

Groups, Identities and Bystander Behavior: How Group Processes Can  
Be Used to Promote Helping.

Mark Levine

Clare Cassidy

## <h1>Introduction

The brutal rape and murder of Kitty Genovese in New York in 1964 has come to dominate the intellectual landscape of research on the psychology of emergency intervention. The story of the 38 bystanders who witnessed events from their apartment windows and did nothing to help has been the touchstone for those trying to explain the behavior of bystanders in emergencies. From the outset, research on emergency helping was absorbed by the question of why individuals sometimes fail to help. The answer seemed to be that people were adversely affected by the presence of others. A variety of psychological processes like ‘diffusion of responsibility’, ‘pluralistic ignorance’ and ‘audience inhibition’ were mobilized to suggest that individual decision making could be degraded by the immersion of the individual in the social world. Concepts like ‘the bystander effect’ (Latane & Darley, 1971; Latane & Nida, 1982) seemed to suggest that individuals were more likely to help if they were free of the potential contamination of the presence of others.

This approach paints a rather negative picture of the effects of the group on helping behavior. However, in this chapter we will propose that this tale of the inhibition of helping by the group is only half the story. While the bystander effect may indeed be one of the most robust findings in social psychology, we will suggest that it is a particular rather than a generic quality of the effect of groups on helping. We will show that, just as the presence of others can lead to inhibition, so it can also lead to the facilitation of helping. In doing so we will endorse Billig’s (1987) injunction that psychological knowledge is always a balance of

argumentative positions (what Billig, following the Greek philosopher Protagoras, calls the opposition of logoi and anti-logoi). Using recent advances in theories of group processes and intergroup relations we will demonstrate that the power of the group can be harnessed to promote bystander interventions in emergencies.

### <h1>The ‘Myth’ of the 38 Witnesses

In order to set the scene for this ‘rediscovery’ of the positive contribution that group processes can make to helping behavior, we begin by returning to the seminal event on which the bystander effect literature has been built. Recent research on the Kitty Genovese murder (Manning, Levine & Collins 2007) shows that the story of the failure of the 38 witnesses to help is in fact a stubborn and intractable myth. Analysis of court transcripts and other material associated with the murder shows that, contrary to popular belief (and to what appears in most undergraduate psychology textbooks) there were (at best) 3 rather than 38 witnesses who saw Genovese and her murderer Winston Moseley together; none of whom witnessed the murder (which in fact took place in an enclosed stairwell), and there were several attempts by bystanders to intervene directly or to call the police. The story of the 38 inactive bystanders was something which appeared in a New York Times article two weeks after the murder (Rosenthal 1964/1999). It was this inaccurate and sensationalized article which became the motivation for Latane and Darley’s (1970) empirical work.

The importance of the mythologized story of the 38 witnesses is not that it invalidates the canon of bystander effect research. The elegant and inventive body of empirical studies carried out by Latane and Darley (and others) which produced the bystander effect are both robust and impressive. To be clear, the claim here is not that this literature is wrong – but rather that it provides only half the picture. We suggest that the powerful (and mythological) image of the 38 witnesses who fail to act holds such sway over the way emergency intervention is conceptualized, that it limits the kinds of questions which are asked. It populates the psychological imagination in a way that ‘crowds out’ the potential search for ways in which groups could contribute positively to emergency intervention. Traditional approaches to bystander behavior have treated the presence of others as the source of the problem, rather than imagining ways in which the group could be the start of a solution.

## <h1>Reconceptualising the Role of the Group in Bystander Research

It is important to recognize that, even at the outset, there was a strand of bystander research which suggested that group size might not be the only important factor in emergency helping. For example, early research by Darley, Teger and Lewis (1973) showed that if bystanders could see each other (and thus be able to communicate) then group size did not inhibit helping. Similarly, Rutkowski, Gruder and Romer (1986) demonstrated that if bystanders were allowed to get to know each other (and build up a sense of cohesion) then groups did not inhibit helping. At the same time, studies which retained a focus on intervention in violence

(Shotland & Straw, 1975; Schwartz & Gottlieb, 1976) produced evidence that increasing group size was not always an inhibitor of intervention. However, these studies were in the minority and the space they opened up for wider exploration of factors affecting emergency intervention was soon swamped by the volume of studies pointing to group size as the key variable.

Over the last few years a body of literature has begun to develop which offers a way of reconceptualising how ‘the presence of others’ is imagined in helping research. Rather than focusing on the question of whether others were present or not, this research explores the psychological relationships between all those present in an emergency. In doing so it draws on the central insight of the Social Identity tradition - in particular Social Identity Theory (SIT: Tajfel 1978, 1982) and Self Categorisation Theory (SCT: Turner et. al., 1987), suggesting that people can define themselves in terms of their memberships of social groups and act accordingly. Unlike earlier psychological approaches to the presence of the group (which assumed that the presence of others would undermine personal identity and thus lead to anti-social behavior (c.f. Zimbardo 1969), social identity theory suggests that the presence of others provides the opportunity for people to define themselves in terms of their social identities and act in terms of the norms and values of those identities. More specifically, it proposes that there are three key dimensions that shape the way group processes can impact on helping behavior. These are the salience of social identities, the boundaries of social identities and the content of social identities.

Taken together, research on these three dimensions has produced a range of evidence to show how group processes can facilitate helping.

## <h1>Social Identity and Helping

One of the earliest discoveries of the Social Identity literature was the tendency of people to favor the in-group – even when that group membership was based on trivial criteria (Tajfel, Flament, Billig & Bundy 1971). This notion of in-group favoritism, and the related idea that people come to see themselves as functionally interchangeable with other members of their group, suggests that people are more likely to help in-group as opposed to out-group members. The salience of a social identity brings with it the conditions for people to experience the emotions and sense of responsibility or obligation that increases the likelihood of help. For example, Dovidio et al (1997), using the minimal group paradigm, have found evidence of in-group bias in helping. Students were more likely to offer help to a student in need when she was believed to be an in-group member than an out-group member. Similarly, Hornstein (1972, 1976) and colleagues have 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, Masor, Sole & Heilman, 1971; Hodgson, Hornstein & LaKind, 1972), Hornstein 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.

Of course, we should not assume that the salience of group membership means that out-group members will never be helped. As we will see later in this chapter (and elsewhere in this volume) out-group helping does occur. Take for example the extensive literature that uses helping as a non-reactive measure of prejudice (Saucier, Miller & Doucet, 2005). While some studies have found in-group favoritism, others have found no differences (Bickman & Kamzan, 1973) or even ‘outgroup favoritism’ (Dutton & Lake 1973). Saucier et al. (2005) reveal a complex picture of the likelihood of help being offered by White people to Black people. Out-group helping is most likely as a result of prejudice avoidance. This can be a consequence of an individuals’ attempt to avoid internal aversive states, or to avoid public accusations of discrimination. Out-group helping is least likely when behavior can be justified on grounds other than race – or in situations of high emergency. The point here is that the social identity approach to helping does not argue that group membership always implies in-group favoritism. Rather the argument is that when social identity is salient (and this may not always be the case – even in studies on ‘race’ and helping), then people will act in terms of the norms and values of the group. For the most part, this means that people are more likely to be helped when they are seen as members of the group than when they are not. However, it can also lead to out-group helping as an expression of group norms and values or interactional context.

## <h1>Identity Saliency and the Flexibility of Group Boundaries

In our own research, we have taken this idea of the importance of group membership for helping behavior and explored some of the ways in which group processes can be used to promote helping. We focused in particular on the question of identity saliency (the ways in which particular social identities come to be important in helping contexts) and category boundaries (how identities are constructed to include and exclude people from the group). Using insights from the social identity literature which show that identities are not automatically given (but rather emerge as a result of comparative context (Oakes, Haslam & Turner 1994) and the struggle over definition of meanings (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001)), we have examined the dynamic role that identities can play in helping. In doing so, we have combined laboratory based experimentation, field experiments in non-laboratory settings and analysis of documents and archive material relating to ‘real life’ bystander behavior. Taken together, this research suggests not only the importance of social identity processes for bystander behavior, but also the ways in which these processes can be drawn upon to promote group level intervention.

For example, in our laboratory experiments (Levine, Cassidy, Brazier & Reicher 2002), we demonstrate that group membership is important not only for bystander – victim relationships but also for bystander –bystander relationships. In these experiments, a Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) clip depicting a violent attack was shown to participants. We discovered that people were more likely to intervene

when they believed the victim was an in-group rather than an out-group member. We also showed (in a study using confederates) that fellow bystanders are more influential when they are believed to be in-group rather than out-group members. When in-group confederates said (publicly) that they would be likely to intervene, participants (privately) indicated that they would intervene too. When in-group confederates said they would not intervene, participants were also less likely to intervene. However, when the confederates were out-group, public expressions of intention (either to intervene or not to intervene) did not influence the judgments of participants.

In short, our laboratory experiments seem to suggest that group membership is important for more than just ensuring that in-group members get help. Group membership also shapes the way the actions of fellow bystanders are perceived. This is important because traditional bystander research tends to focus simply on the numbers of others who are present. It does not look at the psychological relationships between those who might be present as bystanders to an emergency. Where traditional research suggests that increasing group size inhibits helping, our research suggests that the salience of social identities can lead to both the inhibition *and* the facilitation of helping. When bystanders share a common social identity, then behavior will be shaped by the contents of the identity. If group norms favor non-intervention, then the presence of the group will inhibit helping. However, if group norms favor intervention, then the presence of the group can facilitate intervention. In this way, a social identity based approach to bystander behavior offers

the theoretical platform for using group processes to increase the likelihood of bystander intervention.

Of course, these laboratory experiments do not deal with actual helping behavior. Expressions of intention to intervene (in experimental dependent measures) may be useful for demonstrating theoretical principles, but they should not be treated as veridical acts. This is especially true in the domain of helping research where it is clear that words are not always matched by deeds. One of the major strengths of the traditional bystander literature is that it placed participants in situations where they believed they were witnessing ‘real life’ emergencies – and then looked to see how they actually behaved. It is important therefore to demonstrate that social identity processes can shape actual helping behavior in real emergencies

With that in mind we set out to conduct field experiments (in the spirit of the traditional research on helping) that explored the impact of social identity on people’s willingness to help strangers in need. We borrowed the structure of a famous traditional experiment, Darley and Batson’s (1973) ‘good Samaritan’ study, which manipulated the cost of helping a victim in distress. In our studies, cost of helping was replaced by information about group membership. We took a sample of English football (soccer) fans and exposed them, one at a time, to a situation where a stranger has an accident. The fans were all supporters of Manchester United, a famous and well-supported English team. In the first study (Levine, Prosser, Evans and Reicher, 2005 – Study 1) fans were invited to the psychology department and asked to fill in

questionnaires about Manchester United and to write an essay about the joys of being a Manchester United fan. Having raised the salience of the Manchester United social identity, the fans were then directed to another building (on the pretext of being directed to a screening room to watch a film about football). To get to the second building, they had to cross a car park. While they were doing so, an accident was staged in which a confederate came running down a grass bank on the side of the car park (in the eye-line of the participant) and then fell over and clutched his ankle in pain. The confederate was wearing either a Manchester United football shirt (in-group member); a Liverpool FC shirt (out-group member – Manchester United and Liverpool are traditional rivals and have an animosity that can manifest in inter-group violence); or was wearing an ordinary sports shirt which conveyed no information about group membership. Results showed that participants were significantly more likely to help the stranger when he was wearing the Manchester United shirt than either the Liverpool shirt or the ordinary unbranded sports shirt (see Table 1). This provides behavioral confirmation of the tendency to help in-group members over others.

However, in a second study we were able to demonstrate the consequences of one of the key implications of a social identity approach to helping – namely the flexibility of group boundaries and the importance of category inclusiveness. In this study (Levine, Prosser, Evans and Reicher, 2005 – Study 2), Manchester United fans were again invited to the psychology department. This time, however, they were asked to fill in questionnaires about being a ‘football fan’ and to write an

essay about the joys of being a football fan. In this way a more inclusive, football fan identity was made salient for participants. Once this had been completed, participants were again exposed to the accident in which the confederate fell in front of them – wearing either the Manchester United, Liverpool or ordinary, unbranded sport shirt. In this study, participants were as likely to help the stranger when he was wearing the Liverpool shirt as the Manchester United shirt, but not when he was wearing the unbranded sports shirt (see Table 1). This is a particularly striking finding given the degree of antipathy that usually exists between Manchester United and Liverpool fans when they think about themselves in terms of their team affiliations. However, by appealing to a more inclusive and superordinate category (“all football fans”) the benefits of group membership – and associated helping behavior- are extended to those who would previously have not been helped.

While this field experiment is a striking demonstration of the power of social identities, category boundaries and category inclusiveness, it might still be objected that the importance of identity processes has yet to be demonstrated outside the confines of experimentation. To show that category constructions *can* affect helping does not demonstrate that, in situations where helping becomes a life or death matter, they *are* used in order to promote intervention.

One place to look for research which might shed light on this question is in the growing literature on the ‘psychology of rescue’ developed by Holocaust scholars (Oliner & Oliner 1988; Monroe 1996). While much of this research has been concerned with explaining the

motivations of individuals who carried out acts of rescue of Jews from Nazi persecution, there is also work which recognizes the differences in the way different societies responded to Nazi occupation. This more group level focus (Hilberg, 1993; Monroe, 1996) reveals that while some countries (e.g. Netherlands, France) were complicit in rounding up Jews for deportation, others (e.g. Denmark, Bulgaria) were able to organize effective resistance such that their Jewish populations survived relatively intact.

Our research has taken one of these cases, the rescue of Bulgarian Jews (see Bar-Zohar, 1998; Ben-Yakov, 1990; Boyadjieff, 1989; Todorov, 2001 for a full history). Using transcripts of letters, speeches and official documents from the King of Bulgaria and from political and religious leaders (see Todorov, 2001), we explored the way in which the population were asked (in these public documents) to oppose the deportation of the Jews (Reicher, Cassidy, Hopkins & Levine, 2006). More specifically, we analyzed how the population was appealed to in the texts; whether (and how) Jews were included or excluded from the in-group; and how normative behavior for the group was described.

It quickly became apparent that the population was being appealed to in national terms – as Bulgarians. In other words, attempts were made to make national identity salient – as opposed (say) to a more superordinate categorization of ‘all humanity’. It was also clear that the Jews were placed inside the national category boundaries. Jews and Bulgarians were presented as having the same qualities, sharing the same experiences and allegiances and being part of the same Bulgarian polity. Thus, to allow

the deportation of the Jews would be to allow the deportation of fellow Bulgarians. At the same time, the documents describe Bulgarian norms and values as being qualities which required the defense of the Jews. To give the Jews up would be to act against the very essence that makes people Bulgarian.

While this thumbnail sketch may seem a little self-evident or even banal, the power of these category constructions becomes apparent when contrasted with examples where they are not in place. For example, while the Jews of 'old' Bulgaria were placed inside the boundaries of this national category, the same could not be said for the Jewish populations of Thrace and Macedonia. In the early years of the war (1941), treaty negotiations between Bulgaria and Germany meant that Bulgaria was given territory recently annexed by the Germans in exchange for the right to move German troops through Bulgaria. This territory included Thrace, Macedonia and parts of eastern Serbia. For the Bulgarians, this satisfied long held nationalist dreams of a 'Greater Bulgaria'. However, although the Bulgarians were now in charge of these territories, when, two years later, the Nazis applied pressure to transport all Bulgarian Jews to the concentration camps, there was no move to protect the Jewish population in these lands. While the Jews inside the 'old' borders of Bulgaria were placed inside the national in-group – and thus protected, the Jews of the new territories were not. The deportation of Jews from these occupied territories went ahead between March 20th and 29th, 1943. In total 11,343 people were taken to Auschwitz and Treblinka. Twelve survived.

## <h1>Helping the Out-group

Thus far we have developed an argument, using laboratory and field experiments as well as analysis of historical documents, which shows how social identity processes can be central to helping. The salience of social identities, the content of those identities and the boundaries of the identities are central to determining who will receive help. By making the boundaries as inclusive as possible, and by ensuring that the contents of salient social identities favor helping, we can use the principles of social identity theory to promote helping. However, despite the promise of this social identity influenced approach, it is important to avoid the temptation of seeing the creation of inclusive in-groups as the only way to promote helping.

While it is clear that being an in-group member is more likely to bring with it the protection of the group, this does not automatically imply that out-group members will be treated with indifference at best, or deliberate neglect at worst. For social identity theory, behavior can never be derived simply from the fact of group membership. Rather one must take into account the content of the specific identity that is made salient. For some groups there may be strong injunctions to ‘look after our own’, while for other groups, acting prosocially and being charitable to strangers may be the dimensions along which we differentiate our group from others (Jetten, Spears & Manstead, 1996, Reicher, Hopkins, Levine & Rath, 2006)). Analytically, then, we need to distinguish between helping based on in-group inclusion and helping based on in-group norms.

In fact, helping the out-group can sometimes be a strategic expression of in-group norms and values. In a fascinating set of studies, van Leeuwen (2007) shows how the willingness of Dutch respondents to help those who were victims of natural disasters in other parts of the world (the Asian Tsunami, Hurricane Katrina) can be shaped by respondents' beliefs about the place of the Netherlands in the world. Respondents are more likely to help when they think it will lead to appropriate group recognition, and are also more likely to offer help on dimensions on which the Dutch are perceived to have specific and unrivalled expertise (in flood defenses, for example).

Our own research has also revealed strategic aspects to out-group helping. In a study using Scottish respondents (Hopkins, Reicher, Harrison, Cassidy, Bull & Levine, 2007), we discovered that helping the out-group can sometimes be used as a way of trying to improve the stereotype of the in-group. When Scots were told that the English viewed them as mean, they strongly resented this stereotype, were motivated to refute it, and used out-group helping as a way of doing so. In other words, they responded more favorably to requests for help from out-group members than they did to requests from in-group members. This is because helping others is a way of demonstrating that you are not mean. However, helping members of your own group could be discounted as simple self-interest – leaving the stereotype unchallenged. However, helping the out-group is more difficult to dismiss as an act of self interest – and can thus be offered as unambiguous evidence to counteract the stereotype of the Scots as mean.

## <h1>Practical Implications

In this chapter we have presented evidence for the importance of identity processes in helping both in-group and out-group members. However, the important step for any new theoretical approach is the turning of theory into practice. After all, one of the main criticisms leveled at the traditional ‘bystander effect’ approach is that, despite being one of the most robust and reproduced findings in academic social psychology, it lacked practical utility when it came to increasing real world interventions. How then might our focus on social identity be useful in promoting helping in emergencies?

We began this chapter with the story of Kitty Genovese and the 38 witnesses. We argued that there was no evidence to support the idea that bystanders failed to act or that the presence of others had an inhibitory effect. Despite this, the 38 witnesses story still has a hold over the psychological imagination. When we think about bystander behavior in emergencies we think about a ‘society of strangers’ who share public spaces (like city streets, public parks, shopping malls and train carriages) but who are psychologically isolated from each other. At first sight, this seems to pose particular problems for a social identity based account of helping. These public spaces are places where people are unlikely to share a common group identity. Thus, the first issue for a social identity based account of emergency helping is whether collective identities can ever be engendered in such contexts.

In their studies of responses to disasters and emergencies (in particular the London bombings on 7/7/2005), John Drury and colleagues have shown (Drury, 2004; Drury, Cocking and Reicher, 2007) that emergency events themselves can lead to the formation of common identities. Drury reports how survivors of the London bombings contrast the difference between the usual, atomized experience of being a commuter in a crowded train, with the feelings of solidarity and commonality they felt with fellow passengers in the aftermath of the 7/7 bombs. When emergencies are viewed as a threat to collective safety, then people tend to act in co-operative rather than selfish ways. Rare selfish acts tend not to spread. In other words, contrary to the common perception that people tend to ‘panic’ and behave irrationally or act in their own narrow interests, common threat tends to result in common identity. People behave in helpful and pro-social ways towards others who are sharing the emergency.

Clearly, these common threat emergencies are different from emergencies where there is no perceived common threat. This might include an assault by one train passenger upon another. In order to improve the likelihood that bystanders will intervene to help victims of situations such as this, the task is to find ways in which collective identification can be engendered proactively. The key is to make an attack upon one person feel like an attack upon all. This is no straightforward task. While a social identity approach can point to the importance of the salience, boundaries and contents of identity in shaping behavior, it cannot offer a universal prescription. Each public place and

each set of social relations will have a specific set of identity relations which need to be understood in their own terms. However, what Drury's work reveals is that it *is* possible for strangers in public to define themselves and act in terms of a common identity.

A social identity perspective would warn against public policy initiatives that threaten to atomize or divide the collective fabric. For example, it would warn against the policy direction encapsulated in ex-British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's aphorism that 'there is no such thing as society. There are individual men and women, and there are families'. While this was intended as the vanguard of a political attack on what Thatcher saw as the evils of a reliance on the 'welfare state', it limited the boundaries of social responsibility to the confines of the family. It undermined the sense that we have a responsibility for the welfare of others – particularly when those others are strangers. Furthermore, it played into the idea of a contract of mutual indifference – if I am only looking after myself and my family, and the same can be said for everybody else, then I cannot expect anybody to help me should I be the victim of an emergency. These are the kinds of conditions which are likely to keep bystander intervention low.

By contrast, policy initiatives which create conditions whereby an injury to one can be an injury to all, are most likely to promote intervention behavior. Take for example, the decision by the Swedish Government in 1976 to outlaw corporal punishment of children. Over the last 30 years there has been radical change in attitude and practice with respect to violence towards children in Sweden. The Child Rights

Information Network – run by the Commissioner for Human Rights in the Council of Europe – report that “increased sensitivity to violence to children in Sweden has led to an increase in reporting of assaults, but there has been a declining trend in prosecutions of parents, and a substantial reduction in compulsory social work interventions and in numbers of children taken into care. Public attitudes towards hitting children have changed which has facilitated early supportive intervention in individual cases”. In Sweden, people intervene if they see a child being hit by an adult in a public place. They do so because they are not inhibited by the idea that family members have the ‘right’ to hit their children. For them, violence towards a child is not something that is covered by the ‘privatized’ boundaries of the family. Hitting children is against the law- but it is also ‘not Swedish’. Conditions have been created in which particular behaviors are seen to reflect badly on the Swedish public as a whole. Thus, intervention rates are high and collective support for intervention is assured.

## <h1>Conclusions

In this chapter we have argued that, in traditional research on bystander behavior, there is a generally negative view of the role played by groups and group processes. We have suggested that some of this can be traced back to the ‘signal crime’ which was the launching pad for bystander research in social psychology – the inaction of the 38 witnesses to the murder of Kitty Genovese. We have shown how this event, although not supported by the available evidence, has come to

dominate the landscape of helping research. The failure of the group is seen as the crux of the research problem, and as a consequence, there has been little attempt to explore the ways in which groups and group processes could be mobilized to promote helping behavior. We have suggested that this has resulted in a body of literature which tells only half the story. While it is clear that, under some conditions, the presence of others can inhibit helping, there is little work that examines whether the presence of others can ever facilitate helping.

We have offered, as an alternative, an approach to bystander behavior based on some of the insights of a Social Identity theory approach to group processes. This approach suggests that people can define themselves in terms of their membership of social groups, and that when they do, they act in terms of the norms and values of that social identity. Through a series of empirical studies including laboratory experiments, field experiments and analysis of historical documents, we have shown how social identity processes can be mobilized to promote helping. In particular, we have identified the importance of the salience of social identities, the boundaries of social identities and the content of social identities as the key to understanding the role of the group in bystander behavior. We have shown that people are more likely to help others when they are in-group members – and that the more inclusive the identity boundaries are, the greater the range of people who will be helped. However, we also argued that identity processes do not limit helping to in-group members only. We showed that, alongside the importance of identity inclusiveness, identity contents are also important.

Some group identities embody norms and values which promote helping the out-group as a way of establishing or maintaining in-group value and distinctiveness.

The importance of this group level approach to bystander behavior lies in its potential for revitalizing an area of research which has become somewhat moribund over the last two decades. One of the great ironies of traditional work on the bystander effect was that it produced one of the most robust and reproduced findings in social psychology (Latane and Nida 1982; Dovidio, 1984) and yet researchers were unable to use it to increase the likelihood of helping in emergencies. By highlighting the potential of the group to facilitate helping (as well as to inhibit helping), it becomes possible once again to imagine the contribution of research to practice. The approach outlined in this chapter not only offers the potential for contributions to practice, but, by drawing on the insights of a social identity approach to group processes, suggests some of the theoretical mechanisms which make for practical theory.

## References

- Bar-Zohar, M. (1998) *Beyond Hitler's Grasp: The heroic rescue of Bulgaria's Jews*.  
Avon, MA: Adams Media
- Ben-Yakov, A. (1990). Bulgaria. In I. Gutman (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust* (2 vols.). New York: MacMillan.
- Bickman, L., & Kamzan, M. (1973) The effect of race and need on helping behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 89, 73-77.
- Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and Thinking: a rhetorical approach to social psychology*.  
Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Boyadjieff, C. (1989) *Saving the Bulgarian Jews in World War II*. Singer Island:  
Free Bulgarian Center.
- 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
- Darley, J. M., Teger, A. I., & Lewis, L. D. (1973). Do groups always inhibit  
individuals' responses to potential emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social  
Psychology*, 26, 395-399.
- Dovidio, J. F. (1984). Helping behavior and altruism: An empirical and conceptual  
overview. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 17, 361-427.
- 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.
- Drury, J. (2004) No need to panic. *The Psychologist*, 3, 119-119
- Drury, J., Cocking, C. & Reicher, S. (2006). Every man for himself – or for the group? How  
crowd solidarity can arise in an emergency: An interview study of disaster survivors.  
Paper presented at the Group and Intergroup Relations pre-conference, Society for

- Personality and Social Psychology 7th Annual Meeting, Palm Springs, California, January.
- Dutton, D.G. & Lake, R.A. (1973). Threat of own prejudice and reverse discrimination in interracial situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28, 94-100.
- Hilberg, R. (1993). *Perpetrators Victims Bystanders: Jewish Catastrophe 1933-1945*. London, UK: Lime Tree.
- 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
- Hopkins, N., Reicher, S., Harrison, K., Cassidy, C., Bull, R., & Levine, M. (2007) Helping to improve the group stereotype: On the strategic dimension of pro-social behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*., 33, 776-788.
- 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.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R. & Manstead, A.S.R. (1996) Ingroup norms and intergroup discrimination: distinctive self-categorization and social identity effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 1222-1233.
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The Unresponsive Bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Latané, B., & Nida, S. (1981). Ten years of research on group size and helping. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89, 308-324.

- Levine, M, Cassidy, C, Brazier, G & Reicher, S (2002) Self-categorisation and bystander non-intervention: two experimental studies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 7, 1452-1463.
- Levine, M., Prosser, A., Evans, D. & Reicher, S. (2005) Identity and Emergency Intervention: How Social Group Membership and Inclusiveness of Group Boundaries Shapes Helping Behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 443-453.
- Manning, R., Levine, M. & Collins, A. (2007). The Kitty Genovese Murder and the Social Psychology of Helping: the parable of the 38 witnesses *American Psychologist*, 62(6), 555-562.
- Monroe, K.R. (1996) *The Heart of Altruism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Oakes, P.J., Haslam, S.A. & Turner, J.C. (1994) *Stereotyping and Social Reality*. Oxford, UK and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell
- Oliner, P. & Oliner, S. (1988). *The Altruistic Personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*. New York: Free
- Reicher, S. & Hopkins, N. (2001) *Self and Nation*. London: Sage
- Reicher, S., Cassidy, C., Hopkins, N. & Levine, M (2006). Saving Bulgaria's Jews: An analysis of social identity and the mobilisation of social solidarity *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(1), 49-72.
- Reicher, S., Hopkins, N., Levine, M. & Rath, R. (2005). Entrepreneurs of hate and entrepreneurs of solidarity: social identity as a basis for mass communications *International Review of the Red Cross*, 87, 860, 621-637.
- Rosenthal, A. M. (1964/1999). *Thirty-Eight Witnesses*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rutkowski, G. K., Gruder, C. L. & Romer, D. (1983). Group Cohesiveness, Social Norms, and Bystander Intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44,

545-552.

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

A Meta-Analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9: 2-16.s

Schwartz, S.H. and Gottlieb, A. (1976). Bystanders reaction to violent theft: A

crime in Jerusalem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36(6), 1188-1199.

Shotland ,R.L and Straw, M.K (1976) Bystander response to an assault: when a man

attacks a woman. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 990-999

Tajfel, H. (1978) *Differentiation Between Social Groups*. London: Academic Press

Tajfel, H. (1982) *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Tajfel H, Billig M G, Bundy R P & Flament (1971) C. Social categorization and

intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1:149-77

Todorov, T. (2001) *The Fragility of Goodness*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson

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.

van Leeuwen, E. (2007). Restoring identity through outgroup helping: Beliefs about

international aid following the December 2004 tsunami. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(4), 661-671.

Zimbardo, P. G. (1969). The human choice: Individuation, reason, and order vs.

deindividuation, impulse and chaos. In W. J. Arnold & D. Levine (Eds.), *Nebraska*

*Symposium on Motivation* (Vol. 17, pp. 237-307). Lincoln, NE: University of

Nebraska Press.

Table 1. Table of Frequencies of Helping (and % help) by Shirt Condition for Study 1 and Study 2 in Levine et al., 2005.

	Study 1			Study 2		
	Manchester United Identity			Football Fan Identity		
	Help	No Help	% Help	Help	No Help	% Help
Manchester United	12	1	92%	8	2	80%
Liverpool	3	7	30%	7	3	70%
Plain	4	8	33%	2	7	22%