Identity and Emergency Intervention: How Social Group Membership and Inclusiveness of Group Boundaries Shape Helping Behavior

Mark Levine
Amy Prosser
David Evans
Lancaster University

Stephen Reicher
St. Andrews University

Two experiments exploring the effects of social category membership on real-life helping behavior are reported. In Study 1, intergroup rivalries between soccer fans are used to examine the role of identity in emergency helping. An injured stranger wearing an in-group team shirt is more likely to be helped than when wearing a rival team shirt or an unbranded sports shirt. In Study 2, a more inclusive social categorization is made salient for potential helpers. Helping is extended to those who were previously identified as out-group members but not to those who do not display signs of group membership. Taken together, the studies show the importance of both shared identity between bystander and victim and the inclusiveness of salient identity for increasing the likelihood of emergency intervention.

Keywords: social identity; group membership; emergency intervention; helping

Over the past 40 years, social psychologists have identified a number of factors that shape the likelihood of help being offered in an emergency situation. These include the number of people present (Darley & Latané, 1968; Latané & Darley, 1970), the location of the incident (R. Levine, Martinez, Brase, & Sorenson, 1994; Milgram, 1970), and the costs of helping (J. Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Clark, 1981). For the most part, psychological explanations for emergency intervention have tended to be subsumed within general theories of helping behavior (but see Latané, 1981, for an alternative account). For example, the arousal cost-reward model (Dovidio, Piliavin, Gaertner, Schroeder, & Clark, 1991; J. Piliavin et al., 1981; I. Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin,

1969) begins with the aversive arousal caused by the distress of others in need. In this model, it is the balance of cost-reward calculations made by an individual (as a means to reduce aversive arousal) that explains helping behavior. Batson's empathy-altruism model (Batson, 1987, 1991; Batson et al., 1989; Batson & Shaw, 1991) also focuses on the place of emotion in helping. The empathy-altruism model argues that helping is related to the empathetic concern an individual feels (defined as an emotional reaction characterized by feelings like compassion, tenderness, softheartedness, and sympathy) for others. Batson's primary aim is to argue that empathy-based helping provides evidence for genuine altruism or selflessness in the motivation to help others.

Recent work concerning both of these models has begun to move from a focus on individual and interpersonal factors to exploring the importance of group and intergroup processes in helping. What is at issue in these debates is the conceptual possibility of shared identities (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Tajfel & Turner, 1985; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Arguments center on the degree to which the bystander and the victim can be said to share a common identity and the role this common identity

443

plays in explaining helping behavior. For example, the most recent formulation of the arousal cost-reward model (Dovidio et al., 1991; J. Piliavin et al., 1981) includes the concept of *we-ness,* described as "a sense of connectedness or a categorization of another person as a member of one's own group" (Dovidio et al., 1991, p. 102). The model suggests that the categorization of others as members of the in-group leads to multiple and simultaneous effects. Such categorization leads to perceptions of similarity, feelings of greater closeness, and increased feelings of responsibility for the welfare of others. This, in turn, increases both arousal and the costs of not helping a victim while decreasing (through feelings of greater familiarity) the cost of helping. The combination of such effects is predicted to increase the likelihood of intervention. In their review of the arousal cost-reward model literature, Dovidio et al. (1991) suggested there is substantial data consistent with this aspect of the model.

Similar questions about the importance of group processes emerge in recent debates over the claims made by Batson's empathy altruism model (Batson, 1987, 1991; Batson et al., 1989; Batson & Shaw, 1991). For example, Cialdini, Brown, Lewis, Luce, and Neuberg (1997) proposed a reinterpretation of the empathy-altruism model based on the insight that the self-concept can be located outside the individual and inside closely related others. They introduce the concept of *oneness* to describe this self-other overlap and present data that suggest that feelings of empathetic concern, rather than determining helping directly, are predicated on feelings of oneness. Although Cialdini et al. distinguished the concept of oneness from the concept of we-ness on the grounds that the latter refers to a sense of merger with a collectivity whereas the former refers to relationships with a specific other, they remark on the "striking similarity between the concepts we have found useful to account for our findings and those used to account for the powerful in-group favoritism effect in which individuals allocate greater resources to their own groups" (p. 492; see also Brewer, 1979; Tajfel & Turner, 1985).

*Emergency Intervention
and the Social Identity Tradition*

Given the increasing importance of group and intergroup phenomena for emotion-based theories of helping, the aim of this article is to explore the contribution that a group-level perspective can bring to the literature on emergency intervention. As we have seen, both Dovidio et al. (1991) and Cialdini et al. (1997) wrote about the relevance of the social identity tradition (Tajfel, 1978, 1982) for research on helping. The aim of this article will therefore be to use recent work in the social identity tradition to explore the consequences of shared social category membership for the way bystanders make decisions about emergency intervention. There is already some evidence that suggests that the perception of common group membership with a victim will increase the likelihood of helping in nonemergency settings. For example, Hornstein (1972, 1976) has shown that people are more likely to help others believed to be members of the same community or to share similar attitudes.

In early studies using the lost-letter paradigm, Hornstein and colleagues (Hodgson, Hornstein, & LaKind, 1972; Hornstein, Masor, Sole, & Heilman, 1971) found that pedestrians from a predominantly Jewish section of Brooklyn, New York, were more likely to post an apparently lost questionnaire if the questionnaire appeared to have been completed by someone with similar (pro-Israeli) than dissimilar (pro-Arab) sentiments to their own. Later work established that the degree of agreement or disagreement with others' opinions (Sole, Marton, & Hornstein, 1975) and the degree of perceived threat from the out-group (Flippen, Hornstein, Siegal, & Weitzman, 1996) was also important in this kind of helping.

There is also some evidence from the literature on race and helping that people are more likely to offer help to in-group members than they are to out-group members (Wegner & Crano, 1975). However, this picture is not straightforward. For example, Dovidio and Gaertner (1981) have found that, under certain conditions, Whites are more likely to help African Americans than other Whites. Gaertner and Dovidio (1986) used the concept of aversive racism to help explain this complex picture. They argued that to understand the helping behavior of White bystanders, we need to understand not only the norms and values of the specific intergroup context but also whether failure to help can be constructed as being indifferent to race.

Finally, there is evidence from the literature on the contact hypothesis that in-group members may be favored over out-group members. In a study manipulating intergroup contact to examine the role of common in-group identity on prejudice reduction and prosocial behavior, Dovidio et al. (1997) found evidence of in-group bias in helping. Students were more likely to volunteer to help a student distribute questionnaires for a research project when the student was believed to be an in-group member and when contact occurred under common-identity conditions.

However, what is important about more recent theoretical work in the social identity tradition is not simply that it allows for collective identification with others but also that it proposes the dynamic responsiveness of the self-concept to social interactive contexts. This is particularly useful for studies of emergency intervention, as

such situations tend to be interactions between people who have had little or no prior contact, tend to occur in public spaces, and require immediate evaluations (and reevaluations) of relationships with those present in the emergency situation.

Self-categorization theory (SCT: Turner et al., 1987, Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994), a recent development of the social identity tradition, proposes that changes in self-concept are related to changes in immediate social context. In this SCT approach, the self, rather than being a single entity, is a complex system with a number of different levels. Using the notion of the metacontrast ratio (Turner et al., 1987), SCT suggests that social identity changes as other groups or individuals enter (or leave) the relevant social context. What becomes important for explaining both perception and action is the particular self-definition that is salient at any given time. In addition, there is evidence from an SCT perspective that the level of inclusiveness of shared identity affects the degree to which we think what happens to others may be personally relevant. For example, Stapel, Reicher, and Spears (1994) showed that categorical relations affect the degree to which we see things as personally threatening. When the victim of an accident is described as an in-group rather than an out-group member, individuals are more likely to consider that the same fate might befall them. In the same way, perceiving self and victim as members of a shared category may increase levels of intragroup cooperation and thus increase the likelihood of emergency intervention. There is already some evidence for this position. Using an SCT-influenced approach to bystander behavior, M. Levine, Cassidy, Brazier, and Reicher (2002) found evidence that when victims of violence were presented as in-group rather than out-group members, then participants were more likely to express an intention to intervene.

However, before we can make strong claims for the proposition that common social category membership between bystander and victim will lead to an increased likelihood of intervention in emergency situations, it is important to recall some of the strengths of the traditional work in this area. For example, the strength and the success of Latané and Darley's (1970; Darley & Latané, 1968) work on bystander behavior was founded on a collection of ingeniously choreographed experimental studies. By having participants respond to smoke coming into a room (Latané & Darley, 1970) and to an epileptic seizure (Darley & Latané, 1968) they created what Latané and Nida (1981) described as an experimental realism for the paradigm. Participants were engaged in meaningful, involving, and realistic situations. Moreover, they were unaware that the emergency unfolding before them was part of a psychology experiment. By using nonreactive measures, Latané and Darley were able to ensure that participants' behavior was not shaped by a reflexive consideration of what the experimenters might be expecting to see. This combination of experimental realism and behavioral data allowed Latané and Darley to develop a powerful case for the bystander effect. A strong case for the importance of shared social category membership for intervention in emergency settings must also be able to demonstrate the effects of shared identity on actual helping behavior.

The experiments described in this article attempt to emulate the spirit of those early studies and in doing so demonstrate the potential importance of social category relationships for emergency intervention. To do so, the experiments take advantage of real-life social group memberships and associated intergroup relations. In particular, the experiments take advantage of the powerful sense of group membership felt by those people who support English football (soccer) teams. This strong sense of sharing group membership with thousands of other strangers is also bound up with intergroup rivalries with fans of other teams. Moreover, the current fashion in Britain of wearing team football shirts as casual wear means that group affiliations and intergroup relations are readily apparent even among strangers. By taking advantage of these everyday demonstrations of group memberships, studies of emergency helping under conditions of experimental realism can be carried out. To that end, the experiments focus on fans of Manchester United—the wealthiest, most popular, and currently most successful team in England. They utilize the rivalry between Manchester United and Liverpool Football Club (FC)—a near neighbor, the archrival, and the most successful team of the previous decade.

Background to the Experiments

Before the first experiment can be described in detail, it is important to know more about the place of football (soccer) in an English social context and the importance of these particular social categories (and the nature of their intergroup relationship). In terms of popularity and appeal, Manchester United could be considered to be the New York Yankees of English football.[1] In addition to their widespread popularity, they have, in the past 10 years, been the dominant team in English football. At the same time, and perhaps as a result of this success, fans of all other football clubs treat Manchester United fans as potentially inauthentic (not *real* fans) who are just attracted by glamour and success. This means that Manchester United fans are in the unusual position of supporting a high-status team (in terms of on-field success) but belonging to one of the more negatively valenced football supporter identities in England. The particular rivalry with Liverpool FC is longstanding and not just confined to competition on the football field. Liverpool

and Manchester are competing regional cities in the Northwest of England. Although the cities are only 30 miles apart, people born in the respective cities have different accents and self-images and draw on different historical and industrial traditions. Moreover, whereas Manchester United currently dominates English football, Liverpool FC was the dominant team of the 1980s. The history of animosity between some of the fans of the teams is played out in communal chants that are directed at opposition fans inside football grounds as well as occasional violent skirmishes outside football grounds. Attachment to group identities and the intergroup rivalry between Manchester United and Liverpool fans is therefore deeply held and extremely meaningful (see King, 2000, for a review). At the same time, over the past 10 years, football has come to play an increasingly visible part in English cultural life in general. It has become common for fans of all teams to wear the shirt of their chosen club as casual wear (as opposed to just wearing the shirt to the stadium to watch the team). This means that it is not unusual to see people wearing football shirts on the streets. It also allows the possibility of reading a shared social category membership with a stranger (when they wear the shirt of the team you also support). It is this combination of strongly held identities, intergroup rivalry, and facility to read common category membership with a stranger that will form the basis of the first experiment.

Structure of the Experiment

The structure of the experiment borrows several features of Darley and Batson's (1973) Good Samaritan experiment. In particular, participants are exposed to an incident while on their way to a second location after having begun an experiment in the Psychology Department. The experiment itself is centered around a choreographed accident in which a confederate falls over and shouts out in pain. Participants in the experiment are self-identified Manchester United fans who witness the accident while walking between buildings on the Lancaster University campus. The participants have already taken part in the first stage of a study in which their identity as Manchester United fans has been made salient. They are walking between buildings at the request of the experimenters who have asked them to go to a separate location to watch a video. The social category membership of the victim is manipulated by the clothing the confederate is wearing. He either wears a shirt that designates him as an in-group member (Manchester United shirt), an out-group member (Liverpool FC shirt), or that offers no social category information (plain, unbranded sports shirt). As the participants travel between buildings, they see a confederate come jogging into view. The confederate runs down a bank

that leads to a car park across which the participants are walking. The confederate trips and falls in line of sight (although not directly in the path) of the participants and about 15 feet away. The measures of intervention are taken from Darley and Batson (1973) and range on a 5-point scale from not noticing the victim to physically assisting the victim out of the experimental context. The behavior of the participants is assessed by three independent observers, and it is predicted that intervention levels will be highest when the victim is clearly identified as an in-group member and least likely when the victim is clearly identified as an out-group member.

STUDY 1

Method

PARTICIPANTS

Forty-five male students were from Lancaster University and aged between 18 and 21 years. All participants were self-identified Manchester United FC supporters. Participants received no payment for taking part.

PROCEDURE

Recruitment. The recruitment procedure for participants in the study was designed to ensure that, although only Manchester United fans would take part in the study, the participants themselves were not aware of this fact. This was important for two reasons: (a) If participants felt that Manchester United fans were being targeted in some way, it might make them more suspicious of the experimental manipulation that involved the Manchester United football shirt, and (b) given the particular (negative) reputation of Manchester United fans among football fans in general, it might make participants feel that the experiment was an examination of their character. Thus, posters were displayed around the university campus asking for people who were supporters of all English Premier League football teams to take part in a study of football clubs and their fans. Participants who signed up to take part in the study were asked to give a contact number/address and to identify which Premier League team they supported. Only those participants who identified themselves as Manchester United supporters were contacted to take part in the experiment (supporters of other teams were told that we had sufficient participants for the study).

Raising the salience of identity. Having identified a pool of Manchester United supporters, participants were then invited to come to the Psychology Department. Participants were invited separately, and 30 minutes was allowed between each appointment. When participants arrived at the Psychology Department (on the second floor of the building), they were met by an experimenter

who accompanied them to a research cubicle. Once seated in the cubicle, participants were reminded that they were being asked to take part in research on football teams and their fans and invited to fill in two questionnaires. The first questionnaire asked them to identify the team they supported and answer (in an open-ended format) questions about why they supported this team, how long they have supported them, how often they watch their team play, and how they feel about the success and failure of their team. The second questionnaire asked the participants to answer (on a 5-point scale) 10 questions that explored the participant's identification with other supporters of their team. This questionnaire was adapted from Brown, Condor, Mathews, Wade, and Williams's (1986) Identification Scale and included items on cognitive (I am a person who identifies with . . . fans), emotional (I am a person who is glad to be a . . . fan), and evaluative (I am a person who makes excuses for being a . . . fan) aspects of identification. To ensure that participants remained unaware that Manchester United supporters were the focus of the experiment (as they might have done if they had been presented with scales that had been preprinted with the words, "Manchester United") each person was asked to write Manchester United in the relevant position in each item before choosing an appropriate number from the scale.

Creating the emergency incident. After the participants had completed the two questionnaires, they were told that, as part of the study, they would be asked to watch a short video about football teams, their supporters, and crowd behavior at football matches. They were also told that the cubicle was too small to show the video and that a projection room with a large screen display had been booked to show the video (the location of the projection room was familiar to the participants in the study). As this projection room was in another building adjacent to the Psychology Department, the experimenter informed participants that they would accompany them to the new room. The experimenter and participant walked down the two flights of stairs and out onto the car park that separated the two buildings. Having walked a short distance across the car park, the experimenter informed participants that the experimenter needed to go back to meet the next person in the study but that they should continue across the car park and around the back of the building where they would be met by a second experimenter who would show them the video. The participants were then left to walk on alone. The path around the back of the building was a quiet and secluded part of the campus that narrowed as it neared the corner of the building. At the corner of the building, the path had a clear line of sight to a grassy area a short distance away. Hidden observers ensured that all other people were kept out of the area and the sight of the participants. As the participants approached the corner of the building, a confederate appeared, jogged across the grass, and prepared to run down a grass bank a short distance in front of the participants. The confederate had mud splattered up his legs and was wearing shorts, socks, and running shoes. In addition (depending on experimental condition), he was also wearing either a Manchester United team shirt, a Liverpool FC team shirt, or an ordinary, unbranded sports shirt. As the confederate ran down the grass bank, he slipped and fell over, holding onto his ankle and shouting out in pain. Having crumpled to the ground he groaned and winced, indicating that he might need help. The confederate did not make eye contact with or ask the participants for help. As the key dependant measure was whether the participants, having noticed the accident, offered help, the confederate was instructed to be nondirective in response to any first contact from the participants. If the participants asked the confederate if he needed help, the confederate replied, "I think I might have done something to my ankle." Any further solicitation from the participants was met with tentative reassurance that the ankle was going to be alright.

As the incident unfolded, the participants were observed and rated by three independent observers, all hidden at different vantage points around the accident site. The observers were aware in advance of the shirt condition to which the participant was to be exposed. When the participants departed the scene of the accident (having intervened or not), they continued on to the projection room where they were met by another member of the research team. The researcher asked the participants if they noticed anything on the journey to the projection room and, if so, what it was and how serious it appeared to be. The participants were then fully debriefed.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

The degree of intervention offered by the participants toward the accident victim was assessed by three independent observers hidden from the view of the participants and who were required to score the behavior of the participants on a 5-point scale. The scale was adapted from the one developed by Darley and Batson (1973) for their Good Samaritan experiment:

1. The participant failed to notice that the victim was in need of help at all
2. Perceived the victim to be in need of help (i.e., glanced in the victim's direction) but did not offer any form of help at all
3. Stopped and asked the victim if they were in need of help

4. Stopped and asked the victim if they were in need of help and then directly helped the victim themselves
5. After stopping to provide assistance, participant did not leave victim and escorted them out of the experimental context

The only item to be excluded from Darley and Batson's (1973) original scale was the item referring to failing to intervene directly but helping indirectly by asking someone else to help. This item was excluded, as the experiment was designed to ensure that the participants encountered the victim in the absence of any other potential bystanders.

Results

Before the levels of intervention across the three shirt conditions were analyzed, a check was carried out on the strength of identification in each condition. The respondents' scores on the Brown et al. (1986) Strength of Identification Scale were first subjected to a reliability analysis ($\alpha = .71$). The scale was therefore computed into a single scale score and subjected to a one-way ANOVA by shirt condition. This revealed no significant difference in strength of identification with the Manchester United identity (Manchester United shirt: $M = 4.45$, $SD = 0.23$; plain shirt: $M = 4.49$, $SD = 0.46$; Liverpool shirt: $M = 4.51$, $SD = 0.26$), $F(2, 42) = 0.15$, $p = .86$. Moreover, 94% of respondents scored between 4 and 5 on the 5-point scale thus indicating a high level of identification across all conditions.

Although the original Darley and Batson (1973) scale was treated as interval data, for the purposes of this analysis, the scores on the scale were transformed into frequency data. Three classes of behavior were important: whether participants had noticed the event, whether they had noticed the event but failed to offer any help, and whether they had noticed the event and then offered help. Participants who were judged not to have noticed the event (a score of 1 on the original scale) were excluded from subsequent analysis. Remaining participants were coded into one of two categories: those who noticed the event but did not offer any help (a score of 2 on the original scale) and those who stopped and asked the victim if they required help or stayed to help the victim themselves (scores of 3, 4, and 5 on the original scale). Category assignments were determined by an analysis of the ratings of the three independent observers. Of the 45 trials, there were 5 occasions (11.1%) where there was disagreement between observers across category boundaries. On each occasion, participants were coded into the category assigned by two of the three observers.

This data transformation resulted in 10 participants being excluded from the analysis altogether (2 in the

TABLE 1:   Frequencies for Helping by Shirt Condition

	Manchester United	Plain	Liverpool
No help	1	8	7
Help	12	4	3

Manchester United shirt condition, 3 in the plain shirt condition, and 5 in the Liverpool shirt condition). Data from the remaining participants were subjected to analysis by chi-square (see Table 1 for frequencies). The overall chi-square for type of shirt versus helping behavior was as follows, χ^2 (2, $N = 35$) = 12.07, $p = .0024$, suggesting a significant difference in the pattern of frequencies. Examination of Table 1 suggests that this is because of the difference in the pattern of helping in the Manchester United shirt condition as opposed to the plain shirt and Liverpool shirt conditions. This is confirmed by separate chi-square analyses for pairs of conditions, as the Manchester United versus plain shirt condition, χ^2 (1, $n = 25$) = 9.42, $p = .002$, and the Manchester United versus Liverpool shirt condition, χ^2 (1, $n = 23$) = 9.67, $p = .0019$, are significantly different, whereas the plain shirt versus Liverpool shirt patterns are not, χ^2 (1, $n = 22$) = 0.28, $p = .87$.

It is interesting to note that only 3 respondents spontaneously mentioned the event to the researcher when they reached the projection room. However, after being prompted ("Did you notice anything unusual on the way here?"), 31 (88.6%) of the respondents reported the accident, whereas 4 (11.4%) denied seeing anything. When asked to say whether they thought the event was serious, 11 (31.4%) said they thought it was, whereas 24 (68.4%) said it was not. Estimations of seriousness of the incident were not related to the shirt condition, χ^2 (2, $N = 35$) = 3.45, $p = .177$. Moreover, strength of identification (by median split) was also not related to the likelihood of helping, χ^2 (2, $N = 35$) = 0.46, $p = .83$. When asked if they had had any suspicion about the veracity of the accident, all respondents said that they thought the accident was genuine and unrelated to any experimental task they were to engage in. Taken together, the results indicate that levels of intervention are highest when the victim wears a Manchester United shirt. However, there is no evidence that victims who are clearly identified as an outgroup member are less likely to receive help than those for whom no social category information is available.

Discussion

The results of this experiment suggest that shared category membership is important for helping others. It is when participants are able to see the signs of common group membership in a stranger in distress that inter-

vention is most likely. When the victim is wearing the Manchester United shirt, participants' behavior shifts from noticing that the victim is in need of help but not helping to actually stopping and asking if the victim needs help. There is, however, no evidence of out-group derogation. Participants are not less likely to help the victim when he is wearing the Liverpool shirt than when he is displaying no signs of group affiliation. Out-group derogation is of course something that might have been predicted given the strength of feeling between these rival soccer teams. This suggests that, in this study at least, social category information serves to advantage those who are perceived as in-group members in helping situations rather than to disadvantage or derogate clearly defined out-group members.

The failure to find lower levels of helping in the Liverpool shirt condition than the unbranded shirt condition might be explained in a number of ways. It might be that the animosity expressed between the fans of the two teams can be found more in word than in deed. There may only be a small minority of Manchester United fans who would take *particular* pleasure in abandoning a Liverpool fan to a painful injury, whereas most would be able to see beyond the intergroup rivalry to treat them as they would any other out-group member in distress. It may also be an effect of the local context of the experiment itself. Perhaps out-group derogation would be more likely to occur near the Manchester United stadium on a match day rather than the less charged environment of a university car park. Finally, it may be that there is some baseline level of intervention in emergency situations that, in a study with relatively small numbers of participants, obscures potential differences in failure to intervene.

In addition to explanations of the failure of out-group derogation to materialize, it is important also to consider alternative explanations for the propensity of Manchester United fans to help fellow group members in distress. One possible explanation, which might undermine the claims for the importance of social categorization processes for helping, may be the nature of football fandom in England. It may be that supporters of English soccer teams have a particular collective identity based around a kind of tribalism and that this kind of group identity produces group-specific norms that lead to greater levels of helping fellow in-group members. To be able to demonstrate that it is not the kind of group that is important but, rather, the generic process of social categorization itself, it is necessary to demonstrate that changes in categorization can lead to changes in helping. Dovidio et al. (1997) have already demonstrated the importance of common identity conditions for the extension of helping behavior in the contact hypothesis. A strong case for the importance of categorization processes for emergency helping behavior (the helping of strangers in public) would therefore require evidence that shifts in the level of salience of categorization (as described by Turner et al., 1987) can also result in shifts in the limits of helping.

To that end, a second study was carried out. In this study, the same procedure was used to recruit Manchester United fans to take part in the study. On this occasion, however, when they came to the Psychology Department to take part in the experiment, a superordinate category membership (that of football fan) was made salient. Participants were then exposed to exactly the same procedure as in Study 1. However, on this occasion, and from the perspective of a superordinate or more inclusive social category designation, different predictions can be made. From the perspective of a football fan identity, both Manchester United and Liverpool fans share a common category membership. Thus, the respondents in this study, defined in terms superordinate football fan identity, should be equally likely to offer help to the victim in a Manchester United or Liverpool shirt. The level of help offered to the plain-shirt-wearing victim should remain unchanged.

STUDY 2

Method

PARTICIPANTS

Thirty-two male students were from Lancaster University and aged between 18 and 21 years. Once again, all participants were self-identified Manchester United FC fans. They received no payment for taking part in the experiment.

PROCEDURE

The recruitment and subsequent operationalization of the study were identical to the first study except for the level at which identity was made salient. Participants were recruited in exactly the same way as Study 1 and were all Manchester United fans who did not know they had been chosen because of their team affiliations. However, on this occasion, when the participants came to the Psychology Department to begin the study, they were told that this was a study about football fans in general. To reproduce the combination of the potential for negative identity valence and strong identity attachment that existed in the first experiment, participants were told that football-related research usually focuses on the negative aspects of being a football fan (hooliganism, violence, etc). They were then told that in this research, in contrast, the aim was to explore the positive aspects of being a football fan. Rather than concentrate on the small minority of troublemakers who give football a bad

name, the research aimed to find out what fans in general get out of their love for "the beautiful game" (Pelé & Fish, 1977).

As in Study 1, participants were then asked to fill in two questionnaires. The first asked them to answer, in an open-ended format, questions about when they first became interested in football, what they particularly liked about being a football fan, what being a football fan meant to them, and what they shared with other football fans. The second questionnaire required them to complete the Brown et al. (1986) Identification Scale, which was adapted to measure the strength of identification with football fans in general.

Having completed the questionnaires, participants were then asked to go to the other building to watch the video. Respondents were randomly allocated to a shirt condition and were then exposed to the same accident as in Study 1. Their responses were assessed by three independent observers using the same scale as in the first study. In this study, however, after the respondents had been made aware that the accident was part of the study but before receiving a full debriefing, respondents were also asked to complete the Brown et al. (1986) Strength of Identification Scale for a second time—this time measuring identification with a Manchester United identity.

Results

The Brown et al. (1986) Strength of Identification Scale was subjected to reliability analysis (α = .72), computed into a single scale score, and then subjected to a one-way ANOVA by shirt condition. Analysis revealed no differences in strength of identification across conditions (Manchester United shirt: M = 3.77, SD = 0.52; plain shirt: M = 3.89, SD = 0.52; Liverpool shirt: M = 3.59, SD = 0.4), F (2, 29) = 0.51, p = .83.

Ratings of participants' behavior was once again recoded into those who had not noticed the event, those who had noticed but not helped, and those who had noticed and stopped to help. Examination of the three independent observers' judgments revealed that there was disagreement across category boundaries on 4 of the 32 trials (12.5%). Disagreements were once again resolved in the direction of the majority. This resulted in 3 participants being excluded from the analysis (none in the Manchester United condition, 1 in the plain shirt condition, and 2 in the Liverpool shirt condition). Data from the remaining respondents were subjected to chi-square analysis (see Table 2 for frequencies). Overall analysis for types of shirt by helping behavior, χ^2 (2, N = 29) = 7.33, p = .025, suggests a significant difference in the pattern of frequencies. Examination of the data in Table 2 suggests that this is a result of the pattern of helping in the plain shirt condition as opposed to the Man-

TABLE 2:   Frequencies for Helping by Shirt Condition

	Manchester United	Plain	Liverpool
No help	2	7	3
Help	8	2	7

chester United and Liverpool shirt conditions. This is confirmed by chi-square analysis of the pairs of conditions in that the Manchester United and plain shirt patterns, χ^2 (1, n = 19) = 6.34, p = .012, and the Liverpool and plain shirt patterns, χ^2 (1, n = 19) = 4.34, p = .037, are significantly different, whereas the Manchester United versus Liverpool shirt pattern is not, χ^2 (1, n = 20) = 0.27, p = .61.

Immediately postaccident, only 1 person spontaneously mentioned the incident, but 26 (89.7%) mentioned it when prompted. Three (10.3%) respondents denied having seen the incident. When asked to estimate the seriousness of the incident, 14 (48.3%) said it was serious, whereas 15 (51.7%) said it was not. Once again, estimations of seriousness were not related to shirt condition, χ^2(2, N = 29) = 1.37, p = .505. Moreover, strength of identification (by median split) was also not related to the likelihood of helping, χ^2 (2, N = 29) = 0.56, p = .46. When asked, none of the participants reported any suspicions about the veracity of the accident nor claimed to have seen through the experimental design.

Taken together, the results indicate that when football fan identity is salient, participants are as likely to help a victim in a Manchester United shirt as they are to help a victim in a Liverpool shirt. Under the salience of a superordinate football fan identity, victims who show some association with football are more likely to be helped than those who do not. In addition, post hoc measurement of strength of identification with a Manchester United identity revealed that there were no differences in strength of identification across shirt condition (Manchester United shirt: M = 3.83, SD = 0.59; plain shirt: M = 3.82, SD = 0.55; Liverpool shirt: M = 3.95, SD = 0.39).

Discussion

The results of this experiment suggest that the inclusiveness of social category boundaries is important for emergency intervention. In Study 1, a more narrowly defined set of category boundaries (defined in terms of support for a particular football team) limited intervention to only those who were clearly identified supporters of that team. However, when category boundaries are drawn at a more inclusive level (all football fans), then intervention is extended to those who may be supporters of other teams but who can still be identified as fellow football fans. These findings are all the more remarkable

in an English context given the history of (sometimes bitter) intergroup rivalry between the fans of Manchester United and Liverpool FCs. In this study, the collective identification of all football supporters as members of a common category seems to have outweighed the potential for behavior based on intergroup rivalry. Those who can be identified as football fans are more likely to receive help than those who cannot.

It is important to note that the levels of strength of identification (as measured by the Brown et al., 1986, scale) are lower in Study 2 compared with Study 1. Participants seem to identify less strongly with a football fan identity than with a Manchester United identity in the measures taken before participants witness the accident. They also appear to identify less strongly with Manchester United when the strength-of-identification measures from Study 1 are compared with those from Study 2. This raises the possibility that participants in the second study were less strongly attached to a Manchester United identity in general (in other words, before the study started) and were thus more easily categorized into an identity that would allow them to help members of a group most Manchester United fans would never help. However, although this remains a possible explanation, other stronger explanations for the difference in strength of identification can also be made. In the second study, the strength of identification with the Manchester United measure comes after a more superordinate identity has just been made salient and after a deception based on group membership has just been revealed. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the strength of identification with the Manchester United measure in Study 2 has been depressed. It is noteworthy also that although the levels of identification with a football fan identity are lower (in Study 2) than the levels of identification with a Manchester United identity (in Study 1), the effects of the more inclusive social categorization are still strong. Both of these factors suggest that the evidence in this study for the importance of inclusiveness of category boundaries in helping behavior remains persuasive.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Taken together, the two studies described in this article provide evidence for the importance of social group membership and the inclusiveness of social category boundaries for helping behavior. The strength of evidence is based in part on the fact that the studies, in the tradition of Latané and Darley (1970; Darley & Latané, 1968), create a kind of experimental realism in which participants then act. The studies analyze actual helping behavior rather than beliefs about or intentions to act. The studies themselves provide evidence for the rela-

tionship between group membership and action. In the first study, recognizing the signs of common group membership in a stranger (when that group membership is salient) leads to the increased likelihood that bystanders will intervene to help those in distress. However, they also show that group memberships are not fixed or inevitably salient. In Study 2, an experimentally induced shift in the salience of social categorization leads to changes in the way those in distress are assessed. Previous intergroup rivalries become submerged within a more inclusive or common categorization. Those who were previously identified as out-group members are now extended the benefits of group membership. In some respects, these findings could be seen as an extension or development of the work of Dovidio et al. (1997) in the contact tradition. Dovidio et al. (1997) pointed to the importance of common identification in contact situations and the extension of helping behavior when contact occurs under more inclusive categorizations. However, although sharing some things in common with this work, the more SCT-influenced approach adopted in this article has greater potential for explaining emergency intervention. Most emergency situations involve interactions between strangers in public—people who have little or no prior contact in advance of the emergency but who may act toward each other in terms of social category memberships. The emphasis that SCT places on the importance of immediate social context and the potential for dynamic shifts in that context better reflects the qualities of emergency situations.

The second difference between the work of Dovidio et al. (1997) and this article is the emphasis on experimental realism and ecological validity in the studies reported here. However, although there are some clear advantages in assessing emergency intervention in studies with a high degree of experimental realism, there are also some disadvantages. It is difficult to measure the many possible intervening variables that might help to explain why perceived group membership appears to increase helping. The post hoc quality of the kinds of measurement that would be required and the potential for mismatch between observed behavior and the explanations for action offered by participants make analysis of intervening variables problematic. That is not to say that the question of what is important about group membership and helping behavior cannot or should not be addressed. Other forms of empirical study are required to explore the relationship between social category membership and concepts like feelings of similarity (Dovidio, 1984); increases in empathetic arousal (Cialdini et al., 1997); greater feelings of a shared, common fate (Hornstein, 1976); or even greater feelings of self-other interchangeability (Turner et al., 1987). The challenge for future research, if the evidence for the im-

portance of common categorization is to be translated into practical strategies for promoting intervention, is to identify the variables that mediate the relationship between group membership and helping.

A feature of the current study that might also require further examination is the issue of positive and negative valence of identity in relation to helping. It may be that the potential for negative evaluation of identity in the Manchester United identity study is importantly different from that in the general football fan identity study. In the first study, negative valence of identity is associated with authenticity. In the second study, negative valence is associated with antisocial behavior. It may be that this difference contributes to changes in participant behavior from Study 1 to Study 2.

Moreover, in the second study, it may be that, in making a more inclusive superordinate categorization salient, prosocial norms were cued for participants that facilitated the general levels of helping. By suggesting to participants that English football fans were usually seen as antisocial and that this study was interested in the positive experience of fandom, the instructions may have cued prosocial and helpful norms associated with identity. Further work may be required to explore the interaction of salient identity, the inclusiveness of categorization, and the content of group-relevant norms. Even with this caveat, however, the finding of dramatic shifts in helping behavior across powerful and entrenched real-life antagonisms in response to changes in levels of categorization remains important.

In conclusion, the experimental work in this article provides strong evidence for the importance of a social-identity-influenced approach to emergency intervention. In particular, the importance not only of category salience but also of category inclusiveness suggests that a social identity theory (SIT)/SCT-influenced approach can make a significant contribution to the helping literature. This SIT/SCT perspective suggests that the debates around helping should be shifted from the question of whether collective categorization influences helping to a focus on the conditions under which people come to define themselves collectively. It is by exploring the social meanings of the intervention situation in terms of the way bystanders make sense of category relations in social contexts that new insights about helping behavior will emerge.

NOTE

1. In fact, the Yankees and Manchester United have recently agreed to a commercial partnership in which each club will promote the merchandising of the other in their respective countries.

REFERENCES

Batson, C. D. (1987). Prosocial motivation: Is it ever truly altruistic? *Advanced Experimental Social Psychology, 20*, 65-122.

Batson, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question: Towards a social psychological answer.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Batson, C. D., Batson, J. G., Griffitt, C. A., Barrientos, S., Brandt, J. R., Sprengelmeyer, P., et al. (1989). Negative-state relief and the empathy-altruism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 922-933.

Batson, C. D., & Shaw, L. L. (1991). Encouraging words concerning the evidence for altruism. *Psychological Enquiry, 2*, 159-168.

Brewer, M. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal group situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 307-324.

Brewer, M., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 83-93.

Brown, R. J., Condor, S., Matthews, A., Wade, G., & Williams, J. A. (1986). Explaining intergroup differentiation in an industrial organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59*, 273-286.

Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Lewis, B. P., Luce, C., & Neuberg, S. L. (1997). Reinterpreting the empathy-altruism relationship: When one into one equals oneness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 481-494.

Darley, J., & Latané, B. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10*, 215-221.

Darley, J. M., & Batson, C. D. (1973). "From Jerusalem to Jericho": The study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27*(1), 100-108.

Dovidio, J. F. (1984). Helping behavior and altruism: An empirical and conceptual overview. In L. Berkowits (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 17, pp. 361-427). New York: Academic Press.

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1981). The effects of race, status, and ability on helping behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 44*, 192-203.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Validzic, A., Motoka, K., Johnson, B., & Frazier, S. (1997). Extending the benefits of recategorization: Evaluations, self-disclosure, and helping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33*, 401-420.

Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Gaertner, S., Schroeder, D. A., & Clark, R. D., III. (1991). The arousal: Cost-reward model and the process of intervention: A review of the evidence. In M. Clark (Ed.), *Prosocial behavior. Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 86-118). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Flippen, A. R., Hornstein, H. A., Siegal, W. E., & Weitzman, E. A. (1996). A comparison of similarity and interdependence as trigger for in-group formation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(9), 882-893.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986) The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and racism* (pp. 61-90). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Hodgson, S. A., Hornstein, H. A., & LaKind, E. (1972). Socially mediated Zeigarnik effects as a function of sentiment, valence and desire for goal attainment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 28*(3), 191-218.

Hornstein, H. A. (1972). Promotive tension and prosocial behavior: The basis of prosocial behavior from a Lewinian perspective. *Journal of Social Issues, 28*, 191-218.

Hornstein, H. A. (1976). *Cruelty and kindness: A new look at aggression and altruism.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hornstein, H. A., Masor, H. N., Sole, K., & Heilman, M. (1971). Effects of sentiment and completion of a helping act on observer helping: A case for socially mediated Zeigarnik effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17*(1), 107-112.

King, A. (2000) Football fandom and post-national identity in the new Europe. *British Journal of Sociology, 51*(3), 419-442.

Latané, B. (1981). The psychology of social impact. *American Psychologist, 36*, 343-356.

Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York: Meredith Corporation.

Latané, B., & Nida, S. (1981). Ten years of research on group size and helping. *Psychological Bulletin, 89*(2), 308-324.

Levine, M., Cassidy, C., Brazier, G., & Reicher, S. (2002). Self-categorization and bystander intervention: Two experimental studies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 7,* 1452-1463.

Levine, R. V., Martinez, T. S., Brase, G., & Sorenson, K. (1994). Helping in 36 U.S. cities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67,* 69-82.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: Implication for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224-253.

Milgram, S. (1970). The experience of living in cities. *Science, 167,* 1461-1468.

Pelé & Fish, R. L. (1977). *Pelé: My life and the beautiful game: The autobiography of Pelé.* London: New English Library.

Piliavin, I. M., Rodin, J., & Piliavin, J. (1969). Good Samaritanism: An underground phenomenon? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13,* 289-299.

Piliavin, J. A., Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Clark, R. D. (1981). *Emergency Intervention.* New York: Academic Press.

Sole, K., Marton, J., & Hornstein, H. A. (1975). Opinion similarity and helping: Three field experiments investigating the bases of promotive tension. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 11,* 1-13.

Stapel, D., Reicher, S., & Spears, R. (1994). Social identity, availability and the perception of risk. *Social Cognition, 12,* 1-7.

Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations.* London: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press & Paris Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worschel & W. G Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. C. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory.* New York: Basil Blackwell.

Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., Haslam, A., & McGarty, C. (1994). Self and collective: Cognition and social context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 454-463.

Wegner, D. M., & Crano, W. D. (1975) Racial factors in helping behavior: An unobtrusive study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32,* 901-905.