced the situation described in the scenario. For each feeling, indicate the degree to which you would experience that emotion/feeling.

1. Disgusted...

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely does not describe me			Somewhat describes me			Definitely describes me

2. Happy...

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely does not describe me			Somewhat describes me			Definitely describes me

3. Uneasy...

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely does not describe me			Somewhat describes me			Definitely describes me

4.Relaxed...

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely does not describe me			Somewhat describes me			Definitely describes me

5. Irritated...

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely does not describe me			Somewhat describes me			Definitely describes me

6. Cool…

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely does not describe me			Somewhat describes me			Definitely describes me

7. Guilty…

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely does not describe me			Somewhat describes me			Definitely describes me

8. Harmless…

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely does not describe me			Somewhat describes me			Definitely describes me

9. Tense…

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely does not describe me			Somewhat describes me			Definitely describes me

10. Comfortable…

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Definitely   Somewhat   Definitely
does not   describes   describes
describe   me   me
  me

11. Helpless...

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Definitely   Somewhat   Definitely
does not   describes   describes
describe   me   me
  me

12. Confident...

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Definitely   Somewhat   Definitely
does not   describes   describes
describe   me   me
  me

13. Angry...

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Definitely   Somewhat   Definitely
does not   describes   describes
describe   me   me
  me

14. Calm...

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Definitely   Somewhat   Definitely
does not   describes   describes
describe   me   me
  me

15. Fear...

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7
Definitely   Somewhat   Definitely
does not   describes   describes
describe   me   me
  me

16. Helpful...

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely does not describe me			Somewhat describes me			Definitely describes me

17. Threat...

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely does not describe me			Somewhat describes me			Definitely describes me

18. Safe...

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely does not describe me			Somewhat describes me			Definitely describes me