

April 2007 (Revised Version)

Inter-Group Helping as Status Organizing Processes:
Implications for Inter-Group Misunderstandings

Arie Nadler
Tel Aviv University, Israel

Samer Halabi
University of Connecticut. U.S.A.

Gal Harpaz-Gorodeisky
Open University, Israel

“In press” in: Demoulin, S., Leyens, J.P. & Dovidio, J.F. (Eds.): Intergroup
misunderstandings: Impact of divergent social realities, Washington, D.C.: Psychology
Press.

In their review of four decades of research on helping behavior Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin & Schroeder (2005) classify these works into: (a) *Micro-level research* which focuses on identifying the evolutionary origins and individual differences in people's tendency to help others; (b) *Meso-level research* which focuses on variables and processes in the helper-recipient dyad; and (c) *Macro level research* which studies prosocial behavior within groups, communities and organizations. Although research in each of these three categories has a different emphasis they are all united by the goal of uncovering variables and processes that explain and predict people's willingness to offer a helping hand to others in need. The present chapter, however, takes a different tack. It examines the implications of intergroup helping on status relations between the actors involved. It postulates that groups create, maintain or challenge status relations through helping relations. More specifically, giving to the outgroup may be motivated by the wish for positive ingroup distinctiveness, and dependency on the outgroup's help may signal the acceptance of the helper's higher status whereas rejecting it may reflect a desire to change existing status relations. These dynamics may give rise to intergroup misunderstandings in that an offer of help from the outgroup may be viewed as a manipulative ploy to retain dominance and therefore be rejected. By contrast, the spurning of help by a group may be perceived as ingratitude and distrust.

This perspective on helping departs from traditional research on pro-social behavior in three key ways; namely, the phenomena under study, the motivational dynamics that propel them, and the level at which they occur. Regarding the *phenomena*,

while much research has centered on helping behavior, the present chapter explores the full spectrum of helping relations. It considers *help giving*, *help seeking* and *reactions to receiving* help within a single theoretical framework: the Intergroup Helping as Status Relations (IHSR) model (Nadler, 2002). Regarding *motivational dynamics*, whereas past research has centered on behavior that is driven by different levels of caring and empathy, the present chapter views helping relations as reflecting different levels of group members' motivation for positive ingroup distinctiveness. Finally, regarding *level of analysis*, whereas past research has centered on individual and interpersonal processes which can occur within a group setting (i.e., micro, meso and macro levels of analysis, respectively) the present chapter focuses on the intergroup level.

Two points need to be emphasized before we turn to more specific considerations on intergroup helping relations as status relations and their consequences for group misunderstandings. First, we do not claim that all intergroup helping interactions reflect status-related motivations. Oftentimes groups assist because of genuine caring for the outgroup members' plight (e.g., Sturmer, Snyder & Omoto, 2005). Second, our use of the term 'ingroup' and 'outgroup' does not imply two concrete and observable groups. Our analysis is couched in a self-categorization approach which asserts that when people's social identity is salient what appears as an interpersonal encounter needs to be analyzed as an intergroup interaction (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987).

In subsequent sections we (a) formulate the central question of intergroup helping as status relations and define its links to group misunderstandings, and introduce the (b) theoretical background for the IHSR model which consists of relevant literature on helping (Dovidio, Piliavin, Schroeder & Penner, 2006) and the social identity

perspective on intergroup relations (Turner & Reynolds, 2001) . Then (c) the chapter presents the IHSR model and supporting evidence and concludes with (d) a discussion of the conceptual and applied implications of this analysis.

Central Issue: Intergroup Helping as Status Relations and Misunderstandings.

Giving help to the outgroup or receiving help from it has direct implications for power relations between groups (Nadler, 2002). The helping group is resourceful enough to give while the receiving group is dependent on the outgroup's assistance to overcome its predicament. When a group habitually helps another group it makes a concrete and behavioral statement about its relatively higher status. When the receiving group is the willing recipient of such help it behaviorally acknowledges its dependence on the outgroup and its relatively lower status. In fact, the continuous downward flow of assistance can be conceptualized as a social barter where the higher status group provides caring and assistance to the lower status group which reciprocates by accepting the unequal social hierarchy and its place in it as legitimate. Gender relations in past centuries are an example of such a social barter. Men, the more privileged group, catered to women's economic and instrumental needs while women's acceptance of this social arrangement legitimized the unequal social hierarchy and their lower status in it.

Sometimes such intergroup helping relations give rise to misunderstandings and increased tensions between groups. Two real world examples help illustrate this phenomenon. The first is affirmative action programs which aim to help the less advantaged to realize their potential and attain equality. Although important in achieving these goals these programs have been criticized as amplifying the disadvantaged group's dependence and therefore perpetuating rather than remedying social inequality (Prtkanis

& Turner, 1996, 1999). Thus, the benevolent intention that underlies affirmative action programs may be misconstrued and lead to increased tensions between the advantaged group that initiated them and the disadvantaged groups which are its intended beneficiaries. Another illustration is the process of peace-building which is based on the idea that joint efforts by former enemies to attain a common goal will facilitate the transition from relations colored by suspicion and animosity to relations that are founded on trust and good will (Lederach, 1997). For instance, numerous peace building projects were initiated between Israelis and Palestinians during the 1990s after the signing of the Oslo agreements in 1993. Analyses of these projects indicate that the Palestinians (i.e., the relatively less advantaged group) often resented their dependence on the technological know-how and resources of the Israelis (i.e., the relatively more advantaged group). The Israelis on the other hand were often baffled and offended when their offers to assist their former enemy were turned down. In fact, what one side saw as benevolent cooperation the other viewed as degrading dependence (Nadler & Saguy, 2004; Bouillon, 2004).

Taken together, these two examples indicate that intergroup helping can result in group misunderstandings and increased intergroup tensions. Further, both examples are emblematic of helping relations that occur between differentially advantaged groups during times of social change towards greater equality. Affirmative action programs are designed to facilitate a transition to more equal relations between ethnic and racial groups, and peace building projects are designed to facilitate a shift from conflict between differentially powerful groups to co-existence between equals. This suggests that when intergroup helping relations occur against the backdrop of movement towards

greater equality they are likely to give rise to group misunderstandings. This is because of the inconsistency between the social equality that is the sine qua non of such changes and the inferiority that is implied by dependence on another's assistance (Nadler & Fisher, 1986).

The Intergroup Helping as Status Relations model and related research describe and explore these processes in a systematic manner. It suggests that there are two clusters of intergroup helping relations: one occurs when power relations between groups are secure (i.e. stable and legitimate) and another when they are insecure (i.e., unstable and illegitimate) (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), and that group misunderstandings are likely to arise in the second case alone. In the following sections we first describe the historical and theoretical background of the IHSR model, and then present a detailed description of the model and supporting evidence.

(2) Historical and Theoretical Background: Social Status- The Link between Helping and Intergroup Relations

The idea that helping others and being helped by them affects the helper's and the recipient's relative status is echoed in classical writings in the social sciences. In a monograph entitled "Democracy in America," published in 1835, Alexis de Tocqueville observed that members of the ruling class exercise dominance over underprivileged classes by assisting them. He wrote that for the recipients, accepting such assistance is a "servitude of the regular, quiet and gentle kind" (de Tocqueville, 1853/1956, pp. 303-304.). Similarly, Marcel Mauss (i.e., "Essai sur le don" 1923/1957[The Gift]) described the custom of 'potlatch' which consists of lavish displays of gift-giving by a clan leader to other clan leaders. Mauss writes that the "motives for such excessive gifts... are in no

way disinterested.... To give is to show one's superiority" (p. 72) and that this is group-based behavior in the sense that the tribal leader establishes his hierarchical position "to the ultimate benefit... *of his own clan*" (italics added, p. 4). Turning his attention to the recipients, Mauss noted that willing recipients of such excessive gifts acknowledge their relatively lower social position. He writes: "to accept without returning... [is] to become client and subservient" (p. 72). More recent anthropological studies have made similar observations. On Melanesian islands the family of the deceased holds an elaborate feast during which guests receive gifts which they are not expected to reciprocate and the more the family serves relatively rare turtle meat, the higher its esteem and reputation (Smith & Bleig-Bird, 2000, cited by Van Vugt, Roberts & Hardy, in press).

Research in social psychology has drawn similar conclusions regarding the links between giving to others and the helper's worth. Helping others is sometimes motivated by the helper's desire for self-enhancement (Brown & Smart, 1991) and the decision to volunteer is motivated, in part, by people's quest for positive self-regard (Batson, 1994; Snyder & Omoto, 2001). In their simulation experiments of cooperative behavior Sigmund & Novak (1998) note that people behave cooperatively towards others to gain social status. They write that "...cooperation pays because it confers the image of a valuable community member to the cooperating individual" (p. 573). Research and theory on the seeking and receiving of help has shown that dependency on others may pose a threat to the recipient's self esteem (Nadler & Fisher, 1986), and that when this level of threat is high, people avoid seeking needed help and react negatively to its receipt (Nadler, 1991).

Another area of research in social psychology in which social asymmetry between interactants is the key to understanding social behavior is the social identity perspective on intergroup relations. The early formulations of Social Identity Theory attributed the universal tendencies of group members to devalue and discriminate against the outgroup to group members' motivation to positively distinguish their group from the outgroup (Tajfel, 1978). Research on social identity has drawn heavily on the observation that relations between groups are seldom, if ever, relations between equal social entities and that basic group phenomena (e.g., ingroup favoritism) affect and are affected by group status (Sachdev & Bourhis, 1987; 1991). The information that one belongs to a group that is lower than the outgroup on significant dimensions is said to be threatening to social identity and drives members to try to better their group's position. They can do so by individual or collective means. If intergroup boundaries allow relatively free movement between the low and high status groups (i.e., permeable boundaries) members of the low status groups are likely to leave the low status group and join the high status group (i.e., individual mobility). If intergroup boundaries do not allow free movement between groups (i.e., impermeable boundaries) members of low status groups are expected to cope with the unflattering comparison with the high status outgroup by collective means. They can do so by reframing the comparison in ways which makes it more palatable to them (i.e., "social creativity") or try to affect *social change* by changing the status of the ingroup (i.e., "social competition") (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

The emphasis on social asymmetry in these two areas of research serves as the conceptual bridge for the theoretical integration between helping relations and social identity research. This theoretical integration is aimed at clarifying the ways in which

giving, seeking and receiving help between groups create, maintain or challenge status relations between them.

(3) Theoretical Framework and Research Support: The Intergroup Helping as Status Relations (IHSR) Model

Groups may use explicit and direct or implicit and indirect strategies to maintain their relative advantage or try to overcome their relative disadvantage. When an advantaged group openly discriminates against a disadvantaged outgroup it uses direct means to assert its higher status. Similarly, when a disadvantaged group openly challenges the unequal status quo it uses a direct strategy to change it. When, however, the advantaged group tries to maintain its superior social position by making the less advantaged group dependent on its superior knowledge or resources it is using an indirect strategy to maintain advantage. By the same token, the unwillingness of the disadvantaged group to seek or receive needed help from the high status outgroup represents its dissatisfaction with the existing inequality and its desire to attain equality and independence. This is an indirect strategy to change the unequal status quo. Returning to the previous example of peace-building, the stronger group may try to retain its superiority by amplifying the less powerful group's dependence on its knowledge or resources. Such an indirect strategy to maintain preferred status (i.e., helping) is a socially desirable behavior and is therefore more difficult to resist than a direct assertion of power. The less advantaged group may resent what it views as a manipulative assertion of dominance and reject the outgroup's offer of help and the more advantaged group may be offended by the spurning of its generosity. This may spiral into reciprocal group misunderstandings that may result in increased tensions between the two groups.

The Intergroup Helping as Status Relations model suggests that these dynamics depend on (1) *characteristics of the social structure*; i.e., whether the intergroup status hierarchy is perceived as secure or insecure; (2) *characteristics of the help*; i.e., whether help is autonomy or dependency oriented, and (3) *individual characteristics* of ingroup members (for instance, ingroup identification). The model that links these conceptual building blocks is presented in Fig. 1. In the next section we consider each of these three elements and present evidence that support these claims..

FIGURE 1

(a) Characteristics of the social structure: Security of intergroup status relations
 Status relations are said to be secure when they are viewed as stable and legitimate and insecure when viewed as illegitimate and unstable (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). When the status hierarchy is secure, neither the high nor the low status group is motivated to change the unequal status quo. When the status hierarchy is perceived as insecure, members of high status groups are motivated to defend their social advantage and members of low status groups view the disadvantaged position of their group as changeable and will therefore try to alter the unequal status quo (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Changes in gender relations illustrate these dynamics. Prior to the 20th century women's inferiority to men was regarded as both legitimate (e.g., "god made us this way") and stable (e.g., "this is how things are and will be"). From the beginning of the 20th century onward people began to question the legitimacy of gender inequalities and these changed perceptions led to active efforts by the low status group (i.e., women) to change the status quo and attain equality.

How is this reflected in intergroup helping relations? When status relations are secure, members of advantaged groups are expected to care for members of the lower status group and help them whenever they need it. Members of low status groups, on the other hand, are expected to be receptive to the high status group's help. In fact, intergroup helping reinforces inequality through benevolence. When status relations are perceived as insecure, members of high status groups who are motivated to defend their advantage will attempt to reinforce the low status group's dependence on them. They are therefore expected to give much assistance to the low status group. Further, this is likely to be help which reinforces the recipient's dependence and is given when it is neither requested (i.e., "assumptive help", Schnieder, Major, Luthanen & Crocker, 1996) nor objectively needed (i.e., on relatively easy tasks).

The idea that group members can remedy a threat to their status by providing help to the source of this threat was assessed in an experiment by one of the co-authors which used ad-hoc groups in a minimal group paradigm and a subsequent experiment which assessed the same hypothesis with real groups (Harpaz-Gorodeisky, 2005). In the first experiment, after the creation of two ad-hoc groups with the over-under estimators procedure (Jetten, Spears & Manstead, 1996) levels of *threat to group status* and *ingroup identification* were experimentally induced. Following the induction of these manipulations participants were assigned to be test administrators and could offer assistance to the outgroup member on 8 out of 12 problems. A 'level of threat' X 'ingroup identification' interaction ($p < .05$) indicated that *high identifiers* who had experienced *high threat* to their group's status provided the *most help to the outgroup*

which was the source of this threat. This finding supports the idea that group members reduce threat to their group's status by helping the source of this threat.

To rule out alternative explanations (e.g., that negative affect in the 'high threat-high identification' cell produced the high level of helping, (cf. Cialdini, Darby & Vincent, 1973) and to extend the generalizability of the findings, a second experiment was conducted with real groups. Participants were all high school students and their school's academic status was threatened by another high school. In one condition participants could help a neutral outgroup, in another they could provide help to the source of threat to their group's status, and in the third control condition their group status was not threatened. Further, the participants' identification with their school (i.e., ingroup identification) was measured. The findings that high identifiers gave more help to an outgroup which was the source of threat than to a neutral outgroup or in the no-threat control condition (means of help giving were 5.8, 2.9 and 3.5, respectively, $p < .01$) reinforces the interpretation that helping the outgroup was motivated by a wish for positive ingroup distinctiveness. This interpretation is further supported by the finding that the amount of help given by high identifiers to the threatening outgroup was the same on difficult and easy problems. This suggests that helping in this condition was not driven by wanting to aid recipients to overcome a difficult problem but rather by a defensive motivation to remedy a threat to social identity. Although these studies did not vary the security of status relations, they provide support to the idea that group members can reduce threats to the ingroup's status by amplifying the outgroup's dependence on their assistance.

The IHSR model suggests that when members of low status groups perceive the low status of their group as illegitimate or unstable they will view dependency on the high status group as inconsistent with their motivation for equal status. They are therefore expected to be reluctant to seek or receive help from the high status outgroup. The first assessments of this hypothesis examined willingness of low status group members to receive and seek help from the high status group in a real group context (i.e., Israeli-Arab and Israeli Jews as low and high status groups in Israeli society, respectively). In the first experiment a 2 (Arab vs. Jewish helper) X 2 (Help vs. No Help) interaction ($p < .05$) indicated that in accordance with expectations Israeli-Arabs (i.e., the low status group) who received help from an Israeli Jew (i.e., the high status group) had lower affect, feelings of personal self-worth, and perceptions of 'worthiness as an Arab' than did those who did not receive such help. There were no differences on these indices between the help and the no-help conditions when the helper was presented as an Israeli-Arab (Halabi, Nadler & Dovidio, 2006). The results of a second experiment showed that while Israeli Jews sought a similar amount of help from an Arab or Jewish helper (means were 3.1 and 2.7, respectively) Israeli-Arabs sought less help from an Israeli Jew than an Israeli-Arab helper (means were 2.0 and 4.6, respectively) ($p < .01$ for the 'group of helper' X 'group of recipient' interaction, Nadler & Peleg, 2006). The finding that help-seeking by the high status group (i.e., Israeli Jews) was unaffected by the group affiliation of the helper lessens the plausibility of an alternative interpretation that the lower willingness of Israeli-Arabs to seek help from an Israeli Jew represents a general reluctance to seek help from any outgroup.

These studies did not vary, or assess perceived security of status relations. Our participants were Israeli-Arab students from urban families who are likely to have regarded the relatively low status of their group as neither legitimate nor stable (Yuchtman-Yaar & Peres, 2000). In a second stage we examined the willingness of low status group members to receive help from the high status outgroup where different levels of perceived stability of status relations had been experimentally manipulated.

The first experiment was a 2 (Help vs. No Help) X 2 (Stable vs. Unstable status relations) between- participants *minimal group experiment* (Nadler & Halabi, 2006, study 1) where ad-hoc groups were created with the over-under estimators procedure (cf., Jetten, Spears & Manstead, 1996) and participants learned that the outgroup had higher status on scholastic abilities. Half of the participants later learned that this higher status would remain constant and the other half were told that it could change in future administrations of the test (i.e., stable and unstable status differences, respectively). Subsequently, half of the participants received help and the other half did not receive help to solve insoluble anagrams from a member of the outgroup. The findings indicate that participants in the '*unstable status-help*' condition felt worse ($p < .05$), tended to discriminate against the outgroup more ($p < .07$), and perceived it as more homogenous ($p < .01$) than those in the '*stable status-help*' condition. The parallel differences in the '*no-help*' condition were not significant. These findings indicate that receiving help from the high status group when status differences are perceived as unstable poses a threat to the low status group members' social identity (Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1997). Further support for this interpretation is garnered from the finding that participants in the '*unstable status-help*' cell rated the outgroup as more aggressive than did their

counterparts in the 'stable status- help' cell ($p < .01$). The comparable difference in the no-help condition was not significant, $t < 1$. Thus, when help frustrated the low status group's motivation to achieve equality, it was viewed as an aggressive gesture.

Although these findings support the prediction of the IHSR model they are limited by their reliance on the minimal group paradigm (Jetten, Spears & Manstead, 1996). To overcome this limitation we examined the same hypothesis with real groups. As before, we used status relations between Israeli Jews and Israeli-Arabs as the high and low social status groups, respectively. Our participants were Israeli-Arabs (i.e., low status group) who had all received help from an Israeli-Arab or an Israeli Jew under conditions of varying degrees of perceived status stability (Nadler & Halabi, 2006, study 2). In the unstable status condition participants read a section that informed them that the scholastic gap between Israeli Jewish students and Israeli-Arabs students is steadily declining whereas in the stable status conditions they learned that these differences had remained the same over the years. Following this the experimenter, who had presented himself as an Israeli-Arab or an Israeli Jew, gave help without having been asked for it ("assumptive help", cf. Schneider et al., 1996). Consistent with predictions Israeli-Arabs in the 'Jewish Helper-Unstable Status' cell had the lowest affect scores ($p < .05$), the highest ingroup favoritism scores on a Tajfel-type resource allocation task ($p < .01$), and the lowest ratings of Israeli Jews ($p < .01$). These findings are consistent with the hypotheses that the high threat to ingroup status induced by help from the high status outgroup when status relations are perceived as unstable produced the highest motivation for positive ingroup distinctiveness on both measures of discrimination and the devaluation of the high status outgroup.

This study thus supports the central tenets of the Intergroup Helping as Status Relations (IHSR) Model. Group members respond to a threat to the group's status by giving relatively more help to the source of this threat on both difficult *and* easy tasks. Further, dependence on the high status group poses a threat to the low status group members only when status relations are perceived as unstable. Nevertheless, these relationships depend on the characteristics of the help *and* group members. We turn now to consider the role of the *characteristics of the help and group members* in the IHSR model.

(b) Characteristics of the help: Dependency vs. Autonomy oriented help

Research on the relationships between help and effective coping has indicated that some forms of help reinforce recipients' future dependency on others whereas other forms of help encourage recipients' future independence (e.g., Nelson Le-Gal, 1985; Karabenick, 1998). Consistent with this, Nadler (1997, 1998) distinguished between *dependency-oriented* and *autonomy-oriented* help. Dependency-oriented help consists of providing recipients with solutions to problems. Recipients are viewed as unable to help themselves and as chronically dependent on outside sources to overcome their predicaments. Autonomy-oriented help regards recipients as relatively efficacious actors who need help because of a transient and surmountable lack of knowledge or resources. Recipients are viewed as able to help themselves and are therefore given tools, or partial help, which will enable them to solve future problems on their own. To use a well-known example, giving the hungry cooked fish is dependency-oriented help while teaching them how to fish and giving them fishing rods is autonomy-oriented help.

Since high status groups are motivated to retain their social advantage they will dispense dependency- oriented rather than autonomy -oriented help to the low status outgroup especially when their group's advantage is perceived as insecure. Members of low status groups they are expected to welcome dependency- oriented help when status relations are viewed as secure. Thus, a downward uni-directional flow of dependency- oriented assistance is the hallmark of a stable and legitimate social inequality. When status relations are perceived as insecure, members of low status groups are expected to decline and not seek dependency -oriented help from the high status outgroup. They will be receptive only to autonomy- oriented help which serves as a tool to expedite future independence. However the intensity of group members' motivation to protect their social advantage or challenge an unequal status quo depends on their identification with the ingroup.

(c) Group members' characteristics: Ingroup identification

Social identity research indicates that group members' reactions to threats to social identity depend on their identification with the ingroup (i.e., attachment to and commitment to the ingroup, Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1999). High identifiers respond defensively to such threats by expressing stronger identification with the ingroup and behaving in ways that increase positive ingroup distinctiveness (i.e., more ingroup favoritism and outgroup devaluation). In the face of threat to social identity, low identifiers tend to decrease their attachment to the group. Applied to the present context this suggests that because they are more affected by a threat to their social identity, high identifying members of high status groups are more likely than low identifiers to try to maintain their group's advantage by giving dependency -oriented help to the source of

threat under conditions of status insecurity (i.e., the low status group). High- identifying members of low status groups are more likely than low identifiers to avoid seeking or receiving dependency- oriented help from the high status group.

In the next experiment we sought to explore how (a) *security of status relations*, and (b) *ingroup identification* interact to determine *willingness to seek(c) autonomy- or dependency-oriented help* from the high status group (Nadler & Halabi,2006, study 4). Consistent with the logic of the model we expected that the least help would be sought by members of the low status group who are *high identifiers* when status relations are *unstable* and help is *dependency- oriented*. The experiment consisted of a 2 (high vs. low identification) X 2(stable vs. unstable status relations) between- participants design. Participants were Israeli high school students, and ingroup identification was induced by asking them to read about the favorable feelings graduates have about their school. Participants then learned that their school was randomly chosen to be yoked to another high school that was superior in prestige and scholastic achievements. In the stable status condition these differences between the two schools were said to have remained unchanged over the last five years while in the unstable status condition they learned that these differences were steadily narrowing. Following these manipulations participants could seek dependency-oriented (i.e., full solution), autonomy-oriented (a hint on how to solve the problem alone), or not seek help on 3 insoluble mathematical problems. The results fully support IHSR predictions. A 'stability X identification' interaction ($p < .01$), indicates that while no participant in the '*unstable status-high identification*' cell was willing to seek *dependency-oriented help* from the high status group, participants in the other 3 cells showed a medium and similar willingness to seek dependency -oriented help

from the high status group. There were *no differences in help seeking when help was autonomy- oriented.*

A second study also examined the interactive effects of the three building blocks of the IHSR model (i.e., status security, ingroup identification and autonomy-dependency oriented help) by assessing the willingness of members of the *high status group to give dependency- or autonomy- oriented help to members of low status group* when the stability of status relations and ingroup identification was manipulated (Ben-David, , 2007). Consistent with the logic of the intergroup helping model we reasoned that when status relations with the low status outgroup are perceived as unstable, high ingroup identifiers will give the highest amount of dependency-oriented help to the lower status outgroup. This study also sought to examine the possibility that threats to ingroup status can be reduced by emphasizing the common identity between the high status ingroup and the low status outgroup (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). Lowering the threat to ingroup status was expected to result in a lesser amount of dependency-oriented helping. The experiment consisted of a 2(Stable vs. Unstable status relations) X 3 (salient ingroup identity vs. salient common group identity vs. control) between -participants design. Participants were high school students who were told that the status difference between their school and a lower status school in the same region of the country (i.e., the Negev region in Israel) had remained stable or decreased in the last few years (i.e., stable and unstable status differences, respectively). Then participants in the salient ingroup identity condition read a positive section about their school. Participants in the salient *common identity* condition read a similar positive section about schools in the region, and those in the control condition read a neutral section. They were then given the opportunity to help

another student from the lower status school by giving him or her autonomy-oriented or dependency-oriented help (i.e., full solution vs. hint) or no help. Consistent with predictions, participants in the salient ingroup identity condition gave more dependency-oriented help in the 'unstable' than 'stable' status conditions (means were 3.5 and 1.8, respectively, $p < .01$). The parallel differences in the common identity and control conditions were not significant (means were 1.0 and 0.5; and 1.2 and 1.9, respectively). Interestingly, in the salient ingroup identity condition, the amount of autonomy-oriented help was lower in the unstable than in the stable status conditions (means were 1.8 and 3.2, respectively). The parallel differences in the common group identity and the control conditions were not significant.

These findings support IHSR predictions that high status group members reduce the threat to their group's status by giving the source of threat dependency-oriented help. Further, this study importantly extends these predictions by showing that emphasizing the common group identity between the high and low status groups lowers the threat to status which is associated with information about unstable status relations, and decreases the high status group's motivation to provide dependency-oriented help to the low status outgroup.

(5) Concluding Comments: Summary of Past Research and Future Developments:

The empirical evidence for the IHSR model show that intergroup helping relations have implications regarding status relations between the actors involved. We have already noted how this can be fertile terrain for intergroup misunderstandings in peace-building projects between Israelis and Palestinians. Another example of the same link between intergroup helping relations and group misunderstandings is the "pay me"

syndrome described by foreign aid workers (MacLachlan & Carr, 2005). This refers to cases where the receiving communities are reluctant "... to assemble donated drought-directed well equipment, to unload relief food aid, to participate in educational research and to attend AIDS education workshops unless they are paid for their participation" (MacLachlan & Carr, 2005, p. 3). Such 'pay me' demands are misunderstood by foreign aid officials as representing ingratitude and give rise to negative perceptions of the recipients. However, MacLachlan & Carr suggest that by demanding to be remunerated for their investment of time and effort the receiving party is attempting to cope with the humiliating aspects of receiving assistance. The assignment of concrete value to their time and effort increases the recipients' perceptions of equality and self-worth. Similarly, Fisher and his colleagues attributed the difficulties encountered by administrators of international medical assistance programs (i.e., aid given to AIDS stricken African countries) to their lack of appreciation for the receiving parties' need for autonomy and equal status. Based on the IHSR model they suggest ways to prevent such misunderstandings from occurring (Fisher, Nadler, Little & Saguy, in press).

A better understanding of the status concerns that are associated with intergroup helping will contribute to a lessening of intergroup misunderstandings and allow the design of more efficacious programs that will contribute to the helpers, the recipients and the relations between them. In the final section of the chapter we discuss central conceptual and empirical issues that are suggested by our approach. We begin by addressing the definition of 'help', then examine the impact of stability and legitimacy of status relations in this context, and consider the broader implications of our approach for the role of intergroup helping in social inequality.

(a) Help: Chronic or Transient Dependency?

Throughout this chapter we have argued that the concept of help needs to be viewed in a more complex way than the simple distinction between ‘help’ and ‘no help’. The intergroup helping model makes a specific attempt in this direction by emphasizing the distinction between autonomy- oriented and dependency -oriented help. However two other central dimensions in the helping interactions need to be addressed: (a) the assumptive nature of help (i.e., given without having been solicited by the recipient) and (b) the perceived ease or difficulty of the problem on which it was needed. Looked at jointly, *assumptive* help on *easily soluble* problems and *dependency oriented* help are all consistent with a view that the recipient is globally incapable and needs to be ***chronically dependent*** on a more knowledgeable or powerful benefactor. On the other hand, help that is given only when *solicited by the recipient*, only when the problem is *difficult*, and is *autonomy-oriented* are all consistent with the view that the recipient is capable and that his or her need reflects a ***transient and temporary dependency*** on an outside helper.

Linking this distinction between chronic and transient dependency with the IHSR model and the relevant empirical findings thus extends our definition of the two kinds of helping interactions beyond the distinction between autonomy and dependency oriented help. When help -giving by the high status group is motivated by the wish to defend the ingroup's advantaged position, the low status recipients will be treated as *chronically dependent*: help will be dependency-oriented and given in an assumptive manner on easily soluble problems. By contrast, when low status group members are motivated to

gain equality they will be unwilling to seek or receive help, which implies their chronic dependency on the helper. They will be more receptive to a transient and temporary dependency; in other words, help that is given after it has been solicited by the recipient, is autonomy-oriented and only on problems that are viewed as difficult.

These opposing preferences of the advantaged and disadvantaged groups are a fertile terrain for group misunderstandings. The way to prevent such negative consequences of intergroup helping is to encourage an open discussion of these different helping-related motivations and preferences before implementation of the intergroup assistance program. Oftentimes, however, such programs are designed and implemented by the advantaged group with little concern for the perspective of the disadvantaged receiving group. The lack of joint design of assistance programs, before their implementation, reduces their efficacy and may lead to increased intergroup tensions (Fisher et al., in press; Nadler & Saguy, 2004).

(b) Stability and Legitimacy: Two Sides of the Same “Security Coin”?

Perceived security of intergroup status relations is a pivotal concept in our view of intergroup helping. The two facets of secure status relations (i.e., stability and legitimacy) are highly correlated. Tajfel writes: “There is little doubt that an unstable system of social divisions between groups is more likely to be perceived as illegitimate than a stable one; and that conversely a system perceived as illegitimate will contain the seeds of instability” (Tajfel, 1981; p. 250). Much previous research has used variations of legitimacy or stability as operationalizations of secure and insecure status relations. Drawing on research showing more pronounced effects for stability than for legitimacy (e.g., Mummendey, Klink, Wenzel & Blanz, 1999) our research sought to substantiate

the hypotheses of the intergroup helping model by examining helping relations in stable and unstable status relations. However, the distinction between legitimacy and stability has important implications for intergroup helping.

Recent discussions on the effects of perceived legitimacy of social advantage on the high status group's perceptions of and behavior towards the low status group suggest that legitimacy and stability may precipitate different psychological processes which mediate between high social status and helping (Leach, Snider & Iyer, 2002). One conclusion from this body of theory and research on the psychology of advantaged groups is that *illegitimate* social advantage is associated with a feeling of collective guilt which can be alleviated by giving to members of disadvantaged groups (Iyer, Leach & Crosby, 2003). Our approach, which emphasizes intergroup helping as a status organizing mechanism, suggests that when social advantage is perceived as *unstable* group members fear that their group's status may be jeopardized, and in order to protect themselves from this threat they seek to maintain the low status group's inferiority by providing it with extensive dependency-oriented help. Thus, both approaches concur that increased instability and illegitimacy of social advantage lead to more help of the low status group but posit different motivational mediators for this link. The motivational mediator that links instability with increased helping is the desire to increase positive distinctiveness in the face of threat to social advantage (i.e., "*status anxiety*") whereas the motivational mediator that links illegitimacy with increased helping is "*collective guilt*". Recent emphases in social psychology on identifying mediating emotional processes in intergroup relations and related methodological advances should encourage future, more

in-depth assessment of the links between instability and illegitimacy and intergroup helping as mediated by status anxiety and collective guilt, respectively.

(c) Maintaining Social Advantage by Direct or Indirect Strategies: When?

Decades of research have taught us that group members respond to threats to their social identity by discriminating against and devaluing the outgroup which is the source of this threat (Turner & Reynolds, 2001). The IHSR model suggests that groups can reduce threat to social identity by helping the source of this threat. A joint consideration of these two lines of thinking and research raises the question of timing: when do advantaged groups choose to maintain advantage through direct means (e.g., discrimination, using force) and when they do so by indirect means (e.g., maintain the outgroup's chronic dependency)? The foregoing discussion on the distinction between the legitimacy and stability of social advantage provides one possible answer to this question. When there is consensus that the high status group's advantage is legitimate, group members will view defending the existing social order and their advantaged position in it as justified and will therefore respond to threats to social advantage by direct strategies (e.g., using force). When, however, the high status group's advantage is illegitimate it is likely to be associated with collective guilt which will reduce the likelihood of using direct strategies to ward off threats to its privileged position. Under these conditions the high status group is likely to preserve its superiority by indirect strategies (e.g., giving dependency-oriented help to the source of this threat).

This analysis is relevant to intergroup misunderstandings during times of social change. Often in periods of change the legitimacy of the privileged group's advantage is challenged and the low status group exerts a destabilizing pressure on the existing

hierarchy by its demands for greater equality. Thus, while a high level of status anxiety will motivate members of high status groups to reassert their threatened advantage, a high level of collective guilt will prevent them from doing so through direct means. In line with the analysis above, they will do so by giving help that seeks to maintain the low status group's dependency on them (e.g., *dependency-oriented help* given in an *assumptive way regardless of recipient's need*). This is a relatively guilt-free way of maintaining dominance. The low status group on the other hand is likely to be suspicious of the privileged group's "suffocating generosity" and view it as a manipulative ploy to retain dominance. These social dynamics are likely to engender conflicts and misunderstandings which stem from the tension between the low status group's motivation for equality and the high status group's wish to maintain its advantage by indirect means.

The criticisms of affirmative action (Pratkanis & Turner, 1996; Niemann & Dovidio, 2005) and the difficulties that take place during peace-building processes (e.g., Lederach, 1997) are two examples of these phenomena. These unwanted consequences of ingroup helping can be reduced by an increased awareness of the role of power relations in intergroup helping. Further, our research indicates that consistent with the Common Identity Ingroup Model an emphasis on the common identity between helping and receiving groups reduces the threat to the advantaged group's status and with it the tendency give dependency-oriented help. The positive effects of international assistance after extreme and sudden natural disasters can be taken as a real world illustration of this principle. For example, immediately after the 1999 earthquake Turkey received humanitarian aid from Greece which had been its longstanding adversary. This led to a

significant rapprochement between these two former enemies. In this and similar cases (e.g. the assistance given to Pakistan by India in the wake of the 2005 earthquake in Kashmir) help did not give rise to intergroup misunderstandings. On the contrary it was perceived as a sign of genuine care and led to improved relations between the former enemies (Keridis, 2006). In terms of the present analysis, extreme and sudden natural disasters serve to highlight our common identity as frail human beings at the mercy of the powers of nature. We are all faced with the same common dangers. This in turn reduces status concerns in intergroup helping and with it the group misunderstandings that may be otherwise associated with it.

(d) Intergroup Helping and Social Inequality: Paternalism and System Justification

The research in the preceding sections supports the main postulate of the IHSR model that there are 2 clusters of intergroup helping relations. One is characteristic of social systems with secure status relations and the other is associated with insecure status relations. When status relations are secure, the privileged group is expected to cater to the needs of the less privileged and assistance tends to flow uni-directionally downward. In cases where these expectations are not met the less privileged group will express its frustration by angry demands directed at the privileged group. When, however, this expectation is met on a routine basis the downward flow of assistance serves to behaviorally solidify the unequal social system. Such a pattern of helping relations is consistent with people's need to justify the unequal social system they live in by imbuing the status quo "... with legitimacy and see it as good, fair, natural and even inevitable" (Jost, Banaji & Nosek, 2004, p. 887). Our approach suggests that it allows the disadvantaged group to justify its inferiority by referring to the care and assistance that it

receives from the high status group and allows the advantaged group to view its superiority as just, moral and legitimate (i.e., being a provider and caretaker rather than an oppressor). This portrayal of helping relations in secure status systems is congruent with discussions on paternalism in intergroup relations (Van den Berghe, 1967; Jackman, 1994). In the same spirit Pratto & Walker (2001) note in their analysis of American slavery as a paternalistic social system that in such systems "... power differentials, aggression and abuse can be justified by the guise of care" (p.94).

But in spite of their outwardly harmonious appearance, such systems of paternalistic care may be particularly costly for the disadvantaged. In such systems challenging the superiority of the advantaged group may be labeled as ungrateful. It is therefore more difficult to resist the outgroup's dominance. Because of this difficulty systems of paternalistic care in which dominance is clad in the velvet glove of helping may be especially resistant to social change. As social identity theory tells us, such processes of change may be kindled by the disadvantaged group's perception of the existing inequality as insecure. Yet, at this stage of transition a direct confrontation with the advantaged group, which is also the provider of care and support, is unlikely and the disadvantaged group will probably signal its dissatisfaction by a growing reluctance to seek or receive help from the advantaged group. Alternatively, it may try to change its dependence on the high status group from one that reflects a chronic dependency to one that reflects a transient and temporary dependency. It may do so by negotiating a shift from the past arrangements of dependency-oriented help to arrangements of autonomy-oriented assistance. This is 'safer' way for the low status group to voice its wish for equality than an open challenge to the superiority of the high status group. From this

perspective the unwillingness of the disadvantaged group to rely on the outgroup's dependency-oriented help may be an early sign of its desire to change the social structure from one that relies on paternalistic care to one that is based on equality, mutual independence and reciprocal helping arrangements. As we have noted throughout this chapter, these dynamics are likely to be associated with group misunderstandings that may lead to increased intergroup tensions. An awareness of these psychological dynamics in intergroup helping should serve to decrease the occurrence of such misunderstandings.

References

- Batson, C.D. (1994). Prosocial motivation: Why do we help others? In A. Tesser (Ed.), *Advanced social psychology* (pp.333-381). Boston: McGraw-Hill
- Ben David, Y. (2007). Giving help to the low status group as affected by stability of status relations and common ingroup identity. MA dissertation, Tel Aviv University.
- Bouillon, M. (2004). The peace business: Money and power in the Palestine-Israel conflict. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Brown, J.D. & Smart, S.A. (1991). The self and social conduct: Linking self-representations to prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 368-375.
- Cialdini, R. B., Darby, B. L., & Vincent, J. E. (1973). Transgression and altruism: A case for hedonism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 9, 502-516.
- de Tocqueville, A. (1956). Democracy in America. In R. D. Heffner (Ed.), *Democracy in America: Mentor book edition*. New York: New American Library.
- Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Schroeder, D. A. & Penner, L. A. (2006). *The social psychology of prosocial behavior*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ellemers N., Spears, R., Doosje, B. (1997). Sticking together or falling apart: In-group identification as a psychological determinant of group commitment versus individual mobility. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 72(3), 617-626.
- Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (Eds.) (1999). *Social identity: Context, commitment, content*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Fisher, J.D., Nadler, A., Little, J.S. & Saguy, T. (in press). Help as a vehicle to reconciliation, with particular reference to help for extreme health needs. In A. Nadler, T. E. Malloy, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *Social Psychology of Inter-Group Reconciliation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Gaertner, S.L. & Dovidio, J.F. (2000). Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Halabi, S., Nadler, A. & Dovidio, J. (2006). Reactions to receiving assumptive help: The moderating effects of group membership and perceived need for help. *Submitted*.
- Harpaz-Gorodeisky, G. (2005). Help giving as a way to increase positive ingroup distinctiveness in the face of threat to social identity. Doctoral Dissertation Tel Aviv University, Ramat-Aviv, Israel
- Iyer, A., Leach, C.W., & Crosby, F.J. (2003). White guilt and racial compensation: The benefits and limits of self focus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 117-130.
- Jackman, M.R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class and race relations*. Berkeley, CA.: University of California Press.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R. and Manstead, A.S.R., (1996). Intergroup norms and intergroup discrimination: Distinctive self-categorization and social identity effects. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 71(6), 1222-1233.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1996). Intergroup norms and intergroup discrimination: Distinctive self-categorization and social identity effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(6), 1222-1233.
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R. & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, 25(6), 881-919
- Karabenick, S. (Ed.) (1998). *Strategic help seeking: Implications for knowledge acquisition*, Erlbaum Publishing Co.
- Keridis, D. (2006). Earthquakes, diplomacy and ne thinking in foreign policy. *Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, 30, 207-214.
- Leach, C.W., Snider, S.L. & Iyer, A. (2002). "Poisoning the conscience of the fortunate": The experience of relative advantage and support for social equality. In I. Walker & H.J. Smith (Eds.), *Relative deprivation: Specification, development and integration* (1-14). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lederach, J.P. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace.

- MacLachlan, M. & Carr, S.C. (2005). The human dynamics of aid. *Policy Insights*, *10*, 1-10.
- Mauss, M. (1954). *The gift: Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press. (Original work published 1923).
- Mummendey, A., Klink, A., Mielke, R., Wenzel, M., & Blanz, M. (1999). Socio-structural characteristics of intergroup relations and identity management strategies: Results from a field study in East Germany. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *17*, 57-67.
- Nadler, A. & Saguy, T. (2004). Trust building and reconciliation between adversarial groups: A social psychological perspective. In Harvey Langholtz and Chris E. Stout (Eds.): *The Psychology of Diplomacy*. NYC: Praeger.
- Nadler, A. (1991). Help-Seeking Behavior, Psychological Costs and Instrumental Benefits. In C. M.S. (Ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology* (12). New York: Sage.
- Nadler, A. (1997). Autonomous and dependent help seeking: Personality characteristics and the seeking of help. In B. Sarason, I. Sarason, & R. G. Pierce (Eds.), *Handbook of personality and social support* (pp. 258-302). New York: Plenum.
- Nadler, A. (1998). Relationship, esteem and achievement perspectives on autonomous and dependent help seeking. In S. A. Karabenick (Ed.), *Strategic help seeking: Implications for learning and teaching* (pp. 61-95). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Nadler, A. (2002). Inter-group helping relations as power relations: Helping relations as affirming or challenging inter-group hierarchy. *Journal of Social Issues*, *58*, 487-503.
- Nadler, A., & Fisher, J. D. (1986). The Role of Threat To Self-Esteem and Perceived Control in Recipient Reaction to Help: Theory Development and Empirical Validation. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 81-121).
- Nadler, A. & Halabi, S. (2006). Intergroup Helping as Status Relations: Effects of Status Stability, Identification, and Type of Help on Receptivity to High Status Group's Help. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 97-110.
- Nadler, A. & Saguy, T. (2004). Trust building and reconciliation between adversarial groups: A social psychological perspective. In Harvey Langholtz and Chris E. Stout (Eds.): *The Psychology of Diplomacy*. NYC: Praeger.
- Nelson-Le Gall, S. (1985). Help-seeking behavior in learning. In E.W. Gordon (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education*, (12) (pp. 55-90) Washington D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

- Niemann, Y. F., & Dovidio, J.F. (2005). Affirmative action and job satisfaction: Understanding underlying processes. *Journal of Social Issues, 61*(3), 507-523.
- Nowak, M.A. & Sigmund, K. (1998). Evolution of indirect reciprocity by image scoring, *Nature, 393*, 573-577.
- Peleg, A. (2006). Help seeking across national groups. MA thesis, Tel Aviv University.
- Penner, L.A., Dovidio, J.F., Piliavin, J.A., & Schroeder, D.A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 365-392.
- Pratkanis, A. R., & Turner, M. E. (1996). The proactive removal of discriminatory barriers: Affirmative action as effective help. *Journal of Social Issues, 52*(4), 111-132
- Pratto, F., & Walker, A. (2000). Dominance in disguise: Power, beneficence, and exploitation in personal relationships. In A. Lee-Chai & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The use and abuse of power: Multiple perspectives on the causes of corruption*. (pp. 93-114). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Sachdev, I., & Bourhis, R. (1987). Status differentials and intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 17*, 277-293.
- Sachdev, I., & Bourhis, R. (1991). Power and status differentials in minority and majority group relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 21*, 1-24.
- Schneider, M. E., Major, B., Luhtanen, R. & Crocker, J. (1996). Social stigma and the potential costs of assumptive help. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 201-209.
- Snyder, M. & Omoto, A. M. (2001). Basic research and practical problems: Volunteerism and the psychology of individual and collective action. In W. Wosinska, R. Cialdini, D. Barrett, & Reykowski, J. (Eds.), *The practice of social influence in multiple cultures* (pp.287-307). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sturmer, S., Snyder, M. & Omoto, A. M. (2005). Prosocial emotions and helping: the moderating role of group membership. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 532-546.
- Tajfel, H. (Ed.) (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Turner J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Turner, J. C., & Reynolds, K. J. (2001). The social identity perspective in inter-group relations: Theories, themes and controversies. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Intergroup processes* (pp. 133-153). Oxford, UK: Blackwell
- Van den Berghe, P. (1967). *Race and racism: A comparative perspective*. New York: Wiley.
- Van Vugt, M., Roberts, G., & Hardy, C. (in press). Competitive altruism: Development of reputation-based cooperation in groups. In R. Dubbar & L. Bartett, *Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology*, Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Yuchtman-Yaar, E., & Peres, Y. (2000). *Between consent and dissent: democracy and peace in the Israeli mind*. Lanham, Md. : Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.