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Abstract

The literature on empathic concern and perceptions of similarity as traditional explanations for helping behaviours has included studies at the individual (Batson et al., 1991), the intragroup (Houston, 1990) and the intergroup (Sturmer, Snyder & Omoto, 2005) level. The concept of self-ascribed responsibility (as responsibility attributed to the self), however, has been largely overlooked in terms of how it can influence helping behaviours. While some paradigms emphasise the importance of the diffusion of responsibility in explaining when and why people do not intervene to help (Latané & Darley, 1970), little attention has been paid to the processes involved in the reversal of this specific aspect of the bystander effect phenomenon (the effect of an increased sense of responsibility on helping).

The aim of this mixed methods thesis is to develop our understanding of the role of empathy and self-ascribed responsibility as they relate to intergroup helping and charitable giving. The first exploratory study of this project adopted a discursive psychological approach (Edwards & Potter, 1992). In looking at how charity and non-charity workers produced accounts of their own and others charitable giving, the analysis demonstrated the strategic use of interpretative repertoires (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) of empathy and responsibility. These repertoires were invoked at different times, and in different ways, throughout the discursive interactions depending on the particular function they were deployed to serve. Empathy was invoked by constructing specific versions of the recipient group in speakers’ accounts, whereas responsibility was drawn upon by constructing specific versions of the relationship between donor and recipient of help.
Previous research has suggested empathic concern as an important factor in helping situations (Batson et al., 1991; Sturmer et al., 2005) however self-ascribed responsibility in social psychological studies on helping has not been systematically examined, save through its absence. Therefore, the second study of this thesis adopted a quantitative method of investigation, and sought to determine whether or not empathy and responsibility (shifting from interpretative repertoires to concepts operationalised as constructs) would be seen to independently predict helping behaviours in the form of intentions to donate. Results of a survey study showed that both variables contributed separately to donation proclivity. Subsequently, a series of experiments (2x2 factorial designs) were conducted which primed either empathy or responsibility as normative aspects of the ingroup’s identity, and then offered participants the opportunity to indicate intentions to donate to different types of target groups (presented as either blame-worthy or innocent, ingroup or outgroup, and finally threatening or non-threatening). Results suggest that while empathy as a normative aspect of one’s social identity can predict helping that is oftentimes contingent on certain criteria, namely the target group presenting as ingroup members, as innocent of their fate and as non-threatening, responsibility appears to prime a different set of considerations when choosing to give. Those primed with responsibility were seen to overcome issues of group membership, blame and threats to shared resources to essentially give equal amounts to all target groups.

It is therefore suggested that responsibility can be viewed as potentially altruistic in its ability to help in costly situations, as not susceptible to an SIT prediction of ingroup bias, and can prime a collective identity more so than empathic concern. This interpretation of the findings has important implications for the consistent donations charitable organisations rely on in terms of long-term giving.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

In November 2011, the following television appeal for the international children’s charity UNICEF was aired featuring actor Ewan McGregor. It began, as many similar adverts had done before, with black and white slow-moving images of starving children accompanied by poignant classical music. However as the advert progressed, the images and music were removed as Ewan stated:

‘All over the world children are dying because they don’t have the basics they need to survive. We shouldn’t need any music to make you feel sad. We shouldn’t need to show the images in black and white. In fact, we shouldn’t need to show you images at all. All we should need is the fact that children are dying because they don’t have the basics they need to survive. You know, the real basics, food and water. Giving just three pounds each month to help give a child these basics isn’t a huge sacrifice to make, it’s simply the right thing to do.’

The social psychology of helping has overwhelmingly focused on empathy and its predicates, such as similarity, as the main predictors of helping behaviour, to the neglect of other potential pathways to helping, including responsibility and duty. This thesis begins to problematise the monopoly of empathy and similarity holds on understandings of helping by considering how other pathways to helping may operate in everyday commonsense among the general public, as well as those working in the third sector. This thesis adopts a mixed methods
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approach to this consideration. It moves from an initially qualitative discourse analytic approach (Edwards & Potter, 1992) to the talk of charity and non-charity workers towards the eventual development of a scale of responsibility as based on how responsibility is understood by people in their own terms. Ultimately this thesis aims to elucidate how responsibility might differ from empathy as it relates to giving, and both concepts will be examined in the context of intra- and intergroup helping.

1.1 Introduction

The 21st century poses many problems for those employed in charitable organisations or in the ‘third sector’; defined as “an intermediary space between business and government where private energy can be deployed for public good.” (Third Sector Consulting, 2012). However, the public no longer give as readily to charities that they have given to in the past (Voluntary Sector Network, 2012). This decline could be influenced by several factors. While studies have emphasised the continued emphasis on the ‘warm glow’ associated with charitable giving via compassion and empathy (Falk, 2004), others have identified less guilt due to ego-depletion can result in lowered intentions to donate (Xu, Begue & Bushman, 2012). Indeed the British Medical Journal recently directly attributed the decrease in funding for AIDS care in Africa to a concept known as Donor Fatigue (Moszynski, 2010).

Donor Fatigue can be defined as “a state of mind in which donors have exhausted their resources, or in which they grow complacent about appeals from charities leading to diminished public response” (Brown & Minty, 2008, p. 16). It is evident when giving is at its peak immediately after an event or disaster, but starts to rapidly decline following this first brief period (Wynter, 2005). This donor or charity fatigue has been likened to the compassion fatigue often evident in long-term carers (Brown & Minty, 2008). This has serious implications for charitable organisations that depend on reliable, consistent donations to fund their programmes, which are often long-term in nature, and for intra- and intergroup helping in general.
In addition to donor fatigue, increased pressure to give to an increasingly growing number of different charitable organisations, overstretched personal budgets, frustration with perceptions of mismanagement of funds within certain organisations, or simply the difficult economic climate have been presented as contributing to a decrease in charitable giving (Diamantopoulos, Schlegelmilch, & Love, 1993). Moreover, even with the particular difficulties facing society due to the current economic situation, charitable giving in Ireland and abroad was identified as failing to keep pace with the rising incomes of the precious decades during what can be termed in the Irish context as the days of the Celtic Tiger (Ruddle & Mulvihill, 1999). This suggests that regardless of the economic context, charities must continually work to engage their donors if they are to secure consistent giving in the long-term.

Much of the targeting of charitable appeals is currently directed towards the emotional side of giving, by presenting images and music that evoke a sense of sadness or compassion in a potential donor; “The stories told by charitable organizations are typically designed to take the consumer through different emotional stages” (Merchant, Ford, & Sargeant, 2010, p. 754). However, this emotional dimension cannot always predict or secure what can be seen as a long-term investment (Griffin, Babin, Attaway, & Darden, 1993). Charities need to be increasingly creative and innovative in their approach, and this requires a more in-depth understanding of factors relating to charitable behaviour and helping more generally in order to gauge the motivations behind giving.

1.2 Overview of the thesis chapters

The traditional focus on empathy in social psychology has led to several potentially important factors being overlooked in the literature on helping from individual, intragroup and intergroup perspectives; namely the role of self-ascribed responsibility in helping interventions and decisions to donate to charitable organisations. This thesis will explore this area regarding the relevance this conceptualisation of responsibility (as an attribution of responsibility to the self to help) has for theories of helping, and will examine same using a variety of methods. An initially qualitative approach to people’s commonsense understandings
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of this concept as it relates to giving, and how people do being charitable in their everyday talk, will form the basis of a survey study investigating the independent contribution of both empathic concern and self-ascribed responsibility to helping behaviours and decisions to donate.

Subsequently, these concepts of empathy and responsibility will be examined in intragroup and intergroup contexts. They will be primed as normative aspects of the ingroup identity and their impact on willingness to donate to a number of different target groups will be examined. The findings at each level, from the discursive through to the intergroup studies, will be discussed at length in the final chapter of this thesis, which will also include an account of the limitations of such an approach along with a creative overview of the possible future directions of this area of research. To sum, this thesis further develops an understanding of a concept of responsibility as self-ascribed, and employs this conceptualisation of responsibility to assess how it differs from empathic concern as a motivation and precursor to helping, but also how it frames an understanding of the relationship between donor and recipient in decisions to donate in intergroup settings.

A project currently being developed and carried out in schools across Britain by the charity Oxfam aims to engender the values and attitudes of responsible global citizenship in students and young people (Oxfam, 2012). This project presents responsibility, respect for diversity, and empathy as some of the key elements towards a greater understanding of the interdependent and sustainable world in which we should hope to live. This brings to light the necessity for charities and other not-for-profit organisations to start thinking creatively about how best to approach fundraising and helping behaviours in the 21st century. It also highlights the need for harnessing the power of concepts outside of empathic concern and compassion alone to achieve these goals in the long-term.

1.2.1 Chapter 2

Throughout this literature review chapter, the traditional focus on empathic concern as facilitated by perceptions of similarity as a predictor of helping is problematised. This is demonstrated as of import at an individual level of analysis
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(Batson, 1991), however intragroup and intergroup perspectives identify perceptions of similarity as somewhat more complicated as issues of identity threat can arise (Brewer, 1991). Moreover, other considerations throughout an analysis of helping behaviours at these three discrete levels (individual, intragroup and intergroup) that have come to the fore in recent years are identified as concepts that fall under the general rubric of responsibility: nurturant tendencies (Batson, 2005), principle of care (Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010), and obligation due to extended group boundaries (Levine & Thompson, 2004) along with more emphasis on the relationship between donor and recipient groups (Nadler, 2002).

Through this examination of the previous literature on helping behaviour, responsibility is considered to be a potentially important consideration in a helping situation. However, many of the investigations from a social psychological perspective have largely overlooked responsibility as attributed to the self to help, save in examining it through its absence in the literature on the Bystander Effect (Latané & Darley, 1968) or through the lens of blame attribution (Weiner, 1985; Weiner, 1995; Zagefka, Noor, Brown, De Moura, & Hopthrow, 2011). Thus an inductive qualitative, discursive approach to exploring the concept of responsibility in more depth and in terms of how people themselves understand it in their everyday was chosen as best placed as a point of departure. This chapter therefore concludes with an examination of and justification for a mixed methods approach.

1.2.2 Chapter 3

In light of the complex and oftentimes overlooked role of responsibility in helping literature, a qualitative study can prove useful as an initial exploration of responsibility as a complex and multidimensional phenomenon and as a more systematic examination of this concept than has been previously undertaken. Such an approach focuses less on theorists’ understandings of helping behaviours and related concepts, but gains further insight into people’s own understandings of charitable giving as an example of a form of helping. This chapter details the choice method of data collection for this first study, single and multiple participant interviews. Multiple participant interviews were held with members of the general
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public as they have been previously used to good effect (for example, Stevenson & Manning, 2010), and as it is an accountable matter such interviews can show how people account for their charitable behaviour in an open semi-public forum (Wodak & Reisigl, 1999). Single interviews were conducted with charity workers or those employed in the charitable sector. Theoretical sampling was best placed in this instance as charity workers were selected due to their professional relationship with and subsequent responsibility for particular recipient groups.

Through a thematic discursive analysis (Potter & Wetherell, 1987), relying also on Sacks’ work on membership categorisation devices (Sacks, 1972), two interpretative repertoires were identified as used strategically in talk to account for or to justify not giving: empathy and responsibility.

1.2.3 Chapter 4

Chapter 4 presents the first part of the analysis of Study 1. Through a discourse analysis approach to the interviews with members of the general public and those working in the charitable sector, empathy as an interpretative repertoire (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) was identified. Moreover, taking Sack’s work on membership categorisation devices into account (Sacks, 1972), empathy was identified as a resource available to speakers to both account for giving but to also justify a lack of giving. These accounts were worked up in several ways. Presenting a version of the recipient group as similar via shared experience or history for example, as dissimilar and thus not warranting empathy or giving, or as overly similar and depicted as to blame for their situation. Furthermore this resource was seen to be more flexibly used by members of the general public, who, without a stake or vested interest in a particular charity, were not tied to a position in the way charity workers were. Thus these speakers were able to negotiate openly the more complex dilemmatic issues and concerns associated with charitable behaviour as an accountable matter, and also manage any identity concerns. Empathy was identified as being accomplished in talk by constructing specific versions of the recipient groups, and thus mobilising these versions to manage a moral identity and account for giving or withholding aid.
1.2.4 Chapter 5

Chapter 5 presents the second part of the analysis of Study 1. As the previous chapter analysed the speakers’ flexible use of the empathy repertoire, this chapter looks at how responsibility can be used as a discrete discursive resource in people’s accounting. Responsibility was deployed in a way that contrasts with how empathy was invoked. Instead of depicting a version of the recipient as similar or dissimilar and thus evoking empathy, here the speakers work up a version of the relationship between themselves as donors and a recipient as based on one of responsibility, obligation, duty and dependency. Responsibility in this way enabled the speakers to either account for giving to a particular recipient group, or justify a lack of giving while maintaining an identity as moral and responsible. The charity workers however, as in the previous chapter, were limited in their use of this resource, as by their profession must claim responsibility and are thus tied into such a position. Members of the general public conversely were able to flexibly draw on responsibility as a discrete resource in their accounting and use it to aid in their negotiation of such a dilemmatic (Billig, 1987) and complex concept as charitable behaviour.

By examining how these concepts were used as discrete discursive resources in talk, differences therefore emerged between the invocation of empathy and that of responsibility whereby empathy was drawn upon by constructing a specific version of the recipient group as worthy of help (via similarity or shared experience) and responsibility was invoked by constructing a version of the relationship between donor and recipient as one of duty, obligation and responsibility.

This conceptualisation of responsibility enabled the development of a measure of responsibility, such that the previously complex and illusive concept was operationalized as a construct via a 10-item measure that took all aspects identified as forming part of the responsibility repertoire into account. Therefore by adopting an initially qualitative approach to the study of responsibility as it relates to both empathic concern and helping, a fully grounded and ecologically sound understanding of how it is understood by people themselves could be gathered. This could then inform the shift to quantitative methods of investigation, which
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would allow these concepts to be manipulated and examined systematically in a controlled environment, as will be documented in Chapter 6.

1.2.5 Chapter 6

Chapter 6 details two quantitative studies that build on the findings from Study 1. A survey study (Study 2) allowed for the development of a measure of responsibility, and also demonstrated the independent route to helping predicted by responsibility outside of empathic concern. With this understanding, several experimental studies were then designed to identify the processes through which both of these concepts might work. This was achieved by manipulating either empathy or responsibility as normative aspects of a social identity and then presenting participants with a needy target group in the form of a charitable appeal.

These target groups were experimentally varied and thus enabled a comparison to be drawn between predictions of empathic concern to help either group, and predictions of responsibility to help. In Study 3 the perceived blameworthiness of the target group was manipulated, such that both targets formed part of the participants’ ingroup however one was construed as innocent-of-their fate and the other more to blame for their circumstances. It was hypothesised that those in the empathy condition would indicate different levels of willingness to help the target groups in question, whereas those in the responsibility condition were hypothesised to not show a significantly different amount of willingness to help either group.

Empathic concern when primed was indeed seen to result in significantly lower intentions to donate to the blameworthy ingroup than the innocent ingroup, whereas responsibility when primed as a normative aspect of the Irish identity resulted in similar levels of willingness to help across both target groups. These findings suggested that black sheep effects (Marques, 1998) could lead to a difficulty in evoking empathic concern, as the overly-similar ingroup members that were to blame for their situation could be seen to negatively influence the ingroup’s sense of a positive social identity. However, this was only apparent when participants were primed to view empathic concern as a normative aspect of their identity as Irish. Those in the responsibility condition appeared not to
discriminate against the perceptibly blameworthy target group, and were willing to help both ingroup members equally. This might suggest that responsibility was not affected by the *black sheep effect* or a social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Brewer, 1991) perspective on positive social identity motivations and positive distinctiveness.

### 1.2.6 Chapter 7

Chapter 7 presents the move to an intergroup level of analysis. To build on these results and further explore the influence empathy and responsibility exert on willingness to help, Study 4 was conducted. This study controlled for blame by presenting both target groups (children) as equally innocent of their fate. However it moved from an intragroup level of analysis, where participants’ national identity was primed and target groups were both of that same nationality, towards an intergroup level of analysis, whereby participants’ national identity was primed and the two manipulated target groups were either Irish as ingroup and Croatian as outgroup. It was hypothesised that similar to Study 3, participants in the empathy condition would display a different amount of willingness to help in comparison to those in the responsibility condition. More specifically, it was expected that when primed with empathy, participants would indicate a greater willingness to give to the ingroup target group, while those primed with responsibility were not expected to show any significantly different levels of willingness to help either target group.

Results of this study were similar to what was seen in Study 3, and confirmed the hypotheses. Empathic concern when primed as a normative aspect of the ingroup’s identity lead to more discrimination against the outgroup than did responsibility. Empathic concern was seen to induce favouritism towards the ingroup target, and resulted in participants reporting significantly greater levels of intentions to help Irish children than Croatian children. Empathic concern being primed as a normative aspect of being Irish resulted in what social identity theorists (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) would term ingroup bias or favouritism. Conversely, when responsibility was primed as a normative aspect of the Irish identity, participants were not susceptible to this SIT phenomenon and did not
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appear to discriminate against the outgroup, but reported equal intentions to help both.

To further explore the differing roles of empathy and responsibility as forming part of one’s social identity and to examine how this can subsequently impact upon helping different target groups in different contexts, Study 5 remained at the intergroup level of analysis. However, it was noted that at the intergroup level several additional considerations must be taken into account concerning the helping relationship that are not as significant at an individual or even an intragroup level perspective. These considerations involve a concern for status hierarchies between groups, power relations, political considerations and identity threat (Nadler, 2002; Brown & Lopez, 2001). Thus as the dynamic changes at an intergroup level of analysis, Study 5 examined how empathic concern and responsibility would influence donation proclivity in a situation of intergroup threat. This threat was presented as a threat to both the resources of the ingroup and through this a threat to their identity. The ingroup social identity primed at this level was student identity (as opposed to national identity). Study 5 hypothesised that participants in the empathy condition would show significantly less willingness to help a target group that presents as threatening than those in the responsibility condition.

Findings from this final study provide further support for the suggestion that both empathy and responsibility influence helping decisions in different ways. When responsibility was primed as a normative aspect of the student identity, levels of willingness to help the outgroup in the threat condition were significantly greater than willingness to help said group when empathy was primed as normative. This further suggests that responsibility can predict helping outside of empathic concern, but also that it appears to predict an offer of help in situations that are costly to the participants own ingroup, whereas empathy appears not to and predicts giving significantly greater amounts of help to the non-threatening outgroup.
1.2.7 Chapter 8

This final chapter presents a brief summary of this thesis’s findings, and begins to consider how they each contribute to the social psychological investigation of helping behaviour. Responsibility is presented as having a different set of considerations than that of empathy and is therefore able to predict helping in different contexts. Findings could be interpreted in such a way that suggests three key dimensions of responsibility. It is the more consistent giver, and thus could be viewed as altruistic due to the costly nature of the helping situations; responsibility appears to be non-biased and may not adhere to a SIT prediction of ingroup favouritism; responsibility when primed as a normative aspect of one’s identity appears to prime a more collective identity that that of empathy.

Practical implications of these findings for charitable organisations are discussed such as the potential for responsibility to lead to long-term sustained helping. Some limitations of these empirical studies, that an investigation of this mixed methods nature can present, are considered. Finally, however, it is concluded that the limitations do not undermine the general findings and several novel investigations are presented as ideas to further explore the concept of responsibility as it relates to charitable giving in future research.
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Chapter 2

The Social Psychology of Helping Behaviour

This literature review will look at how prosocial behaviour, particularly helping behaviour, has been understood and investigated in social psychology. Research on helping behaviour has largely been undertaken at three discrete levels; an individual level, an intragroup and an intergroup level. This chapter will review the main theoretical approaches and findings at each of these levels. The application of theories at each level demonstrate both the developments in the literature from one approach to another over time, and show the main factors (cognitive, motivational and affective) seen to be prominent in helping situations.

However at each level of analysis we encounter several limitations, omissions, and potential contradictions. For example while egoistic or altruistic empathy-motivated helping facilitated by perceived similarity is an important predictor at the level of the individual, such perceptions of similarity become somewhat problematic at the level of the group. Such challenges and complications can be found within each level of analysis of helping behaviour, yet several propositions outside of this empathy-similarity-helping framework have recently been formulated: nurturance at an individual level (e.g. Batson, Lishner, Cook, & Sawyer, 2005), obligation due to extended group boundaries at an intragroup level (e.g. Levine & Thompson, 2004), and a focus on the relationship between helper and recipient at an intergroup level (e.g. Nadler, 2002).
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There appears to be an underlying pattern across some of these recent propositions: the long-term aspect of helping and the understanding of the relationship as a duty of care. This formulation is suggestive of what popular understandings of the concept of ‘responsibility’ are. Subsequently, under this rubric of responsibility, it is evident that there is an emerging and as of yet underexplored route to helping that could potentially and significantly contribute to our broader understanding of helping behaviour.

Thus a focused review of how this concept of responsibility has been viewed within social psychological investigations of helping will be put forward as possibly addressing some of the gaps considered in the first sections of this literature review. One domain that has begun to look specifically at responsibility is qualitative inquiries, and Discursive Psychological contributions to the study of responsibility and prosocial behaviour will then be presented. Finally this chapter will provide a rationale and explanation of this thesis’ research question and its mixed methods approach (Creswell, 2007).

2.1 Introduction

Dovidio and colleagues (Dovidio, Piliavin, Schroeder, & Penner, 2006) suggest that prosocial behaviour is a very broad, all-encompassing concept with three main forms: helping, altruism and cooperation. While this review will address aspects of all three, and will therefore introduce a concise definition of each in turn, the main focus of this thesis is on helping behaviour in general and more specifically charitable giving and so this is where most attention will be given. Helping is defined by Dovidio et al. as “an action that has the consequence of providing some benefit to or improving the well-being of another person” (Dovidio et al., 2006, p. 22). McGuire (1994) put forward four main types of helping: casual, substantial personal, emotional and emergency. Pearce and Amato (1980) suggested a taxonomy of sorts describing the different kinds of helping; planned and formal versus spontaneous and informal, serious versus not serious, and direct versus indirect. Therefore ‘helping’ is a term that covers a broad range of different actions, therein lying the possibility of a broad range of motivations and potential precursors to these many forms of helping.
This review points to several paradoxes within the literature on prosocial behaviour. Theories of intragroup helping promote perceived similarity as a precursor to helping, a factor that is also presented by several interpersonal theorists as facilitating empathy leading to eventual helping. However, theories on intergroup helping point towards the potentially negative role of similarity (highlighted in instances of identity threat). While these work as examples of how perceptions of similarity can be re-framed as accounting for only a fraction of the explanations behind individual, intra- and intergroup helping, many fail to sufficiently acknowledge the complexities involved in intergroup similarities regarding long-term helping behaviours (especially in the form of charitable donations). Nor do they sufficiently emphasise the role of context and intergroup relations in such intentions to help or donate.

Also, as is highlighted throughout this chapter, empathic concern has traditionally held a monopoly in terms of predictors of helping, thus the role of other possible predictors has largely been overlooked, save a more strategic power relations paradigm (Nadler, 2002).

However, several interesting points of departure have emerged at each level of analysis that suggest the presence of another potentially significant set of considerations involved when making the decision to help. These possibilities are presented as nurturant tendencies (Batson, 2005), as a principle of care (Wilhelm & Bekker, 2010), as obligation (Levine & Thompson, 2004) and as a relationship between helper and recipient (Nadler, 2002). Taken together these individual considerations and the pattern amongst them suggest that there is an important and largely overlooked concept of what can be considered elsewhere in the field of psychology as responsibility. This thesis aims to develop an understanding of, and subsequently examine, these interconnected ideas as responsibility.

Investigations in social psychology that directly relate to responsibility and helping are limited, save in examining it through its absence (Latané & Darley, 1968). Those that do focus on this concept present responsibility in terms of victim accountability and blame-attrition. As such, a rationale will be worked up throughout this review for the overarching research questions in this thesis; what roles do empathy and responsibility play in decisions to help, and more specifically in decisions to engage in charitable behaviours.
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This segment of the chapter will work through the concerns for helping behaviours from an individual level of analysis. It will therefore review the key contributions in this field in terms of the theoretical debates about altruism and egoism from a biological, evolutionary and developmental perspective. The complexity of a helping situation is brought to light, and the reliance on empathic concern via perceptions of similarity as a main route to helping will be problematised. On the basis of some of this literature, some key concepts will be identified as having been overlooked or marginalised, yet having recently begun to be looked at elsewhere. This segment and the sections within therefore will present an overview of existing theoretical concerns but also indicate the limitations of some of these for a more developed understanding of the factors that can motivate decisions to help.

Evolutionary theorists and biologists have sought to understand the basic underlying factors involved in human helping behaviour, with perspectives contradicting that of the *selfish gene* attempting to understand helping more clearly. Dawkins’ view on evolution and helping was at the level of the gene as opposed to focusing on the individual, and while the ‘selfish’ term implies a self-centred approach, the meaning is actually located more in a Darwinian selection way of helping (whereby altruistic and egoistic motivations are explained at the level of the gene).

Theories that go against this include kin selection, reciprocal altruism and group selection, and also focus on the biological and genetic bases of helping (Penner, Fritzsche, Craiger, & Freifeld, 1995). Such theories suggest that helping is something innate stemming from two main motivations; a basic biological drive to act in a prosocial manner, and helping to improve the likelihood of individual survival and success. Inclusive fitness theory and kin selection suggest that one will help another if that person shares their genes, or is related to them biologically. Burnstein and colleagues (Burnstein, Crandall, & Kitayama, 1994) for example found people would help family members who were healthy and therefore more likely to reproduce and continue the bloodline, more than family members...
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who were not. Reciprocal helping involves helping when there is an expectation of a returned favour, where helping is not framed as purely altruistic but in fact strategic. Studies have shown that every culture has a norm of reciprocity (Schroeder, Penner, Dovidio, & Piliavin, 1995) and suggest that this reciprocity has an evolutionary basis (the concept of reciprocity will be returned to in more depth in the intergroup literature review).

All of these evolutionary theories of prosocial behaviour have been investigated, yet more recently proponents of a neurological or physiological basis for altruistic tendencies and theories for helping behaviours as inherited build momentum (Penner et al., 2005). Those proposing a biological basis for helping behaviours return to the original emotion seen to be involved in helping - empathic concern. Studies have shown that empathic concern is higher in individuals whose parents are also empathetic and the developmental aspects of empathy have been examined in school settings amongst primary and second-level students (Barnett, 2001). However, the more pertinent question in this review is how empathic concern is related to helping behaviours more directly.

Thus, having briefly touched on some of the broader views on helping from a biological and evolutionary psychological perspective, this chapter will now give an overview of the literature that presents a case for empathy.

2.2.1 Empathy: Egoism versus altruism

Batson (Batson et al., 1991) presents his understanding of altruism as “a motivated state with the ultimate goal of increasing another’s welfare” (p. 6), and although not denying the existence of egoistic motivations in helping behaviours, demonstrates instances in which altruistic motivations act as the primary motive. Empathy is defined as the ability to understand and share the feelings of another. Batson claimed that acts of a prosocial nature were dependent on this type of empathy, and were more often purely altruistic in motivation. Egoistic models of helping propose that when one witnesses another’s distress this is vicariously felt by the bystander and this vicarious distress is enough to motivate the other to help. Therefore helping can be viewed as more selfish than self-less, and while the outcome may remain the same these motivations are at odds with each other.
Batson’s main predictions posit that empathy is felt for another under certain circumstances (promoting the self-less position), such as perceived similarity between the help-giver and the recipient, taking the perspective of another, and acknowledging the need of another. Once empathic concern for another is felt, decisions to help are predicted to be much higher than if empathy were not a factor. The empathy-altruism link became widely accepted as a route to helping behaviours amongst individuals.

According to Batson, motivation to help is altruistic “to the degree that it is evoked by an empathic emotional response to the victim’s distress”. Using Stotland’s (Stotland, 1969) technique of different perceptual sets, participants in a study by Batson and colleagues (Toi & Batson, 1982) were asked to either observe the actions of a person in distress or imagine how that person in distress was feeling therefore taking their perspective. The former observation set was predicted to evoke less empathic concern for the individual, while the latter was predicted to evoke higher levels of empathy. In order to see whether or not empathy led to altruistic or egoistic motivation, the researchers included a second manipulation - one that created a helping situation that was either easy or difficult to escape from. It was predicted that participants experiencing low empathy in an easy-to-escape helping condition would report decreased motivation to help and that those experiencing high empathy would report increased motivation to help. Results show support for this prediction, as those experiencing high levels of empathy in both the easy and difficult-to-escape conditions were more likely to help - suggesting that their motivation was altruistic as empathy appeared to influence helping even in a costly situation.

Taking the perspective of the other can be seen to facilitate perceptions of similarity, which are often indicative of empathic concern. This particular early study has implications for helping in a costly environment or context, and the role of empathic concern in such a costly context at intra- and inter-group levels will be investigated further in Chapter 6 and 7.

However, that costly helping can be overcome by empathic concern is not indisputable evidence for its altruistic origins. Subsequently, Cialdini and colleagues (Cialdini, Brown, Lewis, Luce, & Neuberg, 1997) reinterpret and thus
provide an alternative explanation to Batson’s seminal work on the empathy-altruism hypothesis. Cialdini proposed helping was due to a self-other overlap. This was put forward on the basis that features of the self-concept can oftentimes be located outside of the individual, and inside an ‘other’. This overlapping sense of self with another was termed one-ness. While this interpretation (oneness) is not presented as purely egoistic, it is termed a “non-altruistic route to helping”.

These studies (3 in total) adopt similar methodological procedures as Batson in his work on the potential processes involved in the empathy-altruism model, however as opposed to using just a measure of empathic concern this research includes a measure of oneness as well as sadness and personal distress. The authors held issue with the changing experimental contexts or situations in which Batson attempted to eliminate systematically several egoistic motivations for helping (‘guilt’, Batson, 1988; ‘sadness’, Batson et al., 1989; and ‘personal distress’ Batson, 1991) and sought then to simultaneously eliminate multiple non-altruistic motives.

Three experiments were conducted such that participants were first instructed to imagine a family member, close personal friend, acquaintance or stranger, and then following a fictitious vignette describing this person’s eviction, their need for a telephone, or their recently orphaned children, participants filled in self-report measures of willingness to help, empathy, sadness, personal distress and oneness. This measure of oneness combined Aron et al.’s (Aron, Aron & Smollan, 1992) overlapping circles, and an item that asked the participants to rate to which extent they would use the word ‘we’ in describing their relationship with the victim. Results found ‘oneness’ as a mediator of empathic concern, and the authors suggest that it is as strong a correlate of helping behaviours as empathy, claiming that empathic concern is simply an “emotional signal” of oneness.

By ‘oneness’ Cialdini and colleagues are arguing that the perceived self-other overlap that can occur during perspective taking (for example) can result in a merging of the self and other into ‘one’. This essentially can then be viewed as leading to selfish or egoistic reasons for helping if the helper is viewing the recipient of help as in many ways an extension of themselves, suggesting the vicarious nature of empathic concern. Aron and collaborators (Aron et al., 1991) had first presented this conceptualisation of merging the self and an other, which they
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termed “the inclusion of the other in the self”. Batson and colleagues (Batson et al., 1991) approached this concept from a slightly different perspective - that empathic concern for another could occur, but would not require an overlap in senses of self to result in helping behaviours. By presenting the concept of ‘one-ness’ as an overlap of self and other, Cialdini challenges Batson’s view that all empathy-related helping is purely altruistic. Cialdini and colleagues were careful however to distinguish oneness from previously examined ‘we-ness’ (Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Clark, 1981) as not a shared sense of collective identity but an overlapping sense of selves in a dyadic relationship only.

While this contributed to the debate surrounding the direct or indirect route between empathy and helping, ‘oneness’ is a less relevant factor for this current research. This is so because Cialdini’s oneness suggests that the identities of both the helper and recipient are merged at such a ‘conceptual’ level, a complete overlapping of selves, as opposed to a more situational circumstance that could lead to feelings of similarity (as with charitable appeals for example where similar circumstances could lead to a sense of ‘oneness’).

Highlighting the importance of this set of studies for the current research, the inclusion of a new variable into a model of helping that has previously focused solely on the prominent role of empathic concern outside of the altruism-egoism debate has enabled the authors to demonstrate its utility - as not only are both variables operationalised in different ways but they are also working through different processes with different outcomes; “affected differently by situational variables (need etc) and have distinct relationships with helping behaviours” (p. 491).

This demonstrates an initial move away from empathy-altruism as a definitive and unproblematic link, however it also illustrates the monopoly empathy holds in investigations into helping behaviours at an individual level of analysis. This is demonstrated as based on similarity, and its prominence could be to the exclusion of other potentially important considerations outside of an emotion-based motivation to help.

One main aspect of this approach to the empathy-helping relationship that presents itself as unproblematic shared by these authors is the rationale that feelings of oneness and empathy due to shared experience or perspective taking
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is the main route to helping. That empathy due to shared experience could and should be harnessed by highlighting similarities and overlooking differences, as opposed to embracing difference, lends itself to an assumption that one never intervenes to help those who are different; “such a system (empathy-led helping in situations of shared perspectives) offers promising prospects for normative and educational messages that emphasize commonalities rather than differences among people” (Cialdini et al., 1997, p. 492). While Cialdini’s work has extended the boundaries in terms of conceptualising empathy and its link to helping (either altruistic or non-altruistic) and has demonstrated that empathic concern is not the only precursor to helping intentions (that oneness can act as a mediator) it fails to recognise the further possibilities of precursors to helping outside of an empathic concern or merging of the self sphere.

Therefore these arguments present the assumption that similarities, or ‘commonalities’, are the sole path to willingness to help. While many types of similarities have indeed been shown to impact upon empathy, such as trait similarity (Batson et al., 1995), affective similarity (Houston, 1990) and similarity of experience (Barnett, 1984), there remains to be seen a more comprehensive investigation into how factors impact upon helping that do not focus on similarities, merging of the self and other, or feelings of oneness and empathy at such an individual level.

Thus from an individual level of analysis, while similarity has been presented as a route to helping via empathic concern, there is a limit to how wide the investigative net has been cast. Assumptions that similarity can facilitate empathy as an emotional response and motivator for helping leaves room for further investigation into other potential precursors. Moreover, this reliance on the similarity-empathy route is seen to extend to the intragroup level of analysis also, further illustrating the presence of this concept as prominent in the studies on helping behaviour.
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2.3 Intragroup perspective: Perceptions of similarity

Similarity has been viewed as a precursor to helping through the facilitating role of empathic concern (Batson et al., 1991). However, perceptions of similarity are also seen to have an impact on helping at a group level. Social Identity Theory (SIT, Tajfel & Turner, 1979) comprises of a series of explanations and predictions of intergroup behaviour, aimed first and foremost at helping understand the dynamics of intergroup conflict. While this theory has been presented as one of intergroup conflict its predictions also have a bearing on situations of intergroup cooperation and, moreover, intragroup processes - as such this review will focus on its relevance to ingroup helping, and indicate where complexities arise in an intragroup context when empathy and similarity are concerns.

The theory of Social Identity first proposed by Tajfel (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) explains the motivations people experience for identifying with a particular social group, how they maintain positive self-esteem associated with this group, and how they respond when this positive social identity is threatened. As a theory of intergroup relations it emphasises the role of social comparisons between groups and how these serve to enhance the self-esteem of in-group members while maintaining their position in a social hierarchy. As was shown in the original minimal group experiments (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy & Flament, 1971), ingroup members, once identified as part of an ingroup (however trivial i.e. global and specific perceivers or appreciating different artists), will automatically act out of that group membership and will choose options in a minimal group context that always favour ingroup members and derogate outgroup members, even if this results in less overall rewards for the ingroup. This phenomenon, ingroup favouritism, has been replicated on many occasions in many different settings, both inside and outside the laboratory.

A self-categorisation approach (SCT, Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherell, 1987) built upon this theory and extended it to focus on the intragroup processes involved in group identification and intergroup differentiation. Focusing on the group-level properties of social behaviour (Oakes, 1994), SCT proposes that people will define themselves differently and consequently behave differently
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in different situations, such that identity is perceived to be dependent on the current context. Meta-contrasts are suggested as the process by which individuals form comparisons between outgroup and ingroup members, and between potential ingroup members and prototypical ingroup members, whereby relative similarity is the basic criteria of inclusion within the ingroup category. With such meta-contrasts acting as the basis for intergroup comparisons, SCT explains the different levels of abstraction (super-ordinate, group, individual) at which certain categorisations are made, and also the context-dependent nature of these categorisations.

Again, while SIT and SCT approaches stem from an attempt to understand intergroup behaviour, it is through their application to intra- and intergroup contexts that one can perceive the benefits ingroup members have for receiving help. Thus SIT and SCT studies, by presenting situations in an oftentimes intergroup context, can demonstrate intragroup processes involved in helping (hence there can often be overlap in discussion about intra and intergroup motivations for comparison purposes).

2.3.1 Social Identity, similarity and helping

Taking a social identity perspective (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and SCT perspective several researchers (Levine, Prosser, Evans, & Reicher, 2005) demonstrate how strength of identification with the ingroup and aspects such as perceived similarity to the ingroup can have an important impact on whether or not a bystander will intervene to help.

Levine and colleagues (Levine et al., 2005) looked at group identification and social category membership of both victim or potential recipient of help and the helper in an emergency helping situation. By making salient participants’ social identity (social identity in the form of being a fan of a specific soccer team or a general soccer fan) the authors demonstrate how when someone identified as an ingroup member was in need of help (i.e. when someone was wearing a soccer jersey of the ingroup team) they were more likely to receive help than someone wearing a rival soccer jersey or someone wearing no sign of preference between soccer teams. Thus, Levine and colleagues illustrate the dynamics of intragroup
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helping, and the importance of ingroup identification as a precursor to ingroup helping, highlighting the real-world applicability of the concept of ingroup bias or ingroup favouritism.

Studies adopting such an approach demonstrate how including outgroup members in the ingroup, and extending the boundaries of an ingroup that is in a position to help, could increase helping behaviours when re-categorisation occurs at a superordinate level of abstraction. Levine and Thompson (2004) examine how social categories can be more influential in decisions to help than geographical location or even emotional reactions to the helping situation. This study looks at the interrelations of identity (with the ingroup) and physical place (of the helper and the recipient of help) in an emergency helping situation.

SCT, while previously viewed as context which is created by other people (Condor, 1996), is here positioned as important in the understanding of sociospatial categories as well as the people within these categories, drawing on Dixon and Durheim’s view that context is in fact inherently spatial (Dixon & Durheim, 2000). SCT is presented as a novel approach to helping by framing it in terms of place identity: bridging a gap between work on sociospatial or geographical links with duty and identity salience and willingness to help.

This study took a British identity and a European identity as the two manipulations of identity salience, and an earthquake in Europe or flooding in South America as the helping scenario. The social identity of the participants (British national identity) was made salient or an identity from a higher level of abstraction (European) was made salient - thus re-categorising participants into another social identity (see Dovidio et al., 1997; Common Ingroup Identity Model). Conducted on university students in the UK, the study included measures of likelihood of helping - these included donations, consumer-purchase decisions, or sponsoring a member of the recipient group - likelihood of political intervention, and a measure of “emotional responses”. These responses were measured using Batson’s original empathy scale items (Batson et al., 1991).

Results indicate that it is not identity per se (there were no main effects of identity i.e. British or European in terms of being predictors of helping) that would lead to increased intentions to help, but the combination of identity and place of disaster. Those primed with a British identity did not appear to
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distinguish between the European disaster and the South American one, whereas those primed with a European identity demonstrated a greater willingness to help when the disaster occurred in Europe. No such distinctions were found with an intention to help politically, which is addressed as an issue for further investigation in terms of the different kinds of helping behaviours (which will be detailed more fully in the intergroup section that focuses on autonomy and dependency-oriented helping).

Moreover, empathy or emotional responses were not seen to differ across identity-primes or geographical locations, suggesting that emotional reactions are not necessarily important predictors in situations where place as relevant to identity is being investigated. Thus the complexities of the similarity-empathy relationship begins to emerge at an intragroup level, where empathic concern is not seen to have particularly strong predictive powers. This study would suggest that there are other factors of importance here above and beyond empathic concern.

2.3.2 Similarity, identity and long-term helping

A novel application of social identity theory in the study of helping behaviour at an intragroup level involves understanding sustained, long-term, planned helping such as volunteering. Role-identity, the adopting of a particular social identity that entails elements of volunteering as central to this identity, has been used to understand why people engage in volunteering for long periods of time. Initially an individual level of analysis was used to look at volunteering, focusing on the prosocial personality as the main component in decisions to engage in such prosocial behaviour. Oliner and Oliner (Oliner & Oliner, 1992) proposed an altruistic-personality as the underpinning explanation for those who rescued Jews during the Holocaust across Europe, and frame most of these rescues as long-term in nature as for the most part they involved helping for periods of between 2-5 years.

Penner (Penner, 2002) also looked at sustained helping, specifically volunteerism, but broadened the focus from simply a prosocial personality perspective to one that took both dispositional and organisational (intragroup) influences
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into account. Using the two factors shown to be key in what has been termed the prosocial personality, Penner used online survey data to investigate dispositional and organisational (intragroup) influences on people’s volunteering roles. These two factors (as demonstrated in Penner, Fritzsche, Craiger, & Freifeld, 1995) were Other-oriented Empathy (which includes both measures of compassion and social responsibility; these measures will be further detailed in Chapter 6) and Helpfulness (which measures actual acts of helping).

Results led to the development of a conceptual model of sustained helping or volunteering, which used a timeline to demonstrate the pathway from initial volunteerism (decision to volunteer) to the formation of a volunteer role identity (Penner, & Finkelstein, 1998; Grube & Piliavin, 2000) and subsequently to sustained volunteerism due to the integration of volunteer-characteristics into their social identity. As such, the extent to which one identifies with a particular social identity can have important implications for the behaviours being carried out by that individual, including helping behaviours.

However, in the development of this role identity approach, empathy remained as one of the integral factors in the model of prosocial personality. While this thesis focuses on situational motivations to help, the emphasis on empathy (even if dispositional) from yet another perspective in the literature on helping behaviour indicates a reliance on it as an almost universal explanation to the exclusion of other less emotive potential precursors.

2.3.3 Relationship between helper and recipient

Contextual and situational factors have more recently been taken into account in a direct way. Strmer, Snyder and Omoto (2005) attempted to redress the apparent lack of group level studies on sustained (long-term or volunteering) helping behaviours by looking at intergroup emotions and their role in helping situations taking the group membership of helper and recipient into account. Whereas an SIT approach to helping would predict ingroup bias and outgroup derogation, the authors’ aim was an understanding of the processes involved in both in- and out-group helping. Ingroup helping was hypothesised to be facilitated by two factors (which so far in this review have been presented as empathic concern and
perceived similarity). Empathy was depicted as dependent on perceived similarity between helper and recipient, perceived attachment to the person in need, and the ability to take the perspective of another (facilitated by perceptions of similarity). Group emotions such as empathy and intergroup attraction (dependent on a positive evaluation of the other in terms of characteristics, attributes or traits) were compared. Thus the complex nature of a helping situation at a group level of analysis was taken into account and acknowledged as involving more than just empathic concern as a contributing factor.

Data from this longitudinal study on volunteering, whose participants were homo- or heterosexual volunteers with an AIDS organisation, allowed for real-world ingroup or outgroup membership on the basis of sexual orientation. The study directly tested the prediction that ingroup helping would be moderated by empathy for the recipient due to perceived similarity, and outgroup helping (heterosexual volunteer with a homosexual recipient of help) would be moderated by attraction, and outgroup members would be perceived to be dissimilar accordingly. Helping in this context was measured in relation to 3 different types of criteria; amount of time per week spent with the recipient, the amount of practical help given to the recipient, and the length of time the volunteer stays with the organisation. The study was administered to the participants at 4 different time points in their volunteering career.

Results showed support for their predictions and thus contributes to social psychological theory on intragroup helping as it demonstrates how empathy can be a precursor to helping when the recipient is perceived as similar, but that in the absence of this perception of similarity and subsequent empathy, helping may still be given, due to intergroup attraction - emphasising the possibility of outgroup helping in the absence of any type of empathy (altruistic or otherwise). It also illustrates the broader point that empathy-motivated helping does not capture all of the complexities involved in helping in a group-level context.

**2.3.4 Dissimilarity and outgroup derogation**

In attempts to understand helping in intragroup settings through the lens of empathy via perceptions of similarity, incidents whereby members of an outgroup
are not granted empathy are useful points of departure. Such a line of research in the helping literature (and more so perhaps in the intergroup prejudice literature to come) looks at retaining uniquely human secondary emotions for ingroup members as a form of ingroup favouritism and bias, and allocating more primary emotions shared with animals as well as humans to outgroup members. This requires identification with the ingroup and also a form of derogation towards the outgroup, and studies have shown that this phenomena, known as infrahumanisation, can occur in helping situations (Cuddy, Rock & Norton, 2007).

This type of phenomenon is closely related to dehumanisation, which involves the devaluing of outgroup members as less human than ingroup members, and has previously been presented as an explanation for some of the atrocities of the Holocaust (Haslam, 2006). Again, however, this type of devaluation and derogation of the outgroup by the ingroup, which leads to a reservation of resources, aid and help for ingroup members only, occurs more often when those ingroup members strongly identify with their own group and see the other group as sufficiently dissimilar.

Thus in attempting to understand motivating factors that lead to ingroup helping, it is oftentimes necessary to investigate these in a comparative context whereby ingroup helping is seen in contrast to outgroup helping. However, this intragroup section has attempted to place its emphasis on SIT and SCT -based studies that highlight the various intragroup processes and demonstrate when ingroup members will receive help (including several suggested explanations as to why).

However, it has also brought to light several concerns and emphasises the limitations in drawing on an empathy-similarity based explanation for helping at a level of analysis whereby similarity is assumed to go hand in hand with shared group membership.

### 2.3.5 The distinction between similarity and shared group membership

Five aspects of the relationship between a helper and a helpee were put forward by Dovidio and colleagues (Dovidio et al., 2006): attraction, similarity, quality of
relationship, group membership, and racial characteristics. That similarity and group membership are presented as two distinct features of this relationship is of interest and deserving of some discussion.

Similarity has been previously discussed in terms of its relationship to empathic concern (similarity of traits, attitudes, experience etc have all been used in experimental studies looking to manipulate the ability to take the perspective of another) and subsequent intentions to (or actual) help. Similarity in terms of nationality, personality and attitudes were seen by Dovidio (Dovidio, 1984) to instigate more helping than dissimilarities, and from a biological basis of behaviour the similarity-helping relationship has been viewed as part of a cost-reward motivation process. However, within these five aspects shared group membership is conceptualised as something that differs from similarity - “although similarity often refers to the correspondence of attitudes and traits between two individuals and can vary by degree...shared group identity represents the all-or-none categorisation of a person as a member of your own group or as a member of another group” (Dovidio et al., 2006, p. 93).

Therefore perhaps similarity as a measure (similarity of experience often seen in both studies of charitable donations and in the charitable appeals themselves) is only one form of tapping into what Cialdini would term a sense of oneness with the recipient of help or the group in need. Shared group membership appears to facilitate giving in terms of allocations of resources (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) which are more likely to be given to those within the same group, and also in terms of the interdependence and common fate that a sense of ‘we-ness’ can instigate for group members (Flippin & Horstein, 1996). However sharing the same group could also mean that helping those who share group membership with you would ultimately also benefit the self, as opposed to perceptions of similarity - unless these perceptions of similarity lead to a shift in cognition and categorisation of the self and other are moved from “a similar other and me” to “we” (Self-Categorisation Theory, Turner et al., 1987).

Dovidio and colleagues (Dovidio et al., 1997) work mobilising the concepts of the common ingroup identity model (Gaertner & Eisenberg, 1997) in order to assess both de- and re-categorisation of groups on willingness to help demonstrated that former outgroup members were helped after re-categorisation - and this was
seen to be more than just perceived similarity exerting an impact, but due more to the fact that the participants shared group membership.

As such, relying on similarity as an explanation for helping limits the contexts in which such helping predictions can hope to be made. In fact, similarity can also prove complicated to the point whereby it can actually hinder helping behaviours (in cases of identity threat for example). Thus, the complicated nature of the empathy-similarity-helping triad is further established.

2.3.6 Similarity, social identity and identity threat

To return to the original motivations proposed by social identity theory, the need to be included but also the need to be distinctive is fundamental to social group identification. By identifying with a social group the need to be included is satisfied. However depending on the group (whether it is a minority or majority group) this inclusiveness in a group where members share some of the same attributes could impinge on the need for distinctiveness. In order to also fulfil this need one will engage in intergroup comparisons to differentiate their own ingroup from another outgroup, therefore satisfying the need to be distinctive.

These needs are in constant tension with each other, as their very nature creates a paradoxical situation where striving to meet one need inevitably leaves the other need lacking, as proposed by Brewer’s (1991) Optimal Distinctiveness Theory. Theories of superordinate groups and higher order levels of abstraction can therefore fulfil an inclusiveness need but can threaten the distinctiveness of the original in-group and its members.

This distinction can result in a situation of identity threat, conceptualised through-out the past few decades as a threat to the distinctiveness of one’s social grouping (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000), a threat to their positive social identity (Branscombe & Wann, 1994), a threat to their status in the social hierarchy (depending on whether intergroup relations are stable or unstable) (Ethier & Deaux, 1994) and a threat to the collective and personal self-esteem that is associated with a positive social identity (Long & Spears, 1998).

Brown and Lopez (2001) examined the complex relationship between intergroup similarity and harmonious intergroup relations. Reviewing research carried
out on the Contact Hypothesis (Allport, 1954) they suggest that perceived similarity to the group can in fact be perceived as a threat to the distinctiveness of the identity of this group - and this identity threat can then lead to intergroup conflict. By taking a Social Identity perspective on the roles of similarity and difference in intergroup relations, they surmise that while interpersonal similarity can lead to interpersonal attraction the opposite can be seen for intergroup similarities.

This can also be seen in the research being carried out on helping behaviour, as perceived similarity can at times result in a negative reaction to helping or a rejection completely (Jones & Aronson, 1978). Thus in situations of ingroup identification or re-categorisation, a positive helping outcome can be the result. However, this can be an unstable boundary to cross, as over-similarity and threat to group distinctiveness could be viewed negatively and result in a lack of helping, once more emphasising the complex nature of a similarity-helping link.

As such, many studies that adopt an S.I.T. approach to the study of helping behaviours can oftentimes focus both on the intragroup processes involved in intra (or ingroup) helping (Self-categorisation theory perspectives also) and simultaneously on how ingroup helping differs from outgroup helping (outgroup derogation for example), signifying the initial intergroup nature of S.I.T as a theory of intergroup conflict. Having reviewed some of the key theoretical and empirical contributions within the social identity tradition as they relate to helping, it is perhaps no longer useful to discuss such approaches to helping without moving forward to incorporate some of the theoretical advancements in social-identity-based helping from an intergroup perspective.

To sum, as empathy and similarity have been shown as important factors prominent in intragroup level investigations and explanations of helping, the reliance on the predictive ability of such an explanation is problematic. The complex relationship between similarity, ingroup identity and perceptions of threat suggests inconsistencies when it comes to helping another. These complexities multiply further when shifting to the intergroup level of analysis, where similarity is also a prominent explanatory factor, but where the multi-faceted relationship dynamics such as changing political contexts and hierarchical power relations are important considerations.
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2.4 The intergroup perspective: The strategic side of helping

This review has looked at theories developed to engage in both individual and intragroup level analyses of helping behaviour. They have highlighted mainly empathy at an individual level, and perceptions of similarity and group membership at an intragroup level, and indicated the limitations of this as an approach to understanding helping behaviours. These limitations, and the challenges they bring to bear on an examination of helping, are highlighted further in the intergroup literature.

Following a social identity tradition of intergroup relations, Nadler’s (2002) intergroup helping as status relations model of helping (IHSR model) emphasises the use of helping as a mechanism for the in-group, focusing on power dynamics and strategy. The nature of this helping behaviour can act to maintain the differences between the in-group and the out-group. The nature of help refers to autonomy-oriented (help that encourages the out-group to be independent) or dependency-oriented help (help that keeps the out-group dependent on the in-group’s support). It is the latter type of help which further divides groups and maintains their differences in power - such that in so far as the nature of help can affect the power relations of groups, it can also reflect it (Worchel, 1984).

This model of helping shows group status and its stability and legitimacy as the most relevant factors when giving help in intergroup contexts. It also illustrates the broader point being put forward thus far: that there could be concerns above and beyond emotional motivations such as empathic concern that impact upon decisions to help, factors that need to be both identified and taken into consideration. Evidently, at this intergroup level progress has been made towards identifying such considerations with Nadler’s model of helping that looks at other elements involved in helping relationships, and at helping as essentially based on the understandings one group has of its relationship with another.
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2.4.1 Helping as based on status relations

Several studies have adopted Nadler’s model and have worked through the predictions made that are dependent on identification with the ingroup, stability and legitimacy of the higher group’s status, and also how this form of helping can be framed as defensive helping when the dominant group is experiencing some form of identity threat (including perceptions of over-similarity to the ingroup). A series of studies by Nadler and Halabi (2006) demonstrate that when status relations appear illegitimate and unstable, and when group boundaries are impermeable, the only way for a group to enhance their positive social identity is by challenging this inequality and working towards elevating their ingroup status. This, however, can be directly undermined in a situation in which the dominant group offers to provide help (in some form or another) to the subordinate group, as this makes salient the differences between each group and can highlight the inferior status of the recipient group and the dominant status of the helping group in a way that undermines the ingroups’ attempts at social competition (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

This series of studies (Nadler & Halabi, 2006) focuses on the recipient of help and their perceptions of stable or unstable status relations, type of help, and ingroup identification, in keeping with the IHSR model, as opposed to the point of view of the giver of help. This demonstrates a shift in conceptualising helping from the perspective of empathy with the recipient to viewing helping as based on a relationship of some sort: one outside of the emotional response and motivation of compassion and empathy.

These studies look at low-status group members and how they react to offers of help. The first study in this series of experiments looked specifically at the link between stability of group status relations and help-giving in a minimal group situation. “Reactions to assumptive help from a high-status outgroup are characterised by feelings of hostility toward the helper” (Schneider, Major, Luhtanen, & Crocker, 1996, p. 100), and results of this experiment that divided participants into global or specific perceivers and manipulated stability by suggesting either consistent or generally inconsistent scores across tasks, showed that indeed when status hierarchy between two groups were seen to be unstable, being helped by a
member of a higher status group led to the participants feeling worse, favouring the ingroup more, and perceiving the outgroup as more aggressive.

Help in this case came in the form of a fictitious and more capable outgroup member offering the answers to difficult questions in a second task. Dependent measures included affect, evaluation of the outgroup, levels of ingroup favouritism and perceptions of similarity or homogeneity between both in- and out-groups. Thus when the low-status group’s attempts at social competition were damaged by the high-status group’s offer of help, the low-status group reacted through derogation against the outgroup and perceiving them as more aggressive (as a way of regaining positive distinctiveness).

The second experiment in this series addressed the same hypotheses, but used real groups (with Arab Israelis and Jewish Israelis) as the researchers sought to investigate these effects by not only comparing a helping situation with a no-helping one (as in Study 1) but help from a high status outgroup member compared to help from an ingroup member, and when status relations were perceived as stable and unstable. The procedure was similar to the previous study, with stability manipulated through fictitious reports of average abilities on tasks of Arab or Jewish Israelis remaining consistent over time, or appearing inconsistent. Whereas in the previous experiment a fake outgroup member participant provided help to the low-status ingroup participant, in this study the experimenter who had introduced himself as either Arab or Jewish depending on the cohort of participants provided assumptive help (help that is not directly asked for but just presumed as required) to the low status member. Once again dependent measures included affect, ingroup favouritism and outgroup evaluation.

Findings suggest that when status relations were depicted as unstable, and a high status outgroup member (here the experimenter) offered assumptive help, participants were more depressed and more likely to derogate the outgroup and favour the ingroup (as a means to regain positive distinctiveness) as this condition led to greater perception of threat to the social identity of the ingroup members. This demonstrates the perspective of the recipient of help in situations where status inequality forms the context of a helping relationship outside of a minimal group paradigm.
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To further consolidate these hypotheses a third study looked at level of identification with the ingroup in the context of unstable status relations and assumptive help from an in- or out-group member. Following the same procedure as Study 2, with ingroup identification manipulated by either reading an article on the unique contribution of the ingroup culture, or a neutral article, the findings were consistent with previous studies and suggest that when high identifiers are offered assumptive help from a higher status outgroup member, they are more likely to derogate the outgroup, favour the ingroup and experience negative affect.

2.4.2 Helping as an identity-related behaviour

Thus an additional effect of Nadler’s model is how groups respond to a threat to their social identity, as this previous study has shown. This is an important element of any helping relationship and one that was highlighted as such once similarity-based empathic concern was not deemed a necessary precursor to helping, and not necessarily appropriate an explanation for helping in cases of identity threat at an intergroup level (Brown & Lopez, 2001). Two further investigations also demonstrate how this occurs in an intergroup setting.

The first of these focused on national identity threat as a precursor to outgroup helping, which was offered in order to re-affirm this threatened identity (van Leeuwan, 2007). Dutch participants were subjected to a manipulation that threatened the Dutch identity and culture. Following this manipulation, participants were informed about the very recent (matter of weeks) Asian Tsunami and were asked how best the Netherlands should help, if at all. Items included both dependency- and autonomy-oriented forms of helping, and were in a domain that was specifically unique and positively related to the Dutch national identity - water management.

Results showed that when Dutch national identity was perceived to be under threat (hypothetical merger with the EU on several important domains) participants were more likely to endorse outgroup help when it was domain-specific and positively linked to their national identity, and also when it allowed them to continue control over this aid. A follow-up study allowed the researcher to further
investigate the role of this uniquely Dutch form of helping. This time their self-reports of perceived identity threat were measured at two time points - the first on reading the vignette (manipulation about the EU threatening unique aspects of the Dutch identity) and again on completing the items relating to forms of outgroup helping. The results of this more complicated second study mirrored the first, in that when national identity was threatened participants were more likely to endorse outgroup helping that was both positively linked to their identity (e.g. water management) and also dependency-oriented in nature. Moreover, participants were less likely to provide aid to an outgroup which was associated with ingroup guilt for a past event (Aceh in Indonesia, a former Dutch colony) when in the high threat condition.

This study also showed that, using the two time points, perceptions of identity threat were seen to reduce when participants reported intentions to help the outgroup in the ways described above. This highlights the strategic nature of helping, and how outgroup helping can often be useful when facing a threat to identity. Identity threat was seen to lead to increased willingness to help on an identity-relevant domain, and also consequently lead to a decrease in perceived identity threat after help was given (intentions were expressed).

The second of these investigations illustrating the integral role of identity management and identity content in helping behaviours was by Hopkins and colleagues (Hopkins et al., 2007) and examined how helping can be used as a platform to strategically improve an ingroup’s seemingly negative stereotype. Participants were primed to believe the outgroup (English) perceived their ingroup (Scottish) as mean or tight-fisted, and in order to counteract this threat to a positive social identity participants were seen to increase their willingness to volunteer, their drive to be depicted as generous, and overall for their group to be perceived as more helpful. This form of social creativity would be beneficial to an outgroup in need of help, however the motivation to help would not necessarily be considered altruistic.
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2.4.3 Helping as based on a relationship

These studies demonstrate the strategic nature of outgroup helping, and how it can in fact be of benefit to the ingroup. They also demonstrate the complexities of helping at the intergroup level of analysis, and re-affirm the argument that empathy and similarity are not necessarily the most pertinent or appropriate explanatory factors in a helping relationship. Both Hopkins and colleagues’ and van Leeuwan’s studies confirm that when the national identity of an ingroup is under threat the group will offer help to an outgroup on identity-relevant domains (or see the very act of helping itself as the identity relevant domain) in order to re-affirm their positive distinctiveness and regain a positive social identity. However, this aid is endorsed only in so far as it remains under the tight control of the ingroup (van Leeuwan, 2007), suggesting that this type of intergroup helping, while spurred by perceived threat to the ingroup, can result in outgroup dependency.

The dependency/autonomy-oriented helping dichotomy (Nadler, 2002) provides a useful platform from which to focus on understanding the different motivations for helping at an intergroup level. The consequences of choosing one form over the other are of importance for recipient groups. However, more than this, these approaches to intergroup helping in such a context thus demonstrate several key concerns that are not often acknowledged within an empathy-helping or empathy via similarity explanation of helping: such as a focus on the type of help given, as opposed to whether help is given, as based on the understandings of the relationship between the helper and the recipient.

2.4.4 Identity threat and defensive helping

Nadler and Halabi (2006) contributed enormously to the study of intergroup relations in helping behaviours, and demonstrated how a low-status subordinate group will react to offers of help from a dominant high-status group. However, the other side of this coin, the perspective of the high-status outgroup as help giver, is examined in a further set of studies by Nadler, Harpaz-Gorodeisky and Ben-David (2009).
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The authors look at how a high status group will react to an unstable status-relations context in which they perceive the low status group to pose a threat - and the nature of help that is offered to counter this threat, dependency-oriented as it is, is termed defensive helping. They also demonstrate how making a common ingroup identity (Dovidio et al., 1997) salient can lead to the high-status group offering autonomy oriented help to the low-status group. This line of studies brings together previous models of helping behaviours and the strategic motivations for intergroup helping depending on intergroup relations, but also research on identity threat and how this can be overcome in such an intergroup context. In order to thoroughly investigate the characteristics and consequences of defensive helping systematically, Nadler and colleagues conducted 3 experiments that focused on two main types of status threat (both relative status threat to positive distinctiveness of the group; one threat related to achievements, one threat related to status). Study 1 demonstrated how defensive helping can operate in a minimal group setting. Defensive helping is evident when more help is given to an outgroup that poses a threat to ingroup status than one that doesn’t pose such a threat, it takes the form of dependency-oriented helping, and it is often given independent of the recipient’s actual state of need (Nadler, Harper-Gorodeisky, & Ben-David, 2009, p. 825).

This first study presented a situation where ingroup identification to a trivial group (e.g. global perceivers) was manipulated by varying the participants’ levels of prototypicality (typical or aypical perceivers within their group). Participants were then informed that the group they belonged to had scored either relatively higher or relatively lower on a second task in comparison to the other group (e.g. specific perceivers). Participants were then placed in a situation whereby they believed they were the masters of a quiz being conducted online with fellow in- and out-group members, some who were presented as struggling, and the participant was invited to provide dependency-oriented help if they so wished (showing them the answer directly as opposed to a hint). The amount of times the participant chose to help a struggling member of the outgroup was recorded as the dependent helping measure. Results supported the defensive helping hypothesis as participants provided most outgroup help when they both identified with their group (as global or specific perceivers) and when the outgroup posed a threat.
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Their second study illustrated the same working of the phenomenon, but in a real-world setting, and focusing specifically on the target of help and the lack of responsiveness to the actual need of the recipient. The procedure was similar to the laboratory study previous to this, however the social identity invoked was that of the participants high-school, and the threat was given in the form of fictitious scholastic achievement that were either better or worse than another high school. The quiz was conducted in a similar manner, with outgroup members struggling and requiring help, and the dependency-oriented helping act (giving the direct answer) was the dependent measure of interest. The actual need of the recipient was measured by asking the participants to rate how difficult they thought the question that required an answer was. Results mirrored those of the minimal group study previously reported, the target that posed the greatest threat was helped the most.

Both of these studies primed an identity and manipulated a threat based on the achievements of the group, with the situational status of the groups related to these achievements. However the final experiment in this series, Study 3, focused on the structural status of the groups involved, which relates more to the hierarchy of each group. Participants were therefore primed with a stable or unstable group-status identity (school and geographical region as social identity; participants were teamed with a school that was either ranked higher or lower than themselves in terms of status and prestige).

To further differentiate this study from the previous two, and to further develop an understanding of defensive helping, this study also manipulated several levels of self-categorisation whereby students/participants were required to think of themselves as separate to the partner school (partner for the task of the experiment), as sharing a common identity with the partner school, or placed in a control condition. Stability was manipulated through instructions that indicated the partner school (lower-status) had either maintained a poor performance over the previous years on the required task, or had been steadily improving. Once again participants engaged in a task that invited them to help an outgroup member who was struggling; this time the participant had a choice as to whether they gave the full answer (dependency-oriented), a hint (autonomy-oriented) or no help. This acted as the dependent measure. Findings suggest that those
participants who felt a threat to their group’s status, who were primed to think of their school as unique and separate to the other, were more likely to provide dependency-oriented help to the out-group. Those primed with a more common identity were shown to provide more autonomy-oriented help when status was threatened.

To sum, in these key experiments the authors sought to show how more help is given to outgroup members when they pose a threat to the ingroup, that this help is usually not particularly concerned with the needs of the recipient, and that it subsequently comes in the form of dependency-oriented help, but can be overcome through re-categorisation of the groups’ social identity. These are all strategic concerns. Such a rational approach to helping is outside of the realm of emotions such as empathy and compassion, or emotions evoked by perceived similarity between helper and helpee. This approach (Nadler’s 2002 IHSR model) does not take empathy or compassionate feelings into consideration, assuming that at a group level these abstract emotions do not exert such an influence (Batson, 1997; Brown & Lopez, 2001). It focuses on relationships between helper and helpee. This approach allows only for an explanation of helping as motivated by strategy and self-concern, however. One would question if there exists a middle-ground by way of explanation, as opposed to the emotional empathy and compassion motivations for helping at one end of the continuum, and ‘darker’ (Worchel, 1984; Nadler, 2002) strategic and control-based motivations for helping at the opposite end. There is a literature of helping outside of this control-based approach at the intergroup level, however, in the form of cooperation.

2.4.5 Cooperation and helping

Regarding the relationship between status relations and helping behaviours, cooperation is particularly relevant as it commonly appears as the antitheses of conflict in intergroup studies, and intergroup helping can oftentimes be viewed as cooperation. However, a main difference lies in the equal status of both groups (which is assumed in cooperation) and the power hierarchies that can already exist or can subsequently be created (implied within helping).
Kohn (1986) defined cooperation as “an arrangement that is not merely non-competitive but requires us to work together in order to achieve our goals” (p. 6). The distinction between intergroup cooperation (as seen in studies adopting Allport’s Contact Hypothesis paradigm, 1954 and some of the work with Gaertner’s Common Ingroup Identity Model, 1997) and intergroup helping becomes clear when one views helping as a product of power relations, demonstrated in Nadler’s work on *Intergroup Helping as Status Relations* (2002).

While studies promoting superordinate group identities provide evidence for reductions in in-group bias, out-group derogation, and other factors that are influenced by these cognitions such as evaluation and self-disclosure (Dovidio et al., 1997), helping can be shown as a consequence but often in a way that differs from a more simplistic or basic understanding of helping: acknowledging first the need of another (group) and secondly acknowledging your own (group’s) ability to provide help. Instead, helping can be viewed as a self-focused goal, strategic in nature with perhaps not-so-beneficial long-term consequences for the recipient.

### 2.5 Conclusions from previous literature

To review, the literature on helping from three discrete levels of analysis has been presented. At each of these levels certain inconsistencies, for example the positive or negative influence of perceived similarity, were identified that would suggest other potential factors in the investigation of helping behaviours be taken into consideration.

At an individual level the question of the altruistic or egoistic basis of empathy has been prominent, and empathy was seen as facilitated by similarity. However, and maintaining the prominence of empathy in helping investigations, at a group level empathy via perceptions of similarity appears somewhat problematic. Issues of identity threat and over-similarity can highlight the complex nature of an empathy-similarity link. Furthermore, the move to the intergroup level of analysis demonstrates that similarity has less than straightforward predictive powers both in terms of whether help will be given and the type of help that will be offered.

Other elements emerge as potentially important when considering the limitations of an approach to helping constrained by issues of empathy and similarity.
At an intergroup level strategic concerns were evidenced as influencing decisions to help. However, above and beyond strategy and status another set of considerations features prominently throughout: caring outside of empathic concern (Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010), a sense of duty and obligation outside of emotions (Levine & Thompson, 2004), and an understanding of the relationship between helper and helpee (Nadler, 2002). This pattern or emerging set of concerns outside of empathy and similarity-led helping can be seen as beginning to potentially address a gap in helping studies. Taking the challenges and limitations of the literature on helping at each of these levels and this emerging set of considerations into account, a common theme continues to arise as potentially important. This theme has been looked at elsewhere across the psychological literature, often under the rubric of responsibility.

However, even where the concept of responsibility has been looked at, there is a lack of coherence between the attempts at its investigation. Within the helping domain responsibility has been examined largely through its absence (Latane & Darley, 1968; Latané & Darley, 1970), or demarcated as blame-attribution. The following section will therefore detail how responsibility has begun to emerge, often as a consideration under the guise of another terminology, across all three levels of the literature on helping.

2.5.1 Alternative routes to helping

While maintaining a concern with the impact of empathic concern, at an individual level several authors have broadened the lens through which they examine helping. Nurturant Tendencies were presented as another concern for those engaged in empathy-motivated helping, and it was defined as encompassing concepts of protection, nurturing and compassion. Through nurturant tendencies Batson (Batson, Lishner, Cook, & Sawyer, 2005) demonstrated how not all empathy is derived from such an egoistic perspective proposed by Cialdini and colleagues (Cialdini et al., 1997), as the targets that are in most receipt of empathy in these 2005 studies are those who rank lowest on self-reported perceived similarity with the participant (namely dogs and puppies; “Regardless of age, dogs are typically in the role of pet, and so dependent on humans for nurturant care”, p. 21).
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Batson’s (Batson et al., 2005) unique studies demonstrate how the link between perceived similarity and empathy is at best more complex than has been acknowledged, and at worst simply the result of confounds in experiments such as liking and self-protection (Batson et al., 2005). Secondly, it utilizes a different species in an empathy experiment to investigate whether similarity at its most fundamental level can be linked to empathy. Thirdly, by proposing an alternative route to empathy Batson is also proposing an alternative route to helping. *Nurturant tendencies* are presented as intrinsic motivations, as innate parts of what it is to be a social animal, and Batson’s reliance on original McDougall theorizing (‘parental instinct’ and ‘tender emotion’, McDougall, 1908; Batson et al., 2005) gives rise to their depiction as another form of empathy outside of similarity: compassion and protection.

It is worth noting that while Batson’s previous work places much emphasis on the similarity between donor and recipient of help as the basis of helping, this new conceptualisation of nurturance does not have the same requirements. Indeed nurturance is depicted as something that is instigated in a situation where the other party (stranger, child, animal) is seen as dissimilar to the participant. Batson fails to highlight or draw much allusion to this aspect of nurturance - perceived dissimilarity or difference - save the notion that in order to perceive someone as vulnerable or in need of help, one must first acknowledge the differences between recipient of help and giver of help, if only in terms of capability (Batson, Eklund, Chermok, Hoyt, & Ortiz, 2007). However nurturance is still assumed another pathway towards empathic concern for another, leading subsequently to helping.

Other authors in the field of empathic concern and its relationship with helping behaviours move away from this assumption however, and present an innovative and promising alternative to the compassionate and empathic drive. Wilhelm and Bekkers (2010) focused on some of the developmental theorising of Eisenberg and Hoffman (1982; 2000). Eisenberg’s stage theory of prosocial moral reasoning suggests that norms, values and duty-orientations internalise throughout development, and Hoffman also posits that helping is due to an internalised value that one *should* help in his theory of moral development.

To build upon this work, Wilhem and Bekkers examine how empathic concern as a dispositional trait could in fact be the first step or the precursor to something
2. THE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF HELPING BEHAVIOUR

they term a *principle of care* - “the endorsement of a moral principle that one should help others in need” (p. 11). From a moral-development perspective it is suggested that empathic concern is perhaps more superficial, and can be observed in young children that have not yet reached the ability for higher level cognition. However when this level is reached, the initial empathic concern usually felt when someone is in need is “transformed” or “replaced” by the more idealistic value-driven cognitive process of moral obligation and a general principle of care.

Dispositional empathic concern is shown to be mediated by principles of care. While the empathy-helping relationship has been studied and presented as of prominent importance in psychology (Batson et al., 1991; Cialdini et al., 1997) many of the ways in which it has been operationalised have involved items on empathy-scales that could in fact be related to aspects of what the authors here term *principles of care*. The authors demonstrate, through the use of large-scale social survey data from across the U.S.A. with helping items including long-and short-term helping (involving dealing with strangers as opposed to friends, family, and acquaintances), that there is a separate pathway from empathy-helping to principle of care-helping, suggesting that both are separate correlates of helping behaviour. The principle of care term implies moral obligation and duty and it is presented more in line with values and traits that are passed on through family members and less associated with the particular perceptions of the recipient of help themselves.

Thus from an individual level of analysis more recent studies by Batson (Batson et al., 2005) and Wilhelm and Bekkers (2010) have presented an alternative aspect to helping outside of a straightforward empathy route, one that can be named *nurturant tendencies* or *principal of care*.

At a group level of analysis, work has also indicated a move from explanations based solely on empathy and similarity and have other concerns that could impact upon helping as their focus. Levine and Thompson (2004), for example, in their study on intentions to help when geographical category boundaries are extended, suggest that a sense of duty and obligation to help those who fall within the category boundaries, here framed as geographical boundaries, once they are viewed as identity-relevant places can explain why people help; “as different identities
become salient, the places for which people feel a sense of responsibility may also shift” (Levine & Thompson, 2004, p. 233).

Nadler’s dependency/autonomy-oriented helping dichotomy (2002) is also suggestive of a route to helping outside of empathic concern, one that focuses on the importance of the relationship between helper and recipient, and how that relationship is understood. Much of this move away from the limitations of an empathy-driven explanation for helping and the complex motivator of perceived similarity could together be termed responsibility: nurturance, principle of care, duty and obligation, and ability to help.

However, responsibility as a concept within the social psychology of helping has not been systematically investigated, save through its absence (Latané & Darley, 1968; the Bystander Effect). Thus a review of how it has been examined in relation to helping behaviours thus far will now be presented.

### 2.5.2 The undervalued role of responsibility

To review, the previous three sections have presented an overview of the main theoretical and empirical contributions to the understanding of helping behaviours from an individual, intragroup and intergroup perspective. Empathic concern was presented as an important and prominent feature of interpersonal helping, and the empathy-altruism hypothesis (Batson et al., 1991) promoted empathy via perspective-taking, and perceptions of similarity, as a motivation for helping.

Perceptions of similarity and ingroup membership formed the basis of an SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) explanation of helping from an intragroup perspective, whereby ingroup bias or favouritism was found to be predictive of increased ingroup helping (Levine et al., 2005). Intergroup theories of helping however introduce a more complex set of factors, whereby power, status relations, and situations of identity threat combine to present a view of helping relationship dynamics that can be strategic and defensive (Nadler et al., 2009).

While these three approaches have contributed to our understandings of a wide array of concepts and processes important to the appreciation of prosocial actions, there remain several gaps which require addressing. At an individual level, empathic concern has been suggested as not the sole route to helping, or
not an ultimately altruistic route (Cialdini et al., 1997). Also, principal of care has been put forward as a matured version of empathy found to be based on moral duty (Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010) and Batson’s more recent theorising suggests the importance of factors such as protection and nurturance (Batson et al., 2005). From an intragroup perspective ingroup favouritism promotes helping, and while an SCT approach to helping suggests interchangeability and perceptions of similarity that lead to such helping, a further application suggests obligation felt for those included within the group boundary (Levine & Thompson, 2004). Finally, an intergroup approach has presented helping within intergroup relations as strategic and begun to emphasise the importance of how a relationship between helper and recipient is understood in terms of ability and dependency (Nadler, 2002). A common pattern emerges across all three approaches to helping, elements suggestive of a set of concerns or considerations that when grouped together could be termed responsibility.

Responsibility has been a somewhat illusive concept in terms of its definition in the social sciences, however. Its philosophical underpinnings have relied on an understanding of responsibility based on merit or consequence (Frankfurt, 1969), whereby responsibility is something that would require or result in praise, blame or some element of change. A sociological approach views responsibility in terms of ‘roles’, and the duty and obligation associated with the behaviour expected of an individual (MacKean & Abbott-Chapman, 2012). Within psychology, a norm of social responsibility from a developmental perspective has been ambiguously defined as believing “people should help others who are in need of help and who are dependent on them for it” (Berkowitz, 1972; Berkowitz & Daniels, 1963; Rutkowski, Gruder & Romer, 1983).

Thus responsibility has been understood via dependency and interdependency (Thomas, 1957). Indeed, dependency and expectation to help are often the forms through which responsibility or social responsibility is indirectly measured, or assumed; “The perception of the dependency relationship presumably arouses feelings of responsibility to these others, and the outcome is a heightened instigation to help them achieve their goals.” (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1963, p. 430, emphasis added).
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Monroe (2003) has alluded to responsibility as it relates to identity when she claims that moral values affect action only to the extent that they are incorporated as part of identity, and Oliner and Oliner (1992) have considered extensivity as an inclusive common moral community, drawing on elements of a common understanding of responsibility. However, within social psychology as it relates to the attribution of responsibility to help, much of the literature has examined responsibility through its absence (Latané & Darley, 1968; Latané & Darley, 1970; Latané & Dabbs, 1975)

Therefore, attempting to define responsibility as it is suggested via Batson’s nurturant tendencies (Batson et al., 2005), or Bekker’s principle of care (Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010), or considerations such as relationships based on dependency or obligation, and in a way that doesn’t demarcate it as blame or cause, is difficult within social psychology. While recent literature from a feminist psychological approach has tried to present a working definition of responsibility specifically outside of these domains, namely as “the taking care of” (Tronto, 1993, p. 210) or as being “imbedded in a set of implicit cultural practices”, the multi-faceted nature of the concept has been continuously highlighted - “assumptions about responsibility sit in a well-tilled field of power relations” (Unger, 2004, p. 388) - yet not fully or systematically explored.

The following section will therefore outline the different issues that responsibility presents for the social psychology of helping, as while previous literature suggests empathic concern via perceived similarity presents as a main route to helping, albeit complicated, a responsibility approach to helping also presents as equally complex. This review will therefore include an outline of the way in which responsibility has been approached in the literature on bystander intervention, how responsibility has been framed from a blame-attribution perspective, and how the dual-nature of responsibility (attributing responsibility for cause as separate to attributing responsibility for solution) can be problematic in helping situations. This literature taken together suggests that responsibility could be an interesting avenue of further investigation as it pertains to helping behaviours. Moreover, the final review in this section will present some preliminary qualitative and discursive work on helping behaviours that has begun to explore this issue of responsibility more systematically.
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2.5.3 Responsibility in bystander literature

The concept of responsibility has been linked to helping behaviours in one key domain in social psychological literature thus far. Research on the traditional bystander effect proposes that “the presence of other people serves to inhibit the impulse to help” (Latané & Darley, 1970, p. 38). The vast amount of research that stemmed from the infamous Kitty Genovese incident in 1964 (for a more detailed account see Latané & Darley, 1968; Manning, Levine, & Collins, 2007) have mainly involved manipulating group size in an emergency situation and measuring whether or not/ the amount of times a participant would intervene to help. Emergency scenarios have included subjects in a waiting room that begins to fill with smoke (Latané & Darley, 1968), a fellow participant suffering a seizure (Schwartz & Clausen, 1970), and subjects witnessing an attack and potential rape (Harari, Harari, & White, 1985) among others. Non-emergency helping situations such as helping someone pick up a stack of dropped pencils in an elevator (Latané & Dabbs, 1975), helping with a flat tire (Hurley & Allen, 1974) or simply answering a door (Freeman, 1974) have also resulted in similar conclusions: the greater the number of people around, the less likely someone is to offer help.

Some of these results are explained by social inhibition, while others are described as due to a diffusion of responsibility. Latané and Darley’s original approach to bystander behaviour led to their development of what can be termed a decision tree whereby an observer must follow through with 5 steps of processing and decision making before he/she will intervene. These include observing the critical incident, acknowledging that it is indeed a situation that requires help, acknowledging their personal responsibility to help, recognising their ability to help, and the resources to help that are available to them. It is Step 3, and the inhibiting role of a diffusion of responsibility, that is of most relevance to the current thesis.

Dovidio and colleagues (Dovidio et al., 2006) have suggested that intergroup helping has been slow to come under investigation as a lot of the early literature on helping stemmed from the traditionally individualistic approach of United States social psychology, and therefore there is ample work looking at such helper/recipient dyads as bystander and emergency helping and intervention as an interper-
sonal helping phenomenon. Latané and Darley’s model of Bystander intervention and diffusion of responsibility has traditionally focused on individuals helping other individuals, and this interpersonal approach was subsequently widened to an intergroup level approach by Levine and colleagues (2005).

_Diffusion of responsibility_ (or the assumption of personal responsibility, seen as Step 3 in the _Decision Model of Bystander Information_) has been shown to have important implications for when someone will intervene to help and when they will not. However, the basic concept of responsibility and the processes that lead to the actual acknowledgement and acceptance of this ‘responsibility to help’ at a more fundamental level are not engaged with in this research - perhaps due to the larger predictions they are attempting to prove/disprove.

Diffusion of responsibility as a concept here simply involves the presence or absence of ‘capable’ others - “bystanders may diffuse responsibility when other witnesses are capable of helping, but not when there are people who are incapable of helping” (Dovidio et al., 2006, p.78; Korte, 1969). The occurrence of this phenomenon (the diffusion of responsibility) is noted often, however the focus is on when it occurs, as opposed to looking closer at why. Moriarty (1975) found that in a study investigating the difference in response rates (helping) of people who agreed to take responsibility for watching over someone’s personal items on a beach while they went for a walk, and those who did not verbally agree to watch over them, those who actively made themselves accountable engaged in ‘helping’ the stranger (in the form of stopping someone else from stealing these personal items) 80% of the time, in comparison to 20% of those who did not take responsibility. This action of accepting responsibility and then holding themselves accountable for the consequences of such acceptance could have implications for general helping and charitable behaviour more specifically - the impact could be upon those who sign up for long-term donations to certain charitable organisations, in line with the different kinds of helping (dependency and autonomy oriented) proposed by Nadler. It is also this conceptualisation of responsibility that will be investigated throughout the thesis.

While studies have suggested that responsibility to help can be greater if and when the group boundaries are extended (Levine & Thompson, 2004) a study of
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the specific impact re-categorisation has on attributions of self-ascribed responsibility, or indeed how these attributions or feelings can impact on helping intentions or behaviours systematically, has not been considered. Yet the phenomenon of diffusion of responsibility would imply that responsibility would be a key factor in any helping situation when diffusion does not occur (i.e. when the criteria are not filled for the observation of the bystander effect). Thus while progress has been made in terms of a shift from an interpersonal to an intergroup focus on bystander helping, intervention and diffusion of responsibility, there remains to be seen a study of the inverse effects (examining specifically when responsibility is not “diffused”) as promising for both emergency and long-term sustained helping behaviours.

2.5.4 Blame attribution

The role of responsibility attributions in helping behaviours has been studied in many domains; social, cognitive, clinical and criminal psychology. However outside of the bystander effect, much of the literature focuses on attribution of blame for the cause of the event, and how any event that is worthy of explanation will automatically be subjected to a series of judgments on controllability, stability, and the causal role of the agent or social actor involved (Weiner, 1995).

“As the observers’ feelings of being vulnerable to the victims situation increase, so too will the blame attributed to that victim” (Walster, 1966, p 35). This concept of perceived similarity as oftentimes leading to attributions of blame to a victim in need can have negative consequences in a helping situation. Jones and Aronson (1973) found females would attribute more blame to a female victim of rape than would a male perceiver. This is here explained by the victim-observer similarity theory, while Shaver’s defensive attribution hypothesis (1985) would suggest that victim-blaming occurs from motivations of self-protection, and as similarity between the victim or the recipient of help and the perceiver increases, blame attributed to the victim or recipient will decrease.

From a Belief in a Just World perspective (Lerner, 1980), the negative consequences of this approach to events and people can be to derogate the victim, as providing a conceptual framework for individuals to interpret the events of their
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personal life (the world) in a more meaningful way can also lead to a dilemma. Lerner claims that people need to believe that the world is stable, orderly and logical, one where good things happen to good people and bad things happen to bad people; we get what we deserve and we deserve what we get (Lerner, 1980). But this very concept creates a dilemma when approaching helping and prosocial behaviour from this perspective in terms of the deservingness of an overly-similar recipient.

As such, in much of the literature linking helping behaviours to attributions of responsibility, it is more often than not confounded with attributions of blame as opposed to self-ascribed responsibility. Alicke’s culpable control model (2000) indicates three main processes involved in the attribution of blame: intention, causation and foresight, focusing on the role of spontaneous evaluations in the attribution of blame and how extra evidential factors can have an effect, such as the reputation of a group, and their social category (helping certain stigmatized groups for example). An observer may exaggerate the degree of control the victim actually had on their circumstances - volitional or causal control - in a biased manner due to these spontaneous evaluations of the victim or the group or category to which the victim or recipient of help belongs. Alike’s model places these judgmental biases in the centre of blame attribution, claiming that they derive from blame-validation processes (searching for information that will support the desired blame attribution - and to de-emphasise environmental contributions).

2.5.5 The two-sided nature of responsibility

However a model of responsibility attributions, developed in the clinical psychology domain, takes both responsibility for the cause and responsibility for the solution or for helping as two separate domains (blame-attribution and self-ascribed responsibility). Brickman and colleagues (Brickman et al., 1982) developed a model of helping and coping, originally in a clinical setting, which demonstrates how a problem can be resolved or a recipient can be helped if and when the attributions of responsibility match for both parties involved.

The model consists of moral and enlightenment facets (both of which assume blame for the helpee but do not hold the helpee responsible for helping them-
selves), *compensatory facet* (which does not hold the recipient to blame, but does hold them responsible for helping themselves) and a *medical facet* (which puts neither blame nor responsibility on the recipient for the problem or the solution). This model has been adopted in intergroup prejudice research and a study on affirmative action in Canada has utilised its assumptions of the effect of attributions of responsibility on willingness to help (and type of help) to investigate people’s reactions to such anti-racism programmes (Quinn, Ross, & Esses, 2001). Results demonstrate the independent roles of both perceived responsibility for cause (blame and deservingness) and perceived responsibility for solution (ability and control) in prosocial conduct.

The authors (Quinn, Ross & Esses, 2001) explained their results by referring to Weiner’s model of attributions of blame and helping in the moral mode (Weiner, 1985 - attribution-affect-action model). Beneficiaries were seen to be responsible or to blame for the cause and therefore solely responsible for the solution therefore less help was given. For the medical model, however, the authors explained a lack of endorsement (help) by the perceptions of inefficiency of such long-term help and the practicality of providing this for such a long period of time. Hence a lack of endorsement for such programmes.

As such, it was concluded that it is not simply a case of less responsibility for cause and solution will necessarily lead to increased helping, but that reactions to helping involved the complex interplay of attributions of both types or forms of responsibility - pointing to the “potentially independent roles of perceived responsibility for cause and solution” (p. 329), and the value of moderate levels of such responsibility attributions as having more favourable outcomes, thus a two-sided nature of responsibility. This study also suggests the important role of perceptions of efficacy in helping situations, and emphasises the question of who takes responsibility when the beneficiaries of help are not attributed responsibility for the solution as something that requires further investigation.

Thus the literature from an individual perspective on responsibility focuses mainly on blame-attributions, with a particular emphasis on the role of perceived similarity in helping interventions. The literature from a group-level perspective however (Quinne et al., 2001; Jackson & Esses, 2000) suggests that responsibility attributions are more complex, and the concept of two-sidedness or the dual-role
nature of responsibility can hamper a full understanding of the positive impact of responsibility on prosocial behaviours.

2.5.6 Responsibility attribution at a group level

Another group-level study by Zagefka and colleagues (Zagefka, Noor, Brown, De Moura, & Hopthrow, 2011) looked at blame attributions, but focused on how these attributions can influence decisions to donate to charitable organisations specifically at a group level. They investigated whether the perceived cause of a disaster (either natural or manmade) would have an effect on willingness to donate to a charitable organization that would help in the affected area, using fictitious newspaper articles as charitable appeals to manipulate perceived cause and using the Asian Tsunami as the naturally caused disaster and the War in Darfur as a disaster that was more humanly-caused. The authors also included measures of perceived self-help and victim blame.

Results suggest that victim-blaming and perceived self-help mediated the relationship between perceived cause (when manmade disasters were shown, more blame was attributed and less help was given) and subsequent intention to help or donate. This demonstrates the role of attribution of responsibility in intergroup helping situations, and points to a gap in the literature where relationships between perceptions of intergroup similarity and difference can impact upon perceptions of responsibility (as was touched on briefly in Batson’s 2005 work on nurturant tendencies).

To sum, much of the individual, intra- and intergroup literature on helping behaviours present several important factors that contribute to when someone might intervene to help. These factors have included for the most part some element of empathic concern, in the form of perceived similarity or perspective taking, in-group membership and perceptions of interchangeability, and even the strategic nature of helping in terms of status relations and intergroup power dynamics. However, little attention has been paid to the role of self-ascribed responsibility to help (attributing responsibility to help to oneself) within any of the theoretical paradigms presented thus far. Moreover, those studies that have included responsibility as a variable have relied on a conceptualisation of
the term ‘responsibility’ that does not imply duty, obligation and self-ascribed responsibility to help, but blame- attribution and responsibility for cause. Indeed, attempting to define responsibility in a way that doesn’t demarcate it as blame or cause has been shown as difficult within social psychology.

An alternative approach to the social psychological study of phenomena such as helping, group identity processes and even responsibility, however, has emerged in recent years. Discursive psychology (Edwards & Potter, 1992), among other approaches to qualitative enquiry, has recently begun to explore issues related to helping and responsibility in a more systematic way. The following section of this chapter will therefore review work from the discursive psychological tradition and also present some other qualitative studies that signify this as a fruitful direction for investigations into responsibility-led helping.

2.6 Qualitative enquiry, responsibility and helping

A quick glance back over the applications of theories adopting an individual, intragroup and intergroup-level analysis of helping behaviours shows the diverse methodologies employed. Survey questionnaires, experimental designs and observational methods have been employed in the search for a better understanding of helping behaviours. Minimal group settings in laboratories and real-world settings taking intergroup contexts into account have been developed, and the forms of helping operationalized have included emergency bystander intervention, long-term sustained volunteering, and charitable donations.

This review has moved from individual- to intergroup-level analyses of theories and applications, and as the current research project is a social psychological study of intergroup helping these group-level literatures hold more relevance in this current context. However, although the literature reviewed thus far has adopted several different methodologies to address the predictions of the theoretical paradigms put forward in the initial sections of this literature review, we have not yet looked at how qualitative methods have been used to investigate helping behaviours.
Also, in light of the complex and oftentimes overlooked role of responsibility as self-ascribed in the helping literature, several qualitative studies can prove useful as they begin to explore responsibility-led helping in a more systematic way than previously undertaken, and demonstrate the complex and multi-faceted role that responsibility as a phenomenon can present.

A qualitative study of the political literature issued at the time of mounting pressure on Bulgaria to deport its Jewish population to Nazi camps during WWII demonstrated three ways in which the argument against deportation was constructed (Reicher, Cassidy, Hopkins, & Levine, 2006). Working from a social identity approach to helping behaviours (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), the authors employ a qualitative analysis to analyse these texts and look at how the arguments for saving the Bulgarian Jews were constructed; these constructions were found to be category inclusion, category norms and category interest.

Category norms were invoked within the political literature by way of making salient the responsibility the Bulgarian people had for their Jewish population. This was achieved by invoking the concepts of vulnerability of the Jewish community and in tandem the norms of generosity and tolerance of the Bulgarians, and also attendance to the obligation and duty they had as Bulgarian citizens to oppose this act. The norms being invoked were ones of responsibility and duty to others, and the categories included members of the national group (“We Bulgarians”), general members of government, and even members of the broad ‘human beings’ category to promote sentiments of duty-of-care to others in need. As such, the use of a qualitative method of investigation here provided a useful account and a deeper understanding of how the Bulgarian identity and the Jewish identity were constructed through these texts to a particular end - in order to stave off their deportation and encourage their support (helping to demonstrate the discursive business being accomplished in the political literature of the time) and moreover how responsibility as a concept can be usefully employed in talk to invoke interventions.

The following section will look at how discursive psychology (DP) and a social-constructivist approach to prosocial behaviour has been drawn upon to gain a deeper understanding of the intergroup context in helping situations, and the way in which people themselves talk about issues relevant to the investigation.
of helping interventions, but also the ways in which Discourse Analysis has been employed to look at the emerging role of responsibility in helping contexts.

2.6.1 Responsibility in talk

The use of Discourse Analysis (DA; Potter & Wetherell, 1987) as the core method associated with discursive psychology has demonstrated the utility of investigating social phenomena not as concrete cognitive structures, but as socially-constructed understandings of such phenomena that are variable and essentially context-dependent, and produced through talk for specific purposes (a further detailed account of DP and DA will be presented in chapter 3). “The relevance and appeal of DP is best understood not so much in its own terms, but in relation to intellectual debates and social psychological notions and topics which it sought to respecify: attitudes, cognition, emotion, attribution, persuasion, and so on.” (Agostinous & Tielaga, 2012, p. 1)

Regarding the dual-role of responsibility and blame attributions, Dalton and colleagues (Dalton, Madden, Chamberlain, Carr, & Lyons, 2008) employed a discursive approach to address a question that has been previously investigated via quantitative methodologies - the role of perceptions of self-help in helping relationships. Participants, young New Zealanders, spoke openly in focus group discussions about their charitable behaviour, their attitudes towards poverty, and how they felt about specific types of charitable appeals. Their methodology involved showing three separate focus groups (with 12 participants in total) some brief video footage of an aid appeal used to stimulate discussion on the aforementioned topics, and discourse analysis was employed in the subsequent talk.

Dalton and colleagues reported several findings. Respondents were seen to draw upon concepts of self-responsibility (of the recipient of help) and self-help when accounting for who they would give charitable donations to and why. The historical context of minority groups in New Zealand was also attended to, and participants worked to maintain their identity as moral social actors while attempting to legitimise their non-donor stance. Several discursive themes were also identified in the data; insufficient information (in relation to aid appeals), emotional arousal (in relation to aid appeals and the video footage) and local
versus international need. This final theme was invoked often through the adolescents discussions as they drew comparisons between the needs and worthiness of their ingroup versus those of an outgroup recipient, producing responsibility-driven talk. Obligation was invoked in relation to ingroup helping, while this was lacking in talk surrounding helping the outgroup. Dalton and colleagues conclude that the invocation of self-responsibility and self-help was highly functional and in specific contexts was used to a particular end, to account for their own non-donor status.

While this concept of self-help has been addressed in studies both discursive and experimental (Dalton et al., 2008; Zagefka et al., 2011), in a study by Gibson (2009) it emerged as a key way in which people talk about social welfare in the UK. This qualitative study employed a rhetorical and discursive analytic approach to posts on an internet forum discussing welfare reform following recent conditions placed on welfare-recipients by the government in the UK. Posters were seen to draw on discursive resources such as effortfulness, and the attribution of blame is consistently invoked when discussing welfare recipients.

However other aspects of responsibility were also invoked by posters, namely that of the government to hold those who misuse welfare funds to account for their behaviour, and also self-responsibility of those who are recipients of welfare to make attempts to help themselves, once again highlighting the complex dual-role of responsibility in talk of helping. The use of a discursive approach to internet postings is innovative as it allows the author to see what posters are achieving with their use of language and how they work up their identities as moral citizens against those perceived as immoral who are at times unfairly the recipients of welfare.

### 2.6.2 Responsibility in identity management

To further highlight how talk about helping behaviour has been examined (though not focused specifically on how responsibility was invoked), in a discursive approach to how social identity impacts upon constructions of intergroup helping amongst Irish adolescents, Stevenson and Manning’s (2010) respondents demonstrated many similarities to Dalton’s (Dalton et al., 2008) participants. This
study showed how Irish participants invoked national identity both strategically and flexibly in accounting for both giving and withholding aid to international recipients. The context of these focus group discussions was a dramatically changing economic climate in Ireland. Long-term routine forms of helping and the role of the national group emerged as discursive issues, and the authors look at how these participants in their day-to-day lives invoke concepts of nationhood to account for giving or withholding charity. They also showed that it is was autonomy-oriented help that most wished to be seen to give as charitable aid, as opposed to strategic predictions of dependency-oriented outgroup helping (which could suggest a responsible drive amongst participants, or a wish to be seen so).

Again identity management is at the forefront of the concerns of respondents in these discursive interactions, and while Stevenson and Manning found their respondents invoked their national identity in a strategic and flexible way, this was done to present themselves as moral social actors. The focus groups and subsequent DA allowed the authors to see how being charitable is achieved through talk, and while the facilitators on no occasion introduced the topic of national identity, once it was brought up by participants probing encouraged elaboration. As such the data generated here was both rich and extensive and the findings emerging from the specific analysis used demonstrate that in their everyday talk young Irish adolescents orient towards their own national identity to account for when or why they would give to charitable organisations, emphasising certain attributes associated with that identity.

Thus, while much of the quantitative and largely experimental studies from individual through to intergroup perspectives have produced accounts of explanations for helping that can oftentimes overlook the potentially important and complex role of responsibility in situations that require help, qualitative investigations have begun to engage with responsibility in a way that is beneficial to an initial understanding of this multi-faceted concept. This demonstrates not just the complexity of the concept of responsibility in the social psychology of helping behaviours, but also that this is a rich area of investigation awaiting further exploration.

Responsibility is evidently important to people in relation to their obligation to others, in terms of long-term helping, as it relates to concerns of morality and
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duty (outside of empathy) and the need to help when help is needed. All of these considerations can be seen as important to people in talk, and it is therefore through talk that we can explore where and how people use responsibility themselves and understand it in their own terms. If responsibility is indeed central to people’s talk about decisions to help, it would be a vital consideration for charitable organisations. However, this approach would also be hugely beneficial theoretically speaking, due to the absence of a clear-cut operationalisation of such self-ascribed responsibility in the literature, and its understanding as either ambiguous or illusive in previous research.

Therefore a qualitative inquiry examining responsibility in talk would help to unpack the connections between the array of different understandings of responsibility and the relationships between these elements of responsibility, helping and how the concept is understood and invoked by people. Furthermore, such an exploratory and ecologically grounded qualitative approach would enable the consequences of its use in talk to be investigated. This is one of the key advantages of a discourse analytic approach, as it necessarily attends to the consequentiality of talk as action. Thus a qualitative study adopting a discourse analysis approach to how responsibility is invoked in talk as it relates to helping and charitable giving, in addition to its relationship with empathic concern and similarity, is seen as best placed as a point of departure for the eventual systematic examination of the impact of (self-ascribed) responsibility on group-level helping.

2.6.3 Charitable giving

Charitable giving was chosen as the type of helping behaviour to act as a platform from which the current investigation could be launched for several reasons; mainly that while this focus on charitable donations can offer an opportunity to examine specific details of the concepts of interest (empathy and responsibility), the findings could also have implications for the study of helping behaviours more generally.

The first qualitative study of this mixed methods thesis (see below section for a more detailed description) focuses on generating talk about charitable giving as a means toward understanding how certain concepts are invoked in discourse
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around helping. This will be demonstrated as a successful approach in the analysis chapters of Study 1, where talk focuses on charitable giving specifically, but where this topic also allowed for the instigation of discourse on volunteering and other forms of helping.

The subsequent quantitative studies of this thesis followed up this specific focus on charitable giving as a straightforward and convenient way to investigate how the emerging concepts of interest (responsibility and empathy) interact with each other and impact upon helping intentions. The survey and experimental methodologies harness the familiarity of charitable appeals to allow for a close-to-realistic engagement from the participant’s perspective with an appeal, and a subsequent decision to help or not, as part of the design features of Study 2, 3, 4 and 5. Thus charitable giving, while notably a specific form of helping in its own right, was chosen in this thesis as best placed to examine the influence of empathy and responsibility.

As charitable giving is the chosen means of gaining a better understanding of empathy and responsibility throughout this thesis, it is both appropriate and necessary at this stage of a literature review to present some of the research on charitable giving and donation behaviour in their own right in order to set up what elements within this domain are and what are not a concern for this current investigation moving forward.

Charitable giving can be viewed as a form of prosocial behaviour that differs from long-term volunteering, in which it is time that is given as opposed to money, and even blood donation which is conceptualised in yet another different way in terms of its prosocial nature (Penner et al., 2005). While the studies on charitable giving often view this as a specific form of helping, much of the research could be translated into and can still speak to helping behaviours more generally.

Cheung and Chan (2000) developed a causal model for donating money to charity that involved relying on a social cognitive framework. They investigated specifically factors that affected intentions to donate to an International Relief Organisation (IRO) in Hong Kong, including self-efficacy, outcome efficacy, awareness of the IRO and the need to donate, trust in the IRO and an individualistic explanation for poverty. Their study and model also included factors such as income, past donation behaviour and a moral obligation to donate. They found
that while self-efficacy and trust in the IRO explained most of the variance in their model, the overall cognitive consistency of the model was explained by a relationship between participants' beliefs in the IRO and their beliefs in general. In contrast to much other research in the area of charitable donations specifically, they claimed that factors such as income, age, education and gender have no effect on donating to charity.

The relationship between gender and donating to charitable organisations has often been explained through the lens of social role theory (Eagly, 2009; Leslie, Snyder & Glumb, 2013). Women are consistently shown to give more to charities than men, controlling for income (Brown & Ferris, 2007). The general suggestion presents an understanding of the higher levels of donations made by females as based on their disposition as more communal, helpful and nurturing.

Ethnic differences have also been looked at in terms of amounts given to charitable organisations and motivations underlying giving, with literature suggesting that Asians, Blacks and Hispanics donate less than Whites (Brooks, 2005). Social exchange theory is often applied to explain these ethnic differences in donations to charities (Jones & Schaubroek, 2004). However, and as has already been addressed in the introductory chapter, this thesis takes a social psychological approach to helping behaviours and does not focus necessarily on gender, ethnicity or individual personality characteristics by way of explanation. Rather it adopts a charitable giving template to investigate how concepts such as empathy, similarity and responsibility can influence helping in intra and intergroup settings.

One area that has focused both on charitable donations specifically yet also adopts a somewhat group level approach to such investigations is the recent interest in corporate social responsibility, research which is most often conducted from an economic or organisational psychological perspective. Nevertheless, giving in the workplace can be viewed as giving at the level of the group, however many of these studies still maintain an eventual focus on factors such as gender and ethnicity which, while they present as groups, do not often take motivators such as those of interest in this thesis (empathy, similarity or responsibility) into account.
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In the context of some of the literature addressed in previous sections, some experimental studies (for example Zagefka et al., 2010) have adopted the use of a charitable appeal to investigate the roles certain factors play in helping behaviours between groups, in a similar way to this thesis. Previous qualitative work has also looked at how helping behaviour is understood through talk about charitable giving (for example Dalton et al., 2008).

Thus this thesis would argue that, based on existing literature, a focus on charitable donation offers an opportunity to examine some specific details of empathy and responsibility. It is also suggested that this focus on charitable giving can have implications for more helping behaviours more generally.

2.7 Conclusion, research questions and a mixed methods approach

This review has illustrated the utility of a discursive psychological approach to the study of social psychological phenomena such as empathy, responsibility and helping behaviours. The previous sections that focused on individual, intra-group and intergroup helping in a broader methodological sense highlighted the overwhelming support for empathic concern as a predictor of helping behaviours, but also demonstrated the dearth of literature on the role of other potentially important contributing factors in situations that require help. The impact of context and intergroup relations has also only recently been investigated, and as such this thesis hopes to redress the gap this presents by examining the role of empathy and self-ascribed responsibility in intergroup helping.

Empathic concern, traditionally holding the monopoly in terms of motivations to help from an individual level, has also been found to impact upon helping at an intragroup level via perceptions of similarity. However, from an intergroup level of analysis such perceptions of similarity can become problematic as issues of identity threat arise, and group dynamics and status relations become more complex. A further motivation to help has also emerged as potentially important; responsibility. From an interpersonal perspective, it has been framed as a ‘principle of care’ (Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010) and as protection and forming part
of nurturing tendencies (Batson, 2005). At an intragroup level, responsibility has been suggested as influencing helping after re-categorisation occurs and can have more of an impact than empathy when ingroup boundaries are extended (Levine & Thompson, 2004). At an intergroup level, Nadler (2002) has suggested a darker more strategic side to helping, and thus an investigation into how responsibility might sit within this model could prove valuable.

Therefore this thesis aims to address the issues empathic concern and similarity present when the context shifts to intergroup levels of analysis, but also to investigate how self-ascribed responsibility differs from empathy, how it relates to helping across several domains and ultimately how useful it can be as a predictor of helping behaviours and charitable giving.

However, to first address the concerns put forward in this review surrounding the often ambiguous definitions of responsibility in social psychology as it relates to helping outside of the domain of blame-attribution, a qualitative study of people’s talk was seen as best placed. This qualitative study (Study 1), by exploring how responsibility, empathy and similarity are used in talk of charitable giving by members of the general public and charity workers, aims to provide a more grounded in-depth understanding of the considerations involved in a responsibility-approach to helping.

Charitable behaviour, as a moral and accountable matter, is an intergroup phenomena but also one that is accomplished in talk. By posing an ethnomethodological question we are able to transcend some of the inconsistencies presented by the previous literature and investigate what people actually do. All aspects of the literature reviewed present differing cognitive processes and differing theoretical perspectives being taken into account when investigating people donating to charities or partaking in prosocial acts.

However, posing a question such as ‘what are people doing in their talk’ can help to take several dimensions of a complex topic into account by analysing people doing being charitable. If charitable behaviour is something that is a social performance and a socially constructed productive and functional phenomena then how best to analyse how perceptions or understandings of empathy, intergroup similarities but more so responsibility impact upon giving than to focus
on how people themselves produce their own discursive versions of these understandings, and how in their everyday talk they do being charitable.

Moreover, as this thesis wishes to address what can be seen as a gap in the literature from a social psychological perspective on self-ascribed responsibility at a group level of analysis, a mixed methods approach to this investigation was chosen. In advancing our understanding of this complex concept of responsibility through people’s own understandings and their talk, a mixed methods approach enables the eventual development of a quantitative measure of responsibility such that it is developed from the qualitative findings (Hitchcock et al., 2005, p. 265) and a systematic examination of the impact empathic concern and responsibility can have on decisions to help target groups with a variety of characteristics. The following section will detail the choice of a mixed methods approach more fully.

2.8 Mixed methods

Some of the issues under discussion throughout this section on the application of mixed methods will include the authors ontological perspective, referring to ones view on the nature of reality, epistemological concerns, referring to the justification of knowledge claims, and finally how this knowledge is constructed, referred to as methodology. “Within psychology, quantitative and qualitative analyses are often represented as antagonists at war, one orthodoxy pitted against another” (Morawski, 2011, p. 260). This may indeed be the case within psychology and social psychology more specifically, however this thesis adopts a mixed methods approach combining both quantitative and qualitative methods of investigation, and thus it is first necessary to address the concerns this can raise amongst researchers, but also the many possibilities for the deeper understanding of social phenomena that such an approach affords.

This chapters final section therefore will present a justification for this choice, arguing that “psychological knowledge would substantially gain from joint or conjoined methodologies” (Westerman, 2011, p158). It will first detail the process of mixed methods that this thesis employed the use of, including an explanation of what constitutes mixed methods. Subsequently this section will argue for the utility of an initially qualitative approach to the study of helping behaviours,
and a quantitative approach to same, including potential limitations of both methods. The section will conclude with a rationale for the choice of this type of research method and how each both fit together and fit with their separate research questions, and finally illustrate how such an approach has been used before to good effect in the study of social psychological phenomena.

2.8.1 Mixed methods explained

Shifting between different paradigms and embracing positivist (often linked to a quantitative approach) and constructivist (often linked to a qualitative approach) perspectives at different times throughout the research process has been identified by Creswell (2007) as a useful way to approach a study using mixed methods. The area of mixed methods has developed over the past 20 years, spanning several disciplines, with the majority of early published work adopting such an approach coming from the field of health sciences. However psychology and social psychology more specifically have begun to engage with mixed methods as a new way of looking at phenomenon, and as a way of further investigating unanswered questions (Liu, 2011).

Creswell and Tashakkori, in acknowledging the changing dynamics in the field of research methods and noting the rise in interest and practice of what is often termed mixed methods research, provide a detailed and useful explanation of the taxonomy of ways in which this form of investigation can be framed and thus used in a research study (2007).

They present what can essentially be viewed as a continuum of mixed methods research, whereby on one end the deeply philosophical understanding of the mixing of methods sits, fully integrating epistemological and ontological worldviews, and on the other end of the spectrum a more practical and pragmatic view of mixing methods as a means to an end sits. There are four ways of framing a mixed methods study along this continuum: the method perspective; the methodology perspective; the paradigm perspective; and the practice perspective. In order to understand the underlying differences between each approach to research, and thus appreciate the approach taken in this thesis, these perspectives will be briefly accounted for.
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The first of these approaches views a mixed method primarily as 'a method'. The focus is on the process and outcomes of using both quantitative and qualitative data (Yin, 2006) and it has been viewed as a 'clean' approach whereby the methods used are not tangled up with underlying or associated philosophy and paradigms (Elliot, 2005). In fact, Creswell and Tashakkori (2007) note that in studies adopting this approach, worldviews are oftentimes overlooked and not mentioned within the reporting of the research. This lack of emphasis on worldviews however has generated some criticisms, such that the complete separation of epistemological and ontological issues from methodological techniques has led to its labelling as "quasi-mixed" (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2006).

The second overarching way of framing these types of studies is the Methodology perspective, integrating research questions, methods chosen, worldviews and subsequent inferences in a way contrary to previous framing. Proponents of this approach claim that researchers should focus on the entire process of a study, and link the philosophical assumptions to the eventual methods used, arguing the impossibility of separating out the methods from the worldviews they represent (Creswell, 2007). However, Braman (2005) has criticised this approach as an incompatibility issue, suggesting that paradigms cannot and should not be mixed.

The third approach, the paradigm perspective, holds that an overarching worldview can be used as a philosophical foundation for the entire research study. This framing of mixed methods suggests that "to understand mixed methods [. . . ] requires a focus on the philosophical issues such as what knowledge warrants our attention, how knowledge is learned, the nature of reality and values, and also the historical and socio-political perspectives that individuals bring to research" (Creswell & Tashakkori, 2007, p. 305). This approach is conceptualised as very much pragmatic by nature (Morgan, 2007).

The final way of framing what is often just termed a mixed methods perspective is the Practice perspective. This final approach looks at mixing methods as a choice that may present itself to researchers as useful at some stage throughout the research process. This suggests that researchers simply decide upon a different methodological technique if the need arises, as a bottom-up approach for
example may emerge as the best way forward in the middle of a research study (Bryman & Bell, 2012).

This thesis sits in the middle of this hypothetical continuum, and adopts a paradigm or pragmatic approach to the use of mixed methods, whereby it understands the value in “comparing and contrasting the inferences that emerge from examining the findings of a study from multiple worldviews and perspectives” (Green, 2006; Creswell & Tashakkori, 2007, p. 306).

2.8.2 The current study

Guba (1990) posits that “having the term (mixed methods) not cast in stone is intellectually useful and allows for reshaping understandings”. While a mixed methods approach must involve much rigour and careful thought from the design phase through to analysis and integration of findings, it is useful that there is scope within this methodological framework to be creative in so far as the research question and area of investigation requires creativity (especially in instances where evidence from previous research drives the formulation of a psychological investigation that is complex). Essentially, a pragmatic approach whereby methods are driven by the questions they are attempting to answer and not vice versa is ideal and it is within this pragmatic approach that this thesis is located.

However, as is often the case in studies of this kind, it is not enough to simply claim a mixed methods approach without clearly stating what the exact methods entail above and beyond the inference of the use of qualitative and quantitative methods of investigation (Creswell, 2009). At the design stage several decisions are required (also presented in the decision tree in figure 2.1 below).

First the researchers must decide if the qualitative and quantitative phases of the research will run in tandem (concurrently) or one after the other (sequentially). Then it must be decided upon which phase or strand the emphasis will be placed (on the qualitative findings, the quantitative findings or equal emphasis on both). Finally the researcher must choose when the actual mixing of the mixed methods approach will occur, either at the analysis stage of each study or strand, or later in the interpretation stage of the overall research findings.
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The current thesis has chosen to use a partial mixed sequential equal status design (Leech & Onwueg Huffman, 2007). The qualitative study is placed first, which will inform the development of the quantitative studies. Equal emphasis is placed on all findings. Integration of these findings occurs at the interpretation of the qualitative findings stage, whereby these results lead to the design and hypothesis-generation of the quantitative studies.

The use of qualitative research to develop quantitative hypotheses can help to approach “complex and multi-faceted” research problems (Doyle et al., 2009, p.175) and can therefore be most useful in a situation where previous literature has indicated there are many questions yet to be answered. It is within this vein that the current thesis asks the overarching research question: what roles do empathy and responsibility play in decisions to help, and more specifically in decisions to engage in charitable behaviours.

The first (qualitative) sub-question, adopting a discourse analysis (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) and an analysis of membership categorisation devices (Sacks, 1972) approach to single and multiple participant interview data, asks: How do

---

**Figure 2.1: Decision Tree** - Decision tree for a mixed method investigation (Creswell & Plano Clarke, 2007).
people in their everyday talk produce accounts of their own and others charitable giving?

The findings from this study inform the generation of a survey study which investigates relationships between charitable giving as a form of helping behaviour and some of the concepts or psychological constructs that emerged from the qualitative analysis. The understanding of responsibility and empathy that emerged Study 1 are used in the development of a scale of responsibility in Study 2. Study 2 adopts a survey method as the initial shift between qualitative and quantitative approaches. It builds upon the findings of Study 1 through its examination of the two interpretative repertories of interest (empathy and responsibility) as psychological constructs operationalised in self-report measures and analysed in relation to their influence on intentions to help a needy group.

Study 3, 4 and 5 further build upon the conclusions drawn from Study 1 and 2. They adopt experimental methods in order to systematically examine the impact of empathic concern and responsibility on intentions to help needy target groups when the characteristics of these groups differ. Therefore the underlying connection and relationship between all 5 studies is in the conceptualisation of empathy and responsibility, and the constant focus on how these two concepts relate to charitable giving as a type of helping behaviour. While both concepts have been reviewed throughout this chapter as of importance in the literature on helping, it was important to first investigate their importance from the perspective of people in their talk before moving towards further more controlled examinations of these concepts, without simply assuming their importance. Thus Study 1 can be viewed as laying the foundations for the thesis as a whole.

2.8.3 Fit of methods and research question

Chapter 3 is devoted to a detailed explanation of the chosen methods and subsequent justification of such methods that were adopted for Study 1. Therefore this section will address only briefly the fit between a qualitative approach to knowledge generation, the specific question Study 1 is attempted to address, and the overarching research question of this thesis. Following from this, a more detailed account of the use of quantitative methods will be presented, as will an
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explanation of fit be provided, ahead of a further account that will be given in
the introductory section of Chapter 6.

As a discursive analytic (DA) approach to the first exploratory qualitative
phase of this mixed methods study is ethnomethodological in nature, focusing on
the action-orientation of language, an analysis of membership categorisation de-
vices presents as a useful addition in terms of a more in-depth and comprehensive
understanding of what people are doing in talk when they are doing being charita-
able. Concepts of identity, such as preserving ones identity as a moral social actor
when constructing accounts of giving or withholding aid, are essentially tied up
with category labels and membership within groups. This first research question
to be addressed using this combination of analytic methods was formed after a
rigorous review of the literature on helping, both from a prosocial behaviours per-
spective and from an intergroup relations perspective which was found to be left
wanting in certain areas such as the role of empathy, similarity and responsibility
in intra- and intergroup helping situations. It is as follows:

Given the lack of a comprehensive or systematic understanding of responsibil-
ity in the literature, this thesis asks how people themselves understand and use
the concept of responsibility as it applies to charitable behaviour. It also asks
what consequences this has for their thoughts, talk and charitable behaviour and
questions how these differ from other ways of understanding the reasons to give
to charity such as empathy?

Study 1 therefore adopts a thematic DA approach to understanding how em-
pathy and responsibility are invoked in talk, and also draws on elements from
Sacks’ (1972) interest in membership categorisation devices in order to examine
the constructive nature of these invocations.

From a DA perspective the focus is less on the specific category that is invoked
and more on the temporal and contextual aspects of this invocation and questions
such as “What is the consequence of producing this identity at this particular
time in any discursive interaction?” Whereas from an analysis of membership
categorisation devices, the focus is on the shared knowledge a particular category
makes available, and therefore it is interested in the specific category that is
deployed. However it also has the purpose and consequence of this invocation as
a concern. Consequently, such a broad general context-specific approach as DA
can be complimented by the more detail-oriented and category-focused analysis of MCD to produce a better understanding of how, when and for what purpose categories (and identities) are worked up or claimed in talk of charitable giving.

The shift to a quantitative examination of the roles empathy and responsibility play in intergroup helping was informed by the conclusions of Study 1, but also an understanding of what a mixed methods approach can provide a research project with. Essentially, as it is conceptualised in this thesis, a mixed methods approach can provide a researcher with a way of compensating for the failings inherent in either a qualitative or a quantitative approach, by merging both and attempting to draw on the benefits of both, while acknowledging their unique limitations. This section will therefore present a brief rationale for the choice to adopt a quantitative approach to the final studies of this thesis (Study 2, 3, 4 and 5).

Gergen’s 1978 paper, considered to be “laying siege to the bastion of tradition” (Gergen, 1978, p.509), presents the experimental tradition emergent in social psychology in that decade and proceeding decades as troublesome. While Orne had already demonstrated the issue of demand characteristics in experimental settings (1962), Rosenthal highlighted experimenter bias as a concern (1966), and the inability to generalise from the laboratory experimental setting to more conventional settings was being debated (Harre & Secord, 1972), Tajfel (1972) was also beginning to highlight some inconsistencies between field of study and method of study. Tajfel’s emphasis on the artificiality of the laboratory setting arose from the crisis in psychology of the 1970s. The need to bring the social context back into the studies of social behaviour was the main thrust of the argument put forward in the seminal work on the minimal group experiments (Tajfel, Billg, Flament & Bundy, 1979).

Suggesting that many psychological experiments occurred in a social vacuum led to the development of a theoretical framework, outside of the methodological debate, that presented the sociality and innate nature of social groups and memberships within such groups as forming an important part of one’s identity, and thus could not be expected to be removed simply due to being a participant in a laboratory study. Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1972) became the cornerstone for research that would take the social nature of human beings in terms of
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their group identities as a key concern and a main area of interest. Thus, Gergen posited that experimentation may be a significant technique in psychological studies under particular conditions (which will be detailed further on), but also that “the continued presumption that experimentation is the single best means by which we can attain knowledge of social behaviour seems both mistaken and of injurious consequence to the field and to those who look to the profession for enhancement of understanding” (Gergen, 1978, p. 509.).

Cronbach has also criticised certain aspects of the experimental method (Cronbach, 1975) claiming that experimenters are simply unable to export basic laws of perception and learning from the laboratory setting of the study into the real world. However, there are particular conditions under which Gergen has suggested experiments can prove invaluable; when experimentation is for the alteration of consciousness; experimentation for increasing theoretical impact; and experimentation in the service of social reform (Gergen, 1978). These conditions will be run through systematically in the context of the investigations of this thesis.

Asch’s study of social conformity (1956) and even Milgram’s initial work on obedience to authority (Milgram, 1963) can be seen to have been original attempts at learning from and thus altering the consciousness of respondents and researchers alike. The experiments to be presented in the latter half of chapter 6 and in chapter 7 on helping behaviours at several levels of analysis (interpersonal, intra- and inter-group levels) can be construed as striving for the revision of awareness in terms of a social identity approach to helping. Practical benefits of such research can also be seen as “playing a vital role in sensitizing us to the little-considered possibilities in social life” (Gergen, 1978, p. 523).

In terms of increasing the theoretical impact as a benefit of an experimental approach to the study of helping behaviours, the manner in which these studies will be carried out takes several levels of analysis into consideration. It also therefore takes several theoretical perspectives into account in both the design stage of the studies (including the differing methodological and therefore ontological and epistemological perspectives) and the analysis and interpretation stage (individual and group perspectives) of empathy, self-ascribed responsibility and helping. “The occasional use of experiments to demonstrate the viability of a viewpoint
insures that we remain in a healthy state of conceptual conflict” (Gergan, 1978, p. 523) and as such the use of experimental methods within this thesis aim to achieve this exact goal; to build upon an inductive and theoretically exploratory discursive study to generate new ways of thinking about intra- and inter-group helping. This is achieved by taking the many theoretical perspectives such as social identity theory (Tajfel, 1972) and identity threat (Brewer, 1991), blame-attribution (Weiner, 1995) and bystander theory (Latan & Darley, 1968), and the empathy-altruism hypothesis (Batson, 1991) into account in informing the analysis of each dimension of the research question.

To the extent of which natural, social or subjective circumstances can be altered, it is possible that empirical findings may fluctuate (Gergen, 1978). This suggests that hypothesis testing is sometimes an arbitrary endeavour. However, the mixed method’s nature this thesis adopts posits that much of the issues presented by Gergen and others can be overcome due to the first discursive and inductive study of this thesis, and the use of a survey method to bridge the conceptual and methodological gap between discursive and experimental traditions. The survey is built upon the findings of this first inductive and qualitative study. The results of this survey were then drawn upon to inform further the development of 3 sets of experiments.

The nature of the 3 experimental settings allowed for what Gergen termed shifting social settings as these studies were designed to engage with the interpersonal, the intra-group and the inter-group nature of charitable behaviours, while also taking into account important and relevant variables such as blame-attribution, ingroup bias, and identity threat. While this thesis works therefore through an investigation of helping from a qualitative perspective, a survey approach, and an experimental stance at both interpersonal, intra- and inter-group levels of analysis, each study on their own presents significant and important contributions to the area of charitable giving, and therefore taken together can be seen to contribute further to the broader social psychological project of prosocial behaviours.
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2.8.4 A place for mixing methods?

“Surely some important behaviour involves standing up?” (Baumeister, Vohs & Funder, 2007, p. 399). Such is the argument in a recent paper on the utility or lack-thereof of the overwhelming tendency to adopt introspective methods such as self-report measures in laboratory studies that claim to have as their object of interest social behaviour of some sort. Social Psychology as a field has again come under scrutiny of late, as it has traditionally been conceptualised as the study of and direct observation of human behaviour (much like the original crisis in psychology as addressed by Henri Tajfel in some of his seminal works, which have previously been discussed). Social Psychology, according to Baumeister and colleagues, has “a mandate to study the important social behaviours that compose the very texture of human life” (Baumeister, Vohs & Funder, 2007, p. 396).

“At one time focused on direct observations of behaviours that were both fascinating and important a focus that attracted many researchers to the field in the first place social psychology has turned in recent years to the study of reaction times and questionnaire responses. These techniques, which promised to help to explain behaviour, appear instead to have largely supplanted it. The result is that current research in social and personality psychology pays remarkably little attention to the important things that people do” (Baumeister et al., 2007, p 396).

This critique of the self-reporting nature of many contemporary social psychological studies suggests that the increased interest in the study of the brain and cognition has led to a decreased interest in the study of behaviour, by way of explanation. This raises the question of ontological perspectives in social psychology, as the subjectivity associated with some more behaviourally-oriented studies can often be problematised, and objectivity associated with the more socio-cognitive approaches can be construed as the sole route to reliable and valid forms of knowledge. This tension between ontological positions is set amidst the broader epistemological debates as to what counts as ‘knowledge’. The original shift in the early 20th century noted by Wundt (Wundt, 1894) from the
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introspection-led methods in psychological science to the more direct observational studies of behaviour as method was “widely regarded as an advancement in the development of scientific methodology” which appears to have suffered a recent return to the original stance (Baumeister et al., 2007, p 397).

Baumeister and colleagues’ critique of the current state of social psychological studies does however include studies with a manipulation and subsequent observation of a dependent variable as considered ‘behaviour’ in their systematic review of the main social psychological journals, merely stating that the accuracy of self-report measures cannot always be relied upon (Baumeister et al., 2007) suggesting that they can often be beneficial. Hence this thesis chooses a combined effort of behavioural studies, in terms of discourse and talk-in-interaction for example, and survey (self-reports) or experimental (primes and manipulations) studies predicting that this combination could produce a more robust theoretical account of charitable giving as a helping behaviour.

West and Brown (West & Brown, 1975) combined two seemingly opposing methods to examine one question relating to helping behaviours in two different ways; self-reported intentions to help an accident victim seeking financial assistance on the road-side in order to access medical help, and actual observations of an actor seeking financial assistance on the roadside for same. Indeed both methods, in an attempt to tackle the same question, came up with contradictory answers as results. This raises the issue of the importance of the research question and as Reicher has pointed out “the way in which we ask our questions” (Reicher, 2001). Rozin (2001) has claimed that social psychology has become “tilted towards examining precisely those topics for which these [referring to self-reports, laboratory and introspective studies] methods are appropriate, and away from everything else”. As ethical dilemmas mean certain studies of behaviour are not entirely feasible, Baumeister and colleagues suggest that “the ideal paper would report both direct observation of behaviour and measurement of inner processes that mediate and produce those behaviours” (Baumesiter et al., 2007, p401). As behaviour in its own right is viewed as only the starting point, as the beginning of solving the puzzle of social phenomena (Baumeister et al., 2007), the current thesis adopts a mixed methods approach that harnesses the benefits
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of both subjective and objective ontological perspectives, and a flexible stance on the epistemological grounding of the subsequent studies.

2.9 Conclusion

A mixed methods approach to any social psychological problem can be advantageous and worthwhile for several reasons. First, by adopting both qualitative and quantitative methodological perspectives at different stages in a research project many of the negative aspects or limitations of either method can be overcome and compensated for by the positive attributes of the other. Secondly, the search for “knowledges, not knowledge”, as Burr (1995) has suggested, is enabled by such an expansive approach to any psychological investigation through its ability to adopt different viewpoints and shift between paradigms where appropriate in order to gain a more in-depth understanding of a difficult, complex phenomenon.

The literature on prosocial behaviour, and previous research into intergroup relations, have resulted in several paradoxes and unanswered questions; whether empathic concern always results in helping; whether there a straightforward relationship between empathy and perceptions of similarity whereby they can both lead to giving; the role of responsibility has in an intergroup helping situation. With such a diverse and complex set of questions being asked, it seems only appropriate to have a diverse way of addressing them. To return to Reichers (2000) critique that much of psychology has become overly concerned with how questions are answered (via qualitative or quantitative methods) as opposed to how these questions are asked (in the case of this thesis, first looking at how people do being charitable in their talk, and then building on these findings to create a hypotheses that require appropriate quantitative analyses), a mixed methods approach to understanding charitable giving with a view to appreciate how best to increase charitable donations was chosen as most appropriate.

The main questions asked of this thesis were thus:

1. Given the lack of a comprehensive or systematic understanding of responsibility in the literature: how do people themselves understand and use the
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concept of responsibility as it applies to charitable behaviour, what consequences does it have for their thought, talk and charitable behaviour and how are these different from other ways of understanding the reasons to give to charity such as empathy?

2. From Study 1 how do perceptions of responsibility for a charitable target affect charitable giving independently of feelings of empathy?

3. Are the effects of reported empathy and responsibility on charitable giving systematically affected by the characteristics of the outgroup and what implications does this have for charitable giving more generally? More specifically, by priming normative aspects of a group’s identity as empathetic or as responsible, will this impact on giving when the target group is manipulated to present as blameworthy, as an outgroup, or as posing a threat to the ingroup donor?
2. THE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF HELPING BEHAVIOUR
Chapter 3

Study 1 Method

3.1 Introduction

Chapter 1 reviewed many of the key studies that have contributed to the social psychology of helping behaviours. Many of these studies from an individual, intra- and intergroup perspective suggested empathic concern as an important precursor to helping. It was also demonstrated that empathic concern could be facilitated by perceptions of similarity between helper and helpee (Batson et al., 1991). However further investigations would indicate that oftentimes perceived similarity can present as problematic for a helper (Jones & Aronson, 1967; Brown & Lopez, 2001). Thus the complex relationship between helping, similarity and empathic concern was identified.

Chapter 1 also introduced the concept of responsibility. While many studies on prosocial behaviour have identified other considerations such as nurturance and protection, principles of care and obligation as important factors when deciding to help, scenarios and helping situations examining responsibility are oftentimes restricted to incidents in which the victim or needy recipient is held accountable for their circumstances (Weiner, 1995). It is in this way that responsibility in the social psychological literature thus far has been framed, and therefore subsequent operationalisations of responsibility in many of these primarily quantitative investigations focus on blame attribution and responsibility for cause as opposed to a donor’s self-ascribed responsibility to give help. The reverse of this blame-attribution, the attribution of responsibility to the self to help, has largely been
overlooked save by investigating it through its absence, as is the case in much of the Bystander literature (Latané & Darley, 1968, 1970).

It is this particular omission that the current study wishes to address: the role of self-ascribed responsibility in helping situations by examining how it is actually understood by people in their everyday talk about helping. However, as the traditional view on empathic concern as a factor is also an important consideration, in addition this study looks to explore how it can be invoked in talk of giving, with a specific focus on its complex relationship with perceptions of similarity (Brown & Lopez, 2001). With this rationale, the following research question was developed:

*How are empathy and responsibility used rhetorically in talk of charitable giving?* With a specific focus on their function in talk, the constructive nature of their use, and the variable, flexible and strategic way in which they are invoked to manage accountability.

In order to answer this question, a social constructivist epistemological perspective was adopted, using a subjective ontological approach to both data collection and analysis.

The overarching concern of this mixed methods thesis is to understand more fully the roles empathic concern and responsibility play in helping behaviours and intentions, and essentially helping at the group level. However, a basis for the merits of this question above and beyond indications from the previous literature that these two concepts are of importance was first essential. To build this foundation, and to use this to inform the subsequent studies of this thesis, an inductive and exploratory qualitative study was chosen as best placed. It allowed for the examination of concepts considered to be important from the perspective of a constructionism epistemological standpoint. It also allowed for a contribution to the qualitative literature thus far, by adopting a discourse analytic approach to talk on helping behaviours and charitable giving more specifically.

As was noted in Chapter 2, charitable giving was chosen as a lens through which more general helping behaviours could be examined in terms of the concepts of interest (empathic concern and self-ascribed responsibility). This is therefore
why the data generated in Study 1 is talk \textit{about} giving to charitable organisations. This also formed the basis for the decision to conduct two sets of interviews, with both members of the general public and those employed in the charitable sector. In order to fully investigate, from an exploratory perspective, whether or not empathy and responsibility feature as important in people’s intentions to and subsequently their decisions to help, such data was deemed necessary. Similar to the way in which charitable giving is conceptualised in this thesis as a lens through which helping behaviours more generally can be examined, charity workers and non-charity workers were chosen as routes through which certain concepts could be examined. The reason behind the choice of participants and methods of data generation have direct implications for the treatment of this data set. The data generated from both single participant interviews with charity workers and multiple participant interviews with lay members of the public were treated equivalently. This chapter will identify the differences between both methods of data collection (from the perspective of a discourse analysis approach), which include differences in terms of the interactive dimension of both methods. However above and beyond the acknowledgment and identification of these differences throughout the analysis, the overarching aim of the research question led to the decision to not treat them as separate data sets.

The research question seeks to investigate how people in their talk \textit{do} being charitable with a specific focus on how concepts such as empathy and responsibility are invoked in talk, with a view to developing a grounded understanding of their importance above and beyond what is indicated in the previous literature thus far. With this as the overarching concern, the differences in data generated from a single and multiple participant interview were not seen to impact upon this goal. This aspect of the methods chosen for Study 1 will be addressed in further sections of this chapter.

This chapter will present the analytic approach adopted, Discourse Analysis (Edwards & Potter, 1992). This will consist of an overview and progression of this approach in psychology over the past 25 years. It will also introduce Sack’s focus on membership categorisation devices as used in talk (1972a) as this method also forms part of the analytic approach to the data from Study 1, and the analysis presented in the following two chapters (Chapter 4 & 5).
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Subsequently this chapter will detail the method of data collection used in Study 1, as single and multiple participant interviews, include a rationale and critique of this method, and work through the sampling strategy and participants chosen before detailing the procedure employed in the interviews. Finally a brief synopsis of the treatment of the data and the overall findings will be given ahead of the first analysis chapter.

3.1.1 Qualitative methods in psychology

First and foremost the methodological perspective adopted in this thesis as a mixed methods approach agrees with Reicher (2000) in that pitting quantitative methods against qualitative methods in a “one versus the other” paradigm is essentially an unhelpful decision. As Reicher highlighted in his response to Elliott, Fisher and Rennie’s published guidelines in qualitative research (Reicher, 2000; Elliott, Fisher, & Rennie, 1999) the dangers of prioritising the way in which we investigate our questions over the way in which questions are asked is particularly prominent in psychology (Moscovici, 1972). With these assertions Reicher is adamant that qualitative methods should be used where appropriate, and that the very health of this discipline depends on choosing methods to suit the research questions, as opposed to “over conforming” with other sciences and attempting to quantify phenomena as a means of conforming and maintaining reputations as natural scientists (Reicher, 2000). Reicher states that “the debate around qualitative methodology is not an attempt to usurp the experimental and statistical mainstream but a means of enhancing our methodological awareness” (p. 2). It is against this theoretical backdrop that an introduction to the type of qualitative method of the analysis of everyday talk employed here (Discourse Analysis in Psychology and Sacks’ work on Membership Categorisation Devices) will be given.

Perhaps it is important to first look at the epistemological standpoint of several qualitative researchers in the field of social psychology, as this can help move towards an understanding of how the many methods of analysing qualitative data relate to each other, appear on a spectrum of ideologies of methodology, and inevitably how studies of discourse fit into this picture. Epistemology refers to one’s
theory of knowledge - essentially what knowledge means - and this can therefore shape one’s methodological standpoint, one’s ideal way of how to gather this knowledge. If methods are in fact seen as a means to an end, or the “way to a goal”, then not only is it necessary to justify our choices of methods, but also to define what this goal actually is (Kvale, 1996). Moving from paradigms such as Positivism (or naive realism) through Empiricism (or ‘sense perception’) to Constructionism (or social constructivism), it is the different ways that knowledge has been understood that has led to these differing methodological perspectives.

Here the first phase of this thesis, as with a lot of the qualitative approaches to data collection and analysis, is closer to the social constructivism end of this continuum believing that reality is constructed through social interactions by the social actors themselves, with understandings of any one reality as based on context.

Burr, in 2003, made reference to his own epistemological viewpoint when he stated that we are in search of knowledges, not knowledge. “Social constructionism draws attention to the fact that human experience, including perception, is mediated historically, culturally and linguistically” (Willig, 2008, p. 7). This perspective is in line with the theories behind the turn to language (Potter, 2010) and emphasises a concern with the many different ways in which people can construct their social reality. Thus Discourse Analysis as used in social psychology (DA) was chosen as best placed for this study as it emphasises these various ways of construction that are available to speakers at each moment in a discursive interaction. This section will now review the progression of DA as a method in psychology, and its relationship with Discursive Psychology (DP) as a perspective in psychology, and finally how it fits with this study’s research question in particular.

### 3.1.2 Discursive Psychology: Origins and varieties

The first duty of a science is to construct methods and descriptions appropriate to the object of study (Edwards, 2012). In line with this statement, the core research question of this study will be addressed by a combination of approaches to talk-in-interaction as action oriented. As such, discourse analysis (Potter & Wetherell,
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1987) and some key concerns from Sacks’ study of membership categorisation devices (1972a) will be employed.

Discursive Psychology (DP) as a discipline in its own right has recently celebrated its 25th anniversary. This thesis adopts elements from the related Discourse Analysis (DA) approach to qualitative data. However while it is necessary to address the key concerns of DP first, it is also important to demonstrate the progression from DA as a method (and the tools used by discourse analysts) towards the eventual development of DP as a discipline. This section will acknowledge advancements in DP and its aims to re-specify psychological concepts through its more recent relationship with Conversation Analysis (Sacks, 1972) and a shift towards a more heavy reliance on naturalistic data. Nevertheless, to forefront this progression, it is necessary to state that this current study (Study 1) remains loyal to the original discourse analysis method in psychology - looking to identify resources that people use in their talk (to manage accountability) and the consequences of this use. This loyalty has implications for the type of data used for this analysis (namely interview data) which will be returned to in section 3.3.1.

3.1.3 Historical origins

From the 1950’s on there was a general sparking of interest across disciplines such as sociology, philosophy and history in the productive function of language, or of talk as “a social performance” (Willig, C., 2008, p. 7). As such, language began to be reconceptualised as productive in that it wasn’t simply a route to cognition. This approach argued against a mainly cognitivist perspective (mechanistic, internalised view of cognitions and mental processes that rely heavily on principles from positivism), and in the 1980’s this turn to language was picked up in psychology and social psychology as Potter and Wetherell (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) put forward a critique of this cognitivist approach and guidelines for a new approach: discourse analysis.

Their critique argued that cognition is not simply based on perception, that an objective perception of reality is not possible and that cognitive structures are not ever-enduring.
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This perspective was derived from and developed upon early work in this vein such as Austin’s Speech Act Theory (1962) and Michel Foucault’s historical and cultural study of discursive practice (1970). Along with Billig’s (1987) work on rhetoric and argumentation, it gave way to a new way of thinking within psychology with the seminal work Discursive Psychology (Potter & Edwards, 1992) in 1992; “The relevance and appeal of DP is best understood not so much in its own terms, but in relation to intellectual debates and social psychological notions and topics which it sought to respecify: attitudes, cognition, emotion, attribution, persuasion, and so on.” (Augoustinos & Tileaga, 2012).

The Loughborough Discourse and Rhetoric Group, founded in 1987, sprung from this interest in language outside of principally linguistic fields, and began to first look at discourse as a topic and the analysis of this discourse as a method (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Simultaneously, Edwards and Mercer were focusing on the analysis of real-life talk, with Edwards’ initial interest in child language usage and in-class interactions and the displays of common knowledge (Edwards, 1978; Edwards & Mercer, 1987). The third area of development that lead to this ‘turn to language’ was Billig’s interest in rhetoric and argumentation, highlighting the social nature of thought and opinion (1987). The aspect these three important publications (Discourse and Psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour, Common Knowledge: the development of understanding in the classroom, and Arguing and Thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology) and three core ideas of DARG had in common was essentially using discourse as a means of understanding what had previously been viewed as purely cognitive topics: for example attribution, attitudes, cognition, memory. Talk was now viewed as intrinsically social and as such it was talk and the study of discursive interactions that would allow sociologists and social psychologists to understand how these topics were constructed and formulated in everyday talk.

The focus of a discursive analysis of talk thus moves away from causal explanations towards the normative nature of social life, and how talk performs actions. In arguing that it is redundant to replace common sense psychological concepts with scientific ones, and by viewing this as widening further the “interpretative gap” (Edwards, 2012) between the object or social phenomena under investigation and the conclusions drawn, these key authors were claiming that it
is more beneficial to see psychological concepts as resources that can be used in everyday talk as terms in which the speakers both understand and subsequently account for their actions.

As discourse analysis developed as a method within psychology, arguments progressed that mental experiences and external worlds do not exist (against what cognitive psychological theorising would claim). Discourse began to be seen as ‘a realm of mental life in which everyday events are constructed’ (Edwards, 2012, p. 2). The resources available to speakers such as interpretative repertoires (Potter & Wetherell, 1987; the use of tropes, metaphors, common cliches and well-known “ways of talking”) and the focus on understanding the management of accountability and stake and interest in talk were early concepts in discourse analysis as a method in psychology.

However as the area developed, Discursive Psychology became a field distinct from simply a method of analysing talk, and distinct from how DA may have been used in social theory or linguistics for example. DP was termed as a field that defined psychology as a topic and a focus (Edwards, 2012) and sought to provide a “systematic, empirical analysis of talk and text, principally everyday recorded talk, using a coherent set of concepts and methods” with an emerging grounding in Sacks’ conversation analysis and a broader ethno methodological approach. Key differences between DA and DP will be addressed in a further section. However, first some of the main milestones in the progression of DP as a perspective in psychology, and DA as a method within this perspective, will be discussed.

3.1.4 Early DP: Interpretative repertoires and rhetoric

Gilbert and Mulkay’s (1984) original interest in the social processes involved in resolving disputes regarding the generation of scientific knowledge led to their discovery of variability in the accounts of their interviewees. Such variability did not just exist across different interviews with different scientists, but they found variability within the accounts of each of the scientists. “The possibility of variation in and between versions of events is built into the fabric of everyday life” (Wooffitt, 2005, p. 16). Thus, through their development of an interest in
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such variability and their stance against the assumption that similar accounts, or regularity in accounts, would represent accurately an underlying reality, they developed the first basic analytic unit of DA, interpretative repertoires. Augoustinos and Tileaga argue that it was interpretative repertoires that first gave social psychologists a new way of understanding many of the key issues of discursive psychology; namely how resources are used to defend, justify, argue and account for - understanding human accountability (Augoustinos & Tileaga, 2012, p.5)

Interpretative repertoires are known in DA as “recurrently used systems of terms used for characterising and evaluating actions, events and other phenomena” (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p.149). An example is the formal and informal contexts in which Gilbert and Mulkay’s scientists invoked an empiricist repertoire (in a formal context) and a contingent repertoire (in an informal context) when accounting for their theoretical stances in their pursuit of scientific knowledge. Instead of seeking patterns within an individual’s talk discourse analysis looks at patterns of recurring talk across all participants. As individuals will oftentimes present competing attitudes or perspectives at different times within a conversational interaction it is more useful to identify how these different ways of talking occur, in what capacity a participant will draw upon them, and for what purpose they are being used. Interpretative repertoires therefore are a set of terms used in explanations, recurring patterns in talk; “commonly these terms are derived from one or more key metaphor and the presence of a repertoire will often be signalled by certain tropes or figures of speech” (Potter & Wetherell, 1992).

Both Potter (2007c) and Gibson (2009) have acknowledged that the early focus on interpretative repertoires has diminished as a feature of prominence in much of the current DP work. However both also emphasise interpretative repertoires as remaining of central importance to much of the literature on social psychological phenomena and issues that adopt a discursive approach (e.g. Croghan & Miell, 1999; Lawes, 1999; Reynolds & Wetherell, 2003; Reynolds, Wetherell, & Taylor, 2007; Gibson, 2009). This resource, interpretative repertoires, functions as important within the analysis of Study 1 as two main repertoires were identified concerning the ways in which people talk about giving, and the related category construction and accountability practices will be presented in terms of their use within these two repertoires (Chapter 4 and Chapter 5).
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Billig’s (Billig, 1987) initial interest in the role of language in social interactions developed into a more specific interest in the role of rhetoric and argumentation in social interactions, and posited that all discourse is some form of rhetoric or persuasive activity. In the initial stages of this perspective on language usage Billig (Billig et al., 1988) investigated the dilemmatic nature of talk, and focused on the problems that common-sense and everyday maxims present to speakers due to their contradictory and argumentative nature. According to Billig, all talk is in some way an argument - against another version of the particular report or claim, against the alternative positions that could be worked up in giving this account - and discourse is thinking-in-action in that it is constantly working to challenge or counter these other ‘possible’ accounts. This is clearly linked to the concept of variability is DA in general, and even in more specific forms of DA. However, unlike DA in psychology or Conversation analysis (CA) in psychology, this rhetorical analysis focuses less on the general action-orientation of language and more on this persuasive and argumentative nature of language in talk (Wooffitt, 2005). Aspects therefore of Billig’s ideological dilemmas will be attended to throughout the qualitative analysis. However the role of rhetoric will not be systematically analysed here.

3.1.5 Progression of DP: Stake and interest

Aside from the different repertoires people can draw on, there are many other mechanisms that can be employed to manage the different dilemmas that emerge in talk. These became more developed in a discursive analytic approach as the field itself progressed. Category entitlement and footing positions act as practices that are available to speakers in order for them to work up the facticity or authority of their accounts. Where there is personal interest in a claim, report, explanation or account there is a requirement to manage that interest or stake (Potter, 1996).

This attention to issues of stake and interest came about from a critique of conventional approaches to studying memory and attribution which was seen to disregard the central issues of the participant’s vested interest and stake in the topic at hand. Thus, in what can be viewed as a set of guidelines for DA, DP
more broadly and the Discursive Action Model (DAM), in 1992’s *Discursive Psychology* Edwards and Potter began to highlight this as a concern in talk and focused on how people could be caught in a dilemma of stake or interest: “how to produce accounts which attend to interest without being undermined as interested” (Edwards & Potter, 1992, pg 158). This concern was further developed in Potter’s *Representing Reality* (Potter, 1996), where this dilemma for speakers was addressed at more length and the many ways and practices by which speakers are seen to manage stake and interest were presented.

There are oftentimes situations throughout a conversation in which the social actor wishes to disguise any interest they may have in altering their depictions of events to suit their own means or present themselves in a positive, more convincing light. In doing so, they are accomplishing a discursive action or piece of business, by managing their own stake in the interaction (i.e. the fact that they may have something to gain if they manage their interests correctly or something to lose if they do not accomplish this). As a precursor to such attempts to avoid all signs of interested-talk *disclaimers* can often be used. Disclaimers constitute short phrases inserted at the beginning of a comment that may be open to miss-interpretation (or accurate interpretation). Such comments can often be construed in a negative way, and in order to avoid this, a disclaimer (e.g. “I’m no racist, but...”) is inserted. These disclaimers can be useful discursive resources when attempting to disguise a stake or interest in a conversation, but also more generally at any point in a conversation when a comment of a sensitive nature is to follow (Condor, Figuo, Abell, Gibson, & Stevenson, 2006). Thus these facets of talk as practices to be analysed became important in developing DA as an analytic method.

*Stake inoculation* (Potter, 1996) was evidenced as a means of staving off any conclusions or assumptions that a speaker’s claims are motivated and interested. Anticipating sceptical responses to reports or claims and attempting to manage this anticipation can be accomplished through stake inoculation or interest-management, or by invoking certain categories (Sacks, 1972a).

*Category entitlement* refers to the entitlement a speaker can claim or work up in any discursive interaction to enable him to be seen as a member of a particular category - usually to enable their claims to go unquestioned or to be seen
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as un-motivated and factual. Category entitlement is described as “the idea that certain categories of people, in certain contexts, are treated as knowledgeable” (Potter, 1996, p. 133). Such categories can either be worked up in this way, or can simply be deployed as labels which are inference-laden and carry the attributes and category bound activities (Sacks, 1972a) that might imply certain levels of knowledge. In the current study such discursive resources are of notable import, as charity workers (as forming some of the sample used in Study 1) for example can immediately add credibility and facticity to their accounts and their descriptions of events, situations and people by working up their membership of such a category (employee of a charitable organisation) or simply displaying this category (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998) thus subsequently displaying an entitlement to speak about such issues.

One further way of managing the dilemma of stake or interest is through footing practices. Footing (Goffman, 1981) relates to “the range of relationships” a speaker can have with their accounts or descriptions (Potter, 1996, p. 124), and footing work can be evident in innumerable contexts: when the social actor attempts to shift their position in a conversation to avoid a particularly contradictory stance (i.e. when they are building up to a new account or a new version of events); when they shift their language from the use of ‘I’ to using ‘We’ for example. Distance Footing (Potter, 1996) also involves this type of shift, and occurs when one is trying to remove themselves from a particular explanation of events or a version of facts - a version which they do invoke in talk, but do not wish to be represented as being within a close proximity of the version itself (i.e. when a speaker attributes a particular construction of an event to someone else, an unknown other). This can be facilitated by another discursive device, known as consensus or corroboration, where a speaker can work up an account so that there appears to be several others also in agreement with their version of events, or depicting the existence of many other witnesses to help them work up the facticity of their own account. Stake, footing and entitlement are seen in DA as three dimensions in which the identity of the speaker is inextricably related to the accounts that they produce (Potter, 1996).

Facticity and accountability management as discursive mechanisms all act therefore to improve the credibility of a speaker and their entitlement to speak in
order to uphold their presenting of themselves as moral social actors (especially so in the case of discussions on morally-accountable issues such as charitable giving). This credibility is outlined by Potter and Wetherell (1987) in which they suggest that footing and interest can be managed to accomplish accounts. These accounts can be worked up to appear even more convincing and less interest-driven by invoking the speaker’s membership in a particular category.

Accountability is seen as an issue in studies of discourse as it is a dimension in which a speaker attempts to present themselves in a particular light and manage their identity. This is important in discursive interactions that revolve around sensitive or political topics, and charitable giving can be seen as a moral and accountable matter. As such the speaker will need to manage or negotiate the identity concerns they have around maintaining a position as someone who is moral whilst remaining loyal to the other concerns an earlier comment for example made relevant for them (Harper, 1996).

“Edwards questions the privileging in psychology of cause-effect relationships and makes a strong case for the idea that intelligibility of social life is to be found in the normative basis of human practices and accountability” (Agoustinos & Tileaga, 2012, p. 4) and it is this accountability that the first research question of this mixed methods study is concerned with.

To further contextualise the methods adopted in Study 1, the following section will look briefly at the progression towards a more micro-analytic focus on language with the turn to conversation analysis and other strands of what can be termed contemporary discourse analysis.

3.1.6 Contemporary DP: The turn to CA and microanalysis

It is here that the difference between methodology and method should be emphasised, in that the former refers to one’s general approach to data collection and analysis, be it of a qualitative or quantitative nature, while the latter refers to the specific techniques used to do both. While the general approach to the first study of the current thesis is qualitative in nature, the method of data analysis
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used is grounded in DA, while borrowing from Sacks’ work on membership categorisation devices (MCD). However there are several forms of DA that developed either as a precursor to DA in psychology (such as Foucauldian Discourse Analysis) or subsequently (such as Critical Discourse Analysis). While these forms of DA have as their basis the fundamental importance the role of language plays in social interactions, and how this role is an active rather than a passive one, they employ slightly different techniques in their analysis and also place different degrees of importance on discourse.

Fairclough’s (1995) Critical Discourse Analysis focuses strongly on the more formal linguistic approach to language and talk in interaction. Such an overly detailed linguistic approach would not be helpful within the confines of the research question for Study 1, as it looks to address more broadly the issue of ways in which people produce accounts of their own charitable giving and that of others, and requires less attention to single utterances and turn-taking. Foucault’s analysis (Foucauldian Discourse Analysis, 1970) is based on a more socio-cultural approach to language and its role in discursive interactions and society as a whole with an emphasis on the role of power, which would appear too broad in its view of the active role of language. As such, the focus within an analysis of this kind would not be useful for looking specifically at ways in which people account for giving or not giving to different groups at a fundamental level - without engaging in too much detail with the overarching historical and cultural issues of the Irish context (participants in Study 1 were all Irish citizens).

Conversation Analysis was originally developed in the 70’s through the interest Harvey Sacks had in a series of telephone calls to a Suicide Prevention Centre and the social organisation of language more generally. It subsequently became the analysis of qualitative data for researchers who were looking to find a method that involved extensive attention to detail and the rigour that CA transcription styles can offer. With additional developments such as Membership Categorisation Analysis, Sacks’ work grew steadily and CA is seen to have been hugely influential in the development of DA in social psychology, despite the differences in analytic procedures that exist between these methods.

However, in more recent years DP has returned to the conversation-analytic approach to naturally occurring data and has begun to merge more closely with
this original type of data analysis (Stokoe, 2009).

Organised turn-taking, the sequential nature of talk and the study of utterance-design is being used in many studies on real-world discursive interactions such as calls to help-centres (Stokoe, 2009) or police interrogations and interviews (Stokoe, 2009). As with critical discourse analysis, however, the attention to detail within such an analytic method is unnecessary for the tasks required of the research question put forward in Study 1: How people in their everyday talk produce accounts of their own and others charitable behaviour. Consequently DA remains best placed as an overarching method of analysis. Where detail is relevant, however, is in the categories deployed in the speakers’ talk, and this final section of this focus on analytic methods will present an overview of Sacks approach to membership categorisation devices (MCD).

3.2 MCA as additional resource

The analysis of Study 1 data will pay special attention to the many different categories and membership of groups which the speakers themselves work up and make relevant throughout the interactions. Membership Categorisation Analysis (MCA, Sacks, 1972) focuses on categories that rely on the common-sense or shared knowledge of speakers for the subsequent inferences these categories make available. Activities that are commonly performed by a particular category of people become a category bound activity, which leads to assigning members to a particular category if they behave in a specific way, or if they partake in a certain action - and also vice-versa as invoking a category can explain a specific activity.

Sacks’ earliest work on membership categorisation devices dates back to 1963, when his lectures relied on much of his own research conducted and developed in the Suicide Prevention Centre in L.A. These lectures in turn were published as two landmark papers in 1972, more commonly known as The Baby Cried paper (1972a) and The Search for help: no one to turn to paper (1972b). Further work in this area was then published in 1992. MCD were essentially noted as a set of practices for referring to persons in talk, text, or narratives. In fact the first paper, The Baby Cried, looks distinctly at children’s narratives and how they tell stories. The turn to the more regimented naturalistic talk as data came to
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the forefront at a later date with the turn to conversation analysis. This has implications for its use in the analysis of this thesis’ current study in terms of the types of data it can help address, as the form of the data therefore can be seen to have consequences for its use (interviews are used in Study 1, and traditional DA and the traditional approach to MCD have both adopted interviews also, see section 3.3).

MCD were identified as involving word selection to do descriptions: “how speakers come to use the words they do, and how that informs the hearing the talk gets” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 463). Based on common-sense knowledge and assumptions that can be derived from the categories or labels people use in their talk, Sacks’ analyses were seen as building an apparatus, in so far as he was looking at MCD as resources available to speakers but also the practices or norms of their deployment in talk (Schlegoff, 2007a). The understandings that hearer and speaker can share with a simple category deployment (and Sacks has suggested that one category is sufficient) becomes the focus of the analyst.

MCD are made up of collections of categories and rules of applying these categories. Some resources available to speakers were identified as relationships that housed certain categories, termed collections. The following analysis will draw upon Collection R and Collection K, as R refers to relationship categories based on rights and obligations, and K is a collection more grounded in knowledge.

The consequences of category deployment, much like a discursive take on language, is of interest to an analyst focusing on MCD. Such consequences can be broken down into three components: membership categories as inference rich, in that a member of one is a representative of said category; membership categories and the understandings associated with them due to common-sense knowledge mean they are protected against induction, (therefore if anyone presents as deviating from their category, the understanding of the category isn’t changed, but the person is understood to be at fault); each category has certain presumptive actions or behaviours associated with it, which are known as category-bound activities characteristic of any category deployed. The common denominator of these three facets of MCD is therefore the consequences of category deployment. The hearer and the speaker understand meanings through the deployment of a category such that the category implies certain attributes, it is protected against
deviant members, and doing a category bound activity can highlight the relevance for the hearer of the initial category deployment.

The way in which these MCD are applied and the rules associated with their use are relatively straightforward. The economy rule posits that the use of a single category from an MCD can be sufficient to provide reference and relevance for the hearer. The consistency rule holds that if a person is initially categorised within one particular MCD, then it follows that the subsequent categorisation work will be part of that same MCD (e.g. introducing a first person as from Limerick, and the following person as from Dublin, as opposed to introducing the following person as interested in sports).

Sacks’ hearer’s and viewer’s maxims simply state that if a category is deployed and a category-bound activity is mentioned in talk, then one should use this information in their understanding of the person in question and understand the relevance of these deployments; “If a category-bound activity is asserted to be done by a member of some category, then hear it that way” (Sacks, 1972b, p. 337) and similarly, “If a member sees a category-bound activity being done, then, if one can see it being done by a member of a category to which the activity is bound, then: See it that way” (p. 338). The common-sense logic of these maxims and rules of application generate an understanding of Sacks’ interest in MCD in talk. Their uses are so prevalent in everyday talk (yet up to Sacks’ time in psychology or sociology left somewhat unacknowledged) that initially MCD were deemed to not simply be sociological findings per se, but presented as posing “some of the problems which social science shall have to resolve” (Sacks, 1972a).

Much like a discursive psychological approach to the analysis of data, the variable and strategic nature of category selection becomes the main concern of the analyst; “it is because multiple MCD are available with their multiplicity of categories that relevance is the issue, and how categories and their MCD become very relevantly oriented to becomes a key topic for inquiry” (Schegloff, 2007a, p. 475).

The following sections will now move forward to address specific concerns regarding the data collection, sample, procedure employed for Study 1, and the way in which the data to be analysed by DA and MCD was generated and subsequently treated.
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3.3 Using DA: Interview methods

This study will employ both single and multiple participant interviews as a method of data collection. This section will present a rationale for this choice while also addressing some of the concerns that have been raised in the literature regarding such a method for a DA approach to analysis. It will also detail the treatment of the single participant interviews (SPI) and multiple participant interviews (MPI) as being treated equivalently, and presents a justification for same.

Variability is viewed as an important aspect of a discursive analysis as, opposed to reliability, it reveals the functional use of discourse (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Such reflexivity and lack of reliability can oftentimes present as a criticism of interview data more often from a quantitative perspective. However even within the realm of qualitative methods of investigation, critiques of the use of interview data have included issues of sample size, assumed group membership of respondents, and problems of footing and staked or interested accounts (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). The following section hopes to address some of these issues and demonstrate how they are understood and navigated through the conducting of interviews and the use of DA on the data collected for Study 1.

Halliday claimed that when focusing on the relationship between language and social context it is necessary to “acknowledge that any particular account or version of the world will be intimately related to the circumstances of its production” (1978) and this represents the concern DA has with function and strategic use of talk-in-action. It also illustrates another key aspect of DA in that this form of analysis or entire approach in psychology doesn’t place emphasis on the truth in what people are saying but on what people are actually doing in their interactions. DA focuses less on the representativeness of a sample, as representative samples are based on the assumption that the individual is limited to a set position (Reicher, 2000). Instead it assumes that discourse is linked to function and therefore a sample ‘population’ cannot exist, as individuals may change positions in their own talk whenever the context shifts. Therefore large sample sizes are not a requirement in a qualitative study that utilises interview data and discourse analysis (see section 3.5 for details of the sample for Study 1).
Discourse Analysis in psychology focuses on the performative quality of talk and language usage as action-oriented. With the first publications on the turn to discourse, interpretative repertoires (IR, Potter & Wetherell, 1987) were first identified as resources available to speakers to accomplish whatever their discursive business might be at that particular time in that particular interactional context. As these IR developed under the strand of DA that studies descriptions for the business they do rather than the objects they describe (Potter, 2010), the initial studies in this area employed open-ended interviews and focus group discussion data (Potter, 2010). Management of accountability in descriptions also developed as an area of interest at this time. However the move towards DP as an explicit title, while still looking at talk as data and DA as an effective method of tackling ‘ideological questions that more mainstream psychology has rarely been able to address directly’ also made the shift towards looking specifically at naturalistic data and recorded conversations as opposed to interview scenarios.

While this move to such natural data sources is now fundamental to many of the originators of the DP approach, there still remains a place for SPI and MPI data while adopting the original broad thematic DA methods of analysing talk-as-action. DP can be seen to tackle some of the broader psychological concerns such as the re-specification of traditionally cognitive topics. DP has also strengthened its relationship in more recent times with conversation analysis, focusing on epistemics as a topic. However, the data to be analysed in the following chapters does not overly concern itself with DP’s broader agenda, in which naturalistic data is now an explicit criteria for what is being termed contemporary discursive psychology (Potter, 2010), and relies on the discursive resources and tools available to speakers to account for their behaviour by drawing on the early discourse analytic approach to interpretative repertoires and issues of accountability and identity management. The important concern in this regard, however, is to understand the context in which the talk occurs, as situated talk, and allows any analysis of this talk to take this context into account in the claims it makes and conclusions it comes to. This study will employ both single and multiple participant interviews to generate the data for analysis and address the overarching research question.
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In order to answer this overarching research question put forward in Chapter 2, and more specifically to answer the first qualitatively framed question of this investigation, it was felt that both the interactive discursive sessions of the multiple participant interviews and the single participant interviews with charity workers should be analysed together. This does not presume that both methods of data collection are not distinct from each other, and does not preclude that the interactions in one context are the same as the other. However, as each extract presented is analysed in terms of the specific context in which the data was brought about (single or multiple participant interviews) the manner in which these seemingly different forms of collecting discursive data will be treated assumes that the purpose of the research question does not require them to be dealt with separately.

Taking all talk together as a whole data set guards against an over-emphasis on the ways in which charity worker versus lay people talk about giving and helping, and allows a more general sense of how previously identified concepts of importance such as empathic concern and responsibility are addressed and managed in talk across both samples. Thus allowing the integration of all participants talk in the analysis in general led to the identification of both Interpretative Repertoires of Empathy and Responsibility and subsequently enabled both IRs to be treated separately and analysed more specifically while drawing on both MPI and SPI data. As was highlighted in the introduction to this chapter, the differences inherent in both methods of data collection were not seen to impact upon the aim of the study if treated equivalently.

3.3.1 Interviews and reflexivity

Gibson and Condor (2009) employed interviews in their recent work on soldiers and civilians common-sense ways of talking about national identity to good effect. Within their study they argue that the use of interview conversations can help to understand further the different interpretative practices that are used by speakers. Similar to the means by which this current study adopts an interview approach to data collection, the method has been chosen to specifically meet the requirements of the research question. As such, and in line with Gibson and
Condors work, the talk is treated as generated samples of discourse - avoiding claims of inferences concerning “the objective referents of talk” or “the subjectivity of the respondents” (Gibson & Condor, 2009). While taking the norms and conventions of interviews (Widdicombe & Wooffitt, 1995) into account but acknowledging that norms of talk are still cultural resources to be drawn upon, Wetherell has argued that an interview “is a highly specific social production it also draws on routine and highly consensual (cultural/normative) resources that carry beyond the immediate local context, connecting local talk with discursive history” (Wetherell, 2003, p.13).

This is perhaps where two key differences between DP and DA should be fully addressed. First, DP as a perspective in psychology tends not to focus necessarily on the broader social and cultural concerns in talk, evidenced in a move away from examining interpretative repertoires so frequently (Potter, 2007c), and thus remains more concerned with examining how speakers address their local concerns in talk. DA as a method is more flexible in its ability to take such cultural and social contexts into account in the analysis.

Furthermore, while DP looks to analyse specifically naturally occurring data, DA has been traditionally used for looking at talk gathered in more structured settings such as SPI or MPI (Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Potter & Hepburn, 2005). It has also been argued that in some cases the use of naturalistic data is not necessarily always the most appropriate approach to answering the specific research question (Potter & Hepburn, 2005).

This criticism, that interview talk is not deemed by discursive psychologists as essentially naturalistic, can be overcome by a reflexive analysis of both interviewer and interviewee, since all talk is “jointly produced” rather than “solely owned” by individual speakers (Condor, 2006b) (a further reason to treat the data from SPI and MPI as equivalent). Just as MPI discussions involve the explicit use of the group interaction as research data (Kitzinger, 1994) so too does an analysis of interview data involve the interaction between interviewer and interviewee in terms of how accounts are constructed and co-constructed rhetorically (Billig, 1987).

Potter and Mulkay (1985) also recommend the use of interviews as a technique for generating “interpretative work on the part of the participants, with the aim
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of identifying the kinds of interpretative repertoires and interpretative methods used by participants” (p. 269). In this current study, interviews will be used with the same aim, of generating understandings of the interpretative work of charity and non-charity workers in interview and multiple participant interview settings in which the management of a moral identity is a concern as they produce accounts of their charitable behaviour.

Much of Sacks’ early work focused on the recounting of experiences as data (for example ‘The Baby Cried’ paper), and as Schegloff emphasises, “a great deal of the subsequent work by others that draws on MCD is addressed to interview data, that is, data in which recounting is done.” (p 464). Regarding the use of MPI data, the issue of word selection for a single individual when deploying categories become an issue of convergence when this categorisation involves more than one individual or speaker. “These orientations and convergences - or lack of them - can be profoundly consequential for how someone is understood, how they are treated, how scenes in which they figure are grasped and whether or how another intervenes in them” (Schegloff, 2007a, p. 475). As such, multiple participant interviews can provide a useful platform for the analysis of such MCD and convergences.

3.3.2 Multiple participant interviews (MPI)

Multiple participant interviews are essentially structured around “an interactional dilemma” (Puchta & Potter, 1999). While critics could argue the policing nature of focus group moderators, a discourse analysis of such group interview data would have traditionally taken the role of the moderator or facilitator into account - as does this current study’s analysis. While MPI have habitually been presented as a means of understanding attitudes, from a discourse analysis perspective it is the constructive, rhetorical and argumentative nature of how these ‘attitudes’ or evaluations are worked up and deployed in talk that is of interest.

Rather than fixed entities, Billig (1987) claims that people give views in particular contexts; produce evaluations where there is at least the possibility of argument, while expressing an evaluation of something and marking the justification of their own position, often simultaneously expressing criticisms against
the counter-position (Puchta & Potter, 2002, p. 347). Early discursive work by Potter and Wetherall have also suggested the occasioned nature of evaluations or attitudes, focusing on variation and the consequences of these in context (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). The key distinguishable features of mainstream treatment of traditional MPI and MPI data from a discourse analysis perspective is that the former claims to produce “perspectives, opinions, beliefs and attitudes” (Puchta & Potter, 1999) whereas the latter keeps the evaluative practices of people in their talk as the topic and the type of claim it can subsequently make. “Interaction is treated as a set of occasioned practices where evaluation may be developed and undermined, often built contrastively for ongoing arguments” (Puchta & Potter, 2002, p. 348).

MPI have often been critiqued for their reporting in research journals, and Wilkinson (1998) has identified that in previous studies claiming to employ MPI data, the analysis sections would simply present extracts that showed one-participant-at-a-time monologues. This illustrates a broader point of the danger of focusing on the content that is of interest to the researchers rather than the interactional features of a MPI dynamic (Wilkinson, 1998), evident in more deductive theoretical approaches to a data-set. Issues of interaction and the need for reflexivity in accounts and interview situations have been addressed in the following analysis through the integration of the interviewer in the analysis and their inclusion in the extracts provided, and also through the use of an abridged version of the Jefferson transcription system (Jefferson, 1984) in the extracts presented.

### 3.3.3 Footing practices, and the issue of group membership

The issue of assumed group membership is also attended to as a concern of Potter and Hepburn in interview settings (2005). From a discourse analytic perspective, groups are not a taken-for-granted phenomenon assumed to exert a constant influence on individuals in their talk. They are instead seen as devices that can be flexible and strategically invoked in talk and oriented to at a specific moment in any interaction to achieve the exact discursive business that is afoot (Potter, 1996; Sacks, 1992). As such, the role of group membership is only a focus in the
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subsequent analyses if and when the speakers themselves make such category or

Therefore, while in this particular study one section of the participants were

regarding the recruitment of lay members of the general public who took part

Regarding the recruitment of lay members of the general public who took part

Footing in interview interactions is presented as a necessary problem in Potter

Footing, while first developed as a discursive device available to be studied by Goffman

Example 1:

To the best of my recollection
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1. I think that

2. I said

3. I once lived that sort of life

(Goffman, 1981, p. 140)

This short sequence of talk illustrates the strategic nature of footing shifts and positioning within talk, as here we can see how a distance is gradually worked up between the speaker of these words and the actual words themselves. Line 1 reflects the animator, and line 2 reflects an embedded animator leading to line 3’s double embedded animator, demonstrating a distance much further in line 3 than line 1 between who is speaking and essentially what is being said.

Footing is an issue in the analysis of interviews as the interview situation itself assumes a purpose for the interviewee being spoken to and questioned; for example, if a single mother is being interviewed about the difficulties involved in lone-parenting, the footing adopted will most likely be one that presents the interviewee as a knowledgeable in this area, thus demonstrating “the different basis on which participants are speaking as individuals or as category members” (Potter & Hepburn, 2005, p. 293). Considering the participants that took part in the current study, lay members of the general public and those working in the charitable sector (see section 3.5), it is important to take into account in the analysis the footing all speakers adopt, and the potential shifts in footing that can occur within each interview at any time depending on the specific concerns of that moment in the discursive interaction and ultimately examining the consequences of such shifts.

The virtues of both single and multiple participant interviews rest on the success of previous studies employing such methods of data collection (MacPherson & Fine, 1995; Widdicombe, 1995; Stevenson & Manning, 2010), on the use of both forms of data collection with two sample groups (Joyce, Stevenson & Muldoon, in press), and essentially on the fit between the research question being asked and the means best suited to address and answer this question.
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3.4 Study 1: Research question, aims and contribution

As a discursive analytic approach to the first exploratory qualitative phase this thesis is ethnomethodological in nature, focusing on the action-orientation of language, an analysis of membership categorisation devices presents as a useful addition in terms of a more in-depth and comprehensive understanding of what people are doing in talk when they are doing being charitable. Concepts of identity, such as preserving ones identity as a moral social actor when constructing accounts of giving or withholding aid, are essentially tied up with category labels and membership within groups.

The first research question to be addressed using this combination of analytic methods was formed after a rigorous review of the literature on helping. Literature from an individual through to an intergroup level of analysis of helping behaviours was examined and reviewed to identify several contradictions and complexities regarding the relationship between empathic concern, perceptions of similarity and helping. Indeed, several papers have also begun to consider certain aspects of responsibility as another potential factor in a helping relationship. However, responsibility has been largely overlooked save via examination through its absence (for example Bystander literature, Latané & Darley, 1968) or investigating the elements within responsibility as a concept that relate to blame-attribution (Weiner, 1995; Zagefka, Noor, Brown, De Moura, & Hopthrow, 2011).

In order to first tease apart this complicated relationship between similarity, empathy and giving, and to further explore the overlooked role of self-ascribed responsibility (i.e. responsibility attributed to the helper themselves to help) it was deemed necessary to first look at how people in their talk do being helpful or charitable and how they understand such concepts as empathy, similarity and responsibility. Thus it was hoped to identify a more grounded understanding of the potentially important role of responsibility as it relates to the traditionally acknowledged important role of empathic concern in helping behaviour, by looking at how it can be used as a resource in talk and how it can be deployed to produce accounts of giving. Thus, the research question for Study 1 is as follows:
3.5 Sampling strategy and participants

**RQ:** How are empathy and responsibility used rhetorically in talk of charitable giving? With a specific focus on their function in talk, the constructive nature of their use, and the variable, flexible and strategic way in which they are invoked to manage accountability.

Thus the aim of this study, and how it hopes to contribute to the qualitative literature on prosocial behaviour, lies in the inductive nature of the analysis. Study 1 aims to examine how concepts that were previously highlighted as important in the previous literature are actually understood and invoked in people’s talk, in order to further consolidate their importance before moving forward to quantitative investigations assuming their importance.

### 3.5 Sampling strategy and participants

Charity workers and members of the general public were selected as respondents in the interview and multiple participant interviews. Single interviews with charity workers were chosen for one main reason: As professionals in the charitable sector they were expected to be well versed in speaking about their own organisation, and thus it wasn’t deemed necessary to create a more informal situation such that a MPI can provide in order to stimulate conversation; it was assumed that charity workers would be comfortable and adept at discussing their charity without much prompting and help from other interviewees.

In contrast, in order to afford members of the general public (who may not feel sufficiently knowledgeable on the topic of charitable giving or different charities specifically) an entitlement to speak at length, MPI were chosen as most appropriate. By engaging two or more interviewees in conversation the onus on any one speaker to continuously talk about one particular topic is removed and the conversation can progress in a less forced manner.

#### 3.5.1 Charity workers as participants

The overarching sampling strategy was theoretical, in that charity workers and members of the general public were chosen specifically due to the nature of the research question and the previous literature, which would advocate that helping
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is an accountable matter (which means not only would it be a concern to those professional charity workers, but also to the average lay individual). The charity workers were contacted via letter and email to enquire if they would be interested in being interviewed as part of a research study on why people give to charity. The charity workers were then selected via non-probability purposive sampling, with selection criteria based on: the work their charity carries out dealing with adults, children or animals; the location of their work as locally based, nationally based or international.

Seven interviews in total were held with charity workers, which were seen to span the general array of types of charities. The charity workers included in the analysis were founders of NGOs and of local animal charities, an employee of an international children’s organisations, an employee of a national philanthropic organisation, an employee with an international charity, and finally with a member of the board of several renowned Irish charities (both national and international recipients). This number was chosen as it was first seen to capture the range of diverse types of charities, but it was also based on saturation. Saturation is a feature of some non-probability sampling techniques such as purposive sampling, and guides that the size of the sample relies on determining during data collection the cut-off point for interviews based on the concept that “no new information or themes are observed in the data” (Guest, Bunce & Johnson, 2006). It has also been found that variability in talk can be demonstrated within quite a small number of interviews (Guest, Bunce & Johnson, 2006), and with a view to a discursive analysis of the talk and thus variability as important within such an analysis, this cut-off point appeared appropriate. Moreover the cut-off point for the single and multiple participant interviews were only decided upon when the analyst felt that there was sufficient data to work with such that resources as used in talk were beginning to surface consistently.

3.5.2 Members of the general public as participants

Members of the general public were contacted via email, and were selected via non-probability convenience or snowball sampling. This method of sampling required existing subjects to recruit more subjects into the sample. The purpose of
this method was strategic, in that once one respondent agreed to take part they would also agree to bring to the interview session a friend, colleague or acquaintance of some description. The merits of this approach have been acknowledged in previous studies, as the value of selecting and using the talk of pre-existing groups versus artificial groups in a multiple participant interview setting allows for the interaction to occur without the over-engagement of the researcher or interviewer (Krueger, 1988; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990).

In total, 5 pilot MPI were held successfully, consisting of groups between 2 - 4 respondents (5 male, 11 female; age 17-35). Students from the Psychology Department at the University of Limerick were asked via email to take part in this study, and received a number of extra credits in return for their time. This sample was a convenience sample chosen to pilot the use of the procedure that was eventually adopted in the main multiple participant interviews. This procedure (see section 3.6) was piloted on MPI with 2, 3 and 4 participants to gauge when they were most effective in invoking lengthy discussion. It was decided that 4 participants were too cumbersome, and resulted in a more stifled interaction than did 2 or 3.

From this observation 6 main MPI were then held with 2 people in each (6 male, 8 female; age 19-41) with the exception of 1 MPI which held 3 people. Participants were mostly professionals, with the exception of one student, and came from legal, social work, economic, retail and administrative backgrounds. These made up the lay members of the general public, who were not employed in the charitable sector. All participants in these MPI were of Irish nationality. In so far as the multiple participant interviews were conducted with pre-existing groups, this can in some ways address the contemporary discursive psychological critique of using “non-naturalistic” data, as the talk within these groups, while guided in terms of topic, came as close to naturally occurring talk as one could hope when interested in such a specific psychological topic (Dalton, Madden, Chamberlain, Carr, & Lyons, 2008).

The charity worker interviews were analysed with a view to how issues of accountability, stake and interest were managed in talk, in a similar vein as were the multiple participant interviews with members of the general public. Within the analysis of both sets of interviews, the interviewer or facilitator was taken
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into account in a reflexive manner and their interactions and the consequences of their talk were included in the analysis.

3.5.3 Treatment of the data

SPI and MPI data are often treated the same in the analysis of studies that are generally more evaluative in nature, such as service provision in both general and mental health sectors (e.g. Seguire et al., 2013, analysing trauma interventions after a school shooting in the USA; Brewster, Sen & Cox, 2013, examining engagement with self-help texts via bibliotherapy). Oftentimes when the data is collected the rationale for different choices of methods is from a practical perspective as opposed to a theoretical one: SPI with patients could be combined with MPI with health care professionals for example. A decision such as this, in cases such as these, can be based on ethical considerations also, and the potential vulnerability of a patient answering sensitive questions in a group setting is considered, which is not necessarily acknowledged as problematic for those in the capacity of professionals (doctors, nurses and so on).

For the present purposes a similar decision was made, with charity workers in the place of the patients (SPI) and members of the general public in place of the aforementioned professionals (MPI). The decision in this respect was not made based on ethical concerns, nor was it heavily theoretically based. It was of a practical nature, one that weighed up the balance between the differences that these two methods can present in terms of the type of data they generate, and the overarching goal or aim of the actual study (section 3.3, and the introduction to this chapter, both demonstrate the rationale for choices of participants and corresponding method of data collection).

Harding (2013) has claimed that “some of the suggestions that are made for analysing focus group data are similar to those for analysing interview data: Barbour (2007: 117-119) discusses the use of codes and Onwuegbuzie et al. (2009: 6-7) suggest the use of the constant comparison method where there is more than one group”. Harding further consolidates his point by suggesting that Wilkinson (2011) also champions an approach to the analysis of data that may come from
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Different methodological techniques that is not so set-in-stone: “Indeed, Wilkinson (2011: 169) argues that the distinctive methodological features of focus group research is the data collection rather than the data analysis”.

Thus as the decisions surrounding the method of data collection were made not out of a need to generate separate data sets, but out of a need for generating data from differing types of participants (lay members of the public and those employed by charities), there was no underlying need to subsequently treat both of these SPI and MPI data sets separately. The rationale put forward from discursive analysts on the forms of interactions both methods generate, and thus the suggestion to treat SPI and MPI data differently, is acknowledged throughout the analysis however. Essentially, as Belzie and Oberg (2012) argue, if the choice is made to analyse data generated from different methodological techniques in the same way, it is often because this way is “best suited to the research purpose”. As the research question in this instance aims at gathering a broad understanding of the use of empathic concern and responsibility in talk of helping and charitable giving, treating the data equivalently was seen to suit this goal.

3.6 Procedure

Both single and multiple participant interviews followed a semi-structured interview schedule (see Appendix 2). Interviews with charity workers were close to open-ended in their approach, as charity workers who agreed to interview were often-times well-rehearsed in talking about the benefits of their particular charity and when and why donors would give to them over others. This in fact was used to the advantage of the analyst, as the occasioned nature of talk-as-action and the moral accountability of people’s talk of charitable giving was readily available in the single participant interviews. The single participant interviews lasted between 40 minutes and 1 hour 30 minutes and were held in the place of work of the respondent who were able to acquire access to a quiet and empty room. Both single and multiple participant interviews were run simultaneously over the course of several weeks.

A number of pilot multiple participant interviews were initially conducted (both MPI and SPI were run simultaneously). These were carried out in order
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to generate reasonably semi-structured interview schedules that would encourage participants to speak, and also to become aware of any problematic issues that might arise in such situations. Ethical approval was granted by the University’s ethics committee and all pilot studies were held in the Department of Psychology’s qualitative laboratory. The multiple participant interview, however, posed several problems in these piloting stages, in so far as respondents felt they could not engage much with the topic and often claimed their ‘understanding’ and ‘experiences’ of charities were limited. To overcome this issue and conduct a multiple participant interview that would produce data demonstrating how non-charity workers navigate the moral and ideological dilemmas of charitable giving, and co-construct their versions of charitable groups and donor groups, a group task was administered at the beginning of all multiple participant interviews.

Respondents were given a sheet of A4 paper between them, with written instructions as follows. They were allotted a hypothetical sum of 5000 euro, which they had to spend in a charitable manner (donations). Along with this instruction they were provided with a number of cue-cards, which contained categories such as ‘dogs and cats’, ‘the elderly’, ‘Europe’, ‘children’, ‘food’ - all groups and labels that had emerged in the pilot focus groups as worthy causes to donate to. The instructions stated that while these ideas could be used, it was not compulsory, and respondents were informed that they could use these categories or discard them and generate their own ideas together. The instructions gave an initial time-frame of 10 minutes to discuss with the other participants the options and come to a decision about what they would do with their 5000 euro, all of which was recorded and used as data (the introduction, the instructions, and the discussion between participants) as part of the MPI. Once the instructions were followed and decisions made, the respondents were then engaged in a discussion similar to the loose and semi-structured interview as that of the charity workers. Several generic quotations about charitable giving, such as ‘Charity begins at home’ (see Appendix 3), were also employed in some instances in order to further generate discussion. The entire discussion, from the instructions given by the facilitator at the start of all sessions, through the decisions made on the hypothetical sum of money, and subsequently the group engagement on the topic in question, was recorded and included in the analysis.
3.7 Overview of analytic procedure and main findings

The multiple participant interviews lasted between 45 minutes and 1 hour 20 minutes, and these tasks were selected in order to ensure a reasonable flow of conversation by allowing them a sense of entitlement to speak (Potter, 1996). MPI in the main study were either held on the University campus in a room provided by the department of psychology, in the place of work of some of the respondents, or in a quiet location in Limerick city centre. All interviews were transcribed verbatim using an abridged version of Jefferson Transcription style (Jefferson, 1984).

3.7 Overview of analytic procedure and main findings

The entire data corpus was analysed to address the research question posed at the beginning of this chapter: How empathy and responsibility are used rhetorically in talk of charitable giving, focusing specifically on their function in talk, the constructive nature of their use, and the variable, flexible and strategic way in which they are invoked to manage accountability. All material was selected in which respondents were shown to be justifying giving or not giving. This involved an inductive approach to the data and the process of exhaustively coding in the initial stages all instances in which respondents provided accounts of giving or withholding aid to specific charities or groups, or hypothetical charities or groups.

These accounts were divided and further coded into instances in which respondents were seen to draw up tropes of empathy or talk of responsibility in the data. These tropes were identified as two broad interpretative repertoires, and as such the micro-analysis that followed was based on these instances separately (the empathy repertoire and the responsibility repertoire were identified as discrete resources and were thus examined as such). However, as all talk is action-oriented and produced to accomplish the discursive demands of any interaction, many instances were double-coded as talk shifted from deploying one repertoire to the other in quick succession. Deviant case analysis was also used to provide an exhaustive account of the data (Silverman, 2001). The discursive features of this talk were examined, in particular respondents’ use of these two
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main interpretative repertoires of empathy and responsibility. The analysis further examined how membership categorisation devices were deployed to draw upon these repertoires and construct successful accounts of giving or withholding aid.

As charitable behaviour is often seen as an accountable matter, throughout the discursive interactions respondents were seen as constantly attempting to manage their concerns around maintaining their identity as moral, charitable, knowledgeable and so forth. By drawing on discursive resources such as working up category entitlement, by shifting their footing within a particular section of their talk, and by attempting to avoid interested-talk all the respondents were essentially doing being charitable while also either constructing or co-constructing their own versions of what they understand to be ‘being charitable’.

3.7.1 Development of the empathy repertoire and the responsibility repertoire

This section will briefly document how both repertoires, the empathy repertoire and the responsibility repertoire, arose, what they consists of, and why they were named as such.

The empathy repertoire was developed out of an analysis of how people in their talk do being helpful or charitable, and how they understand concepts of empathy and similarity in relation to this helpfulness. The rationale being given by speakers when they are invoking the empathy repertoire works towards an understanding of the speaker as an empathic donor, whereby the empathy felt is based on similarities drawn. The end result is a justification for giving.

While similarity is worked up and invoked within the use of this repertoire, the end result is still an empathic donor. Thus the name of this particular repertoire was chosen, as the ultimate consequence of talk is to justify giving or a withholding aid by being empathic/ demonstrating an inability to be empathic. This often works through similarity, where similarities between past or present circumstances are made relevant; through dissimilarity, where a lack of shared history or circumstance is invoked; or through what is presented as over-similarity, where the recipient is depicted as unworthy of empathy and help due to their
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shared circumstances (for example other 1st world nations). However as all of this similarity-related work was being done to justify empathy-based giving, the empathy repertoire was seen as the appropriate name for this repertoire.

The empathy repertoire was identified by first coding all material where respondents appeared to be justifying giving or withholding help. Instances in which respondents were seen to draw upon emotive words, phrases, expressions and metaphors were isolated. Instances in which respondents worked up identities as compassionate (when speaking of the givers of help) were also identified. Thirdly instances in which the speakers took time to work up versions of the recipient groups as warranting the speakers empathy or not were coded. It began to emerge at this stage of the analysis the presence of the concepts of similarity, dissimilarity and over-similarity. These instances were looked at in relation to the work they were being deployed to do, which essentially was to account for giving or not giving. They were then identified as enabling the speaker to present themselves as empathic donors.

At this stage of the analysis a thematic discursive analysis was being employed as the framework through which these instances were being identified. Later a closer more detailed analysis of the extracts selected and coded under this original umbrella term of the empathy repertoire looked at the use of membership categorisation devices more specifically. It was shown that empathy was often accomplished through the construction of a recipient group as either warranting empathy or not by depicting them as suitably similar or not.

To sum, the empathy repertoire came about by first identifying empathy as an important concept worthy of investigation and forming part of the research question for Study 1. Subsequently, keeping this as an umbrella term for all empathy-related talk, instances that took this form were identified and analysed in so far as the consequence of these extracts were to justify giving or withholding help. The use of similarity, dissimilarity and over-similarity became apparent throughout this analysis, especially as it progressed into the more fine-grained detail of the use of membership categorisation devices. However, as this way of talking was identified as, what Potter and Wetherall term, an interpretative repertoire and the analysis took shape, the original interest in empathy was maintained and this IR was named the empathy repertoire.
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The responsibility repertoire was developed in much the same way. Previous literature had indicated that this concept, over and above blame-attribution, could be important in helping behaviours and decisions to give help. Therefore much like with the empathy repertoire above, instances in which giving or withholding help were identified in talk were coded when words, phrases and metaphors were deployed that appeared to ‘look’ like responsibility as it has been conceptualised in Chapter 2: duty, obligation, and accountability of the speaker, and vulnerability and dependency of the recipient.

As these instances were identified and drawn together, an understanding of what was being done by the speakers began to emerge. Responsibility talk appeared to be invoked in ways that highlighted or made relevant the relationship between the speaker and the recipient of help. If the speaker made relevant their identity as an adult, it was most often in conjunction with invoking the child identity of a specific recipient of help. These categories allowed the speaker to justify giving by relying on shared understandings made available to speakers and hearers of the responsibility inherent in the relationship between an adult and a child, often presented as based on dependency and vulnerability.

However throughout the coding procedure and the early thematic DA analytic work, it became evident that withholding aid from specific recipients was also successfully accomplished by drawing upon a discourse of responsibility. In such cases, speakers were quick to work up the lack of a relationship of responsibility between themselves as a donor and the potential recipient of help. Here the aspect of accountability was made relevant, and speakers would rationalise the absence of a relationship of responsibility between themselves and a needy other by indicating the presence of another relationship which they were outside of: most often a relationship of responsibility that exists between the government as a capable other and the recipient group in need. This was often accomplished by deploying the category of government and working up the category bound attributes of such an organisation, including responsibility and duty of care.

To sum, the initial interest in the concept of responsibility, as presented in Chapter 2, led to its inclusion in the framing of the research question for Study 1. The subsequent analysis of its use in talk, and the way in which it was invoked by constructing a version of the relationship between the speaker and an-
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other, through concepts of duty, vulnerability, accountability, dependency and obligation lead to its retention as the name for the 2nd of the two overarching interpretative repertoires: the responsibility repertoire.

3.7.2 Summary

DA looks at the functional and constructive nature of language in interaction, thus the two main interpretative repertoires of empathy and responsibility were identified as being drawn on at different times in talk depending on the speaker’s discursive business and the function of such a repertoire; to account for giving, or to justify withholding. The empathy repertoire was seen to be invoked in a very specific way throughout the interactions: by constructing a particular version of the recipient group as worthy or unworthy of help and empathy. These versions were constructed as based largely on similarity, dissimilarity or in some contexts over-similarity, and categories were deployed strategically to work up these versions of recipients. Empathy as a discursive resource was therefore seen to function through specific constructions of the recipient group as worthy or unworthy of empathy, and subsequently, helping.

However, the responsibility repertoire was invoked in a comparatively different way: by respondents’ constructions of a specific version of the relationship between both speaker-as-donor and potential recipient group. As a discrete discursive resource, responsibility was invoked to produce versions of category-relationships that were based on ability and inability to help. This was accomplished by depicting this relationship as one of duty, obligation and responsibility.

The following two chapters will illustrate how each of these interpretative repertoires was used in talk and to what effect. Chapter 4 will present a detailed analysis of the empathy repertoire, and the construction of the recipient groups within this repertoire. Subsequently, Chapter 5 will demonstrate the use of the responsibility repertoire, and the construction of a relationship of responsibility within this talk. Both chapters will give worked examples from the interviews and multiple participant interviews and will present short discussions as to how the results relate to the previous DA and MCA literature and work on charitable giving more specifically.
3. STUDY 1 METHOD
Chapter 4

The Empathy Repertoire

This chapter presents the analysis of the qualitative study of this thesis, Study 1. The talk of charity workers and members of the general public was analysed from a discursive psychological perspective in the context of charitable giving. Two overarching interpretative repertoires were identified. The first resource, the empathy repertoire, will be the focus of this chapter’s analysis. As such, a brief review of how empathy has been investigated from a quantitative perspective in the social psychological literature will be presented in terms of its role in helping from an individual through to an intergroup level of analysis. Furthermore, several qualitative studies will be reviewed as offering a more in-depth look at talk of giving and helping as strategic and context-dependent. Both approaches to helping (quantitative and qualitative) where empathy is a factor have also highlighted the important yet complicated role of perceptions of similarity.

The constructive nature of the empathy repertoire will be of concern throughout the analysis, and therefore a more fine-grained approach to the analysis of how categories can be deployed and descriptions produced was adopted (MCA, Sacks, 1972). The two overarching functions of the invocation of the empathy repertoire are accounting for giving or justifying withholding help. The analysis will thus be split into two sections, each looking more closely at how this repertoire is used in talk in a flexible manner, and how a specific version of the potential recipient of help is constructed in such a way as to serve the need of the speaker.
These constructions were based largely on similarity, dissimilarity or in some contexts, over-similarity, as categories were systematically deployed to work up these versions of charity recipients. Empathy as a discursive resource was thereby seen to function through these specific constructions of the recipient group which worked to present these targets as worthy or unworthy of empathy, and subsequently helping.

Thus the aim of Study 1 was to examine how concepts deemed to be of importance in the previous literature on prosocial behaviour are actually understood and used by people in their talk. This study constitutes the first of a mixed methods investigation whereby the roles of empathy and responsibility are systematically examined in terms of their impact on helping behaviours at the group level. However in order to move forward with an investigation of their impact, this exploratory inductive study first examines their presence and their use in talk. Therefore the aim of this chapter’s analysis is to demonstrate the presence of an empathy repertoire in people’s talk of charitable giving and helping behaviours and to indicate how and when it can be used to good effect.

4.1 A quantitative approach: Empathy and giving

Batson (Batson et al., 1991; Batson, 1991; Batson et al., 1988) has illustrated many ways in which empathy can result in positive interpersonal interactions and helping, suggesting that there are three main routes to empathic concern: acknowledging the need of another, taking the perspective of another, and perceptions of similarity between the self and another. A core element of this literature focused on the altruistic nature of empathic concern and its ability to predict prosocial acts. Cialdini and colleagues, in suggesting its primarily egoistic grounding, provided an alternative explanation for the empathic pathway to helping (Neuberg et al., 1997) suggesting oneness was a better predictor. Aron and colleagues (1992) had also suggested an overlapping sense of self could be predictive of helping in contrast to how Batson framed helping as motivated by
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Empathic concern - as an overlapping sense of self would imply egoistic reasons behind a decision to help.

Empathy as a precursor to helping intentions and behaviours has been investigated from a group-level perspective also, with a Social Identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) approach to helping also arguing that empathic concern is facilitated by perceptions of increased similarity. Ingroup bias in early social identity studies demonstrates the desire to help one’s own group over another once group membership is made salient (Tajfel, Turner, Billig & Flament, 1971). More recent studies have illustrated how a shared sense of identity increases the giving of help to a fellow group member as well as receiving help in the spirit in which it is intended (Levine et al., 2005).

However, in the broader literature on prosocial behaviour and the relationship between perceptions of similarity between helper and helpee, the negative impact of similarity on helping behaviours has also been highlighted. Research on the phenomenon of victim-blaming often looks towards perceived similarity in explanations for a lack of helping (Grubb & Harrower, 2008; Jones & Aronson, 1973). Lerner’s Just World Beliefs theory (1980) and other theories on victim similarity (Walster, 1966) have also proved useful in understanding the motivations for lack of willingness to help similar others. This may occur as people feel motivated to attribute victimhood to something a similar other has done rather than acknowledge their own vulnerability.

Claims have been made that empathy can overcome negative attitudes towards stigmatised groups (who could be viewed as blameworthy in terms of their situation of need, e.g. the homeless) (Batson, Early, & Salvarani, 1997). However, earlier work by Batson has presented empathic concern as potentially a “fragile flower” (1983, p. 718) that is easily crushed by self-concern. Thus the quantitative literature on the empathy-helping relationship, while vast and spanning individual, intra and inter-group levels, presents several paradoxes. Empathic concern is presented as facilitated by perceptions of similarity, whereas similarity is shown at times to result in less help-giving.

Group-level studies also suggest over-similarity can not only result in blame attributions (Jones & Aronson, 1978) but also perceptions of identity threat (Brown
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& Lopez, 2001). To further investigate the complex role of empathy, and by extension perceptions of similarity, a more inductive exploratory approach to how these concepts relate to charitable giving could prove fruitful.

4.2 A qualitative approach: Accounting for giving in talk

Research from a discursive perspective on helping has illustrated several examples in which speakers orient towards similar issues of empathic concern or similarity in their talk of giving or in their accounts of more general behaviour. Identification as a member of a similar category or of the same group was investigated by Reicher and colleagues (Reicher, Cassidy, Hopkins, & Levine, 2006) in their discursive analysis of government and public texts in Bulgaria during the 2nd World War. These texts were seen to work towards harnessing the support of the Bulgarian population and preventing the mass evacuation to concentration camps of the Jewish population in Bulgaria, and this was seen to be accomplished in several different ways, one of which was to construct a version of the group as part of the national group or national category, and present them as “Bulgarian Jews”. This demonstrates how cognitive processes of self-categorisation (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherell, 1987) are understood, negotiated and worked up in talk, as category membership is deployed as strategic and consequential. In effect, the concept of ‘we’ness (Dovidio et al., 1997) as mobilised in the political documents of the time arguably shaped the understanding of helping behaviours for the Bulgarian people.

In terms of how people themselves understand these issues in their talk of helping behaviour, Stevenson and Manning demonstrate how speakers work up their identities as moral and charitable in the context of giving (2010). This study illustrates how charitable giving is morally complex, and involves justifying withholding donations as well as accounting for when and why respondents, young Irish people, would choose to give. Speakers in this analysis also tended to deploy specific categories in their accounts, and used these to preserve a moral and discerning identity as social actors.
This concern for the preservation of a moral identity resonates with the work of Dalton and colleagues (Dalton, Madden, Chamberlain, Carr, & Lyons, 2008), who adopted a discursive analytic perspective on focus-group talk to demonstrate how young people in New Zealand negotiated issues of poverty and giving. Emotional arousal and category membership as being ‘local’ emerged as noteworthy in this particular study.

Outside of the context of giving or helping behaviours, Gibson (2009) has looked at online discourse about welfare recipients in the UK. While online chat-rooms offer anonymity in terms of how accountable a speaker can be for what they produce as fact or opinion, the talk produced in his analysis centred specifically on the concept of blame.

Respondents worked up their accounts of blaming welfare recipients for their situations of unemployment through the rhetorical construction of those recipients as sharing category membership with speakers or posters, and presenting them as similar in terms of opportunity.

While Dalton et al. (2008), and Stevenson and Manning (2010) both examined accounts of charitable giving or donation behaviours as strategic and occasioned and informed by the identity concerns of the interaction or context, neither have considered the nature of the rhetorical resources deployed by individuals in their accounts, and in particular neither has systematically examined the use of empathy or similarity per se in talk of charitable giving. Therefore these two concepts remain unexplored in terms of their rhetorical functions and use as discursive resources in talk of charitable giving.

4.3 The current analysis

This following analysis, from a Discursive Psychology (Edwards & Potter, 1992) perspective, employed a thematic Discourse Analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006) and concepts from Membership Categorisation Analysis (Sacks, 1970). In order to understand the discursive business that is afoot in any interaction, an important emphasis is placed on the many resources a speaker can draw upon and utilise in order to accomplish their accounts or versions of reality and to also produce an
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account such that it is unlikely to be open to a counter-claim or argument (see Billig’s 1987 work on rhetoric and ideological dilemmas).

The different discursive tools that will be analysed in this chapter will be grounded in these “ways of talking”, types of discourses or interpretative repertoires. Instead of seeking patterns within an individual’s talk discourse analysis looks at patterns of recurring themes across all participants. As individuals will oftentimes present competing attitudes or perspectives at different times within a conversational interaction it is more useful to identify how these different ways of talking occur, in what capacity a participant will draw upon them, and for what purpose they are being used. Interpretative repertoires are a set of terms used in explanations, recurring patterns in talk; “Commonly these terms are derived from one or more key metaphors and the presence of a repertoire will often be signalled by certain tropes or figures of speech” (Potter & Wetherell, 1992).

As discourse analysis has three main concern, action, construction and variability, this analysis will focus on how these concerns are negotiated by respondents in their talk. Section 1 will analyse the strategic use of the empathic repertoire in accomplishing one of two overarching actions or functions: accounting for giving. Section 2 will analyse instances in which the empathic repertoire was invoked to serve the second overarching function: justifying withholding aid.

Construction is a core aspect of DA, and this analysis borrows certain elements of Sacks’ work on membership categorisation devices (MCA, Sacks, 1972a, 1972b, 1992). This is a form of conversation analysis which takes as a priority the deployment of categories, and the relationship between these categories, descriptions and their functions in talk. This has been used to good effect in Abell and Stokoe’s analysis of interviews with Princess Diana (2001), and in Hester and Housley’s work on nations (2002).

The construction afoot in many of the following examples from across the data set demonstrate how speakers worked to construct a specific version of the recipient group, depending on the context of the interaction and the function the empathy repertoire was invoked to serve. Thus recipients were constructed as similar, sharing category membership with the speakers, and essentially warranting empathy in many accounts of giving. However this similarity could also be
invoked to justify a lack of giving. This was accomplished by constructing recipient groups based on attributions of blame and thus not warranting empathy, or constructing similarity as integral to empathy-led helping.

Therefore those who were depicted as falling outside of the category boundaries would be presented as not warranting empathy. Thus the particularly noteworthy aspect of this chapter is the contingent nature of empathy (i.e. If one can empathise, one will give. If one is not necessarily deserving, and cannot be empathised with, then they will not receive help), and this is evidenced through the use of the empathy repertoire as it relates to helping and charitable giving.

This aspect of empathy, its contingent nature, also draws attention to the third concern of DA: variability. The flexible way in which this repertoire is invoked, and the strategic way in which charity and non-charity workers construct versions of recipient groups depending on the contextual demands of the interaction, is fundamental to understanding the consequential and action-oriented nature of language and talk as functional.

4.4 Section 1: Accounting for giving aid

Across the data set speakers used empathy to aid in the construction of a particular version of a recipient group. This version is constructed based on the context of the interaction or account, and essentially based on the needs of the speaker: a need to account for giving or a need to justify withholding. For example the following extract demonstrates how, at its most fundamental level, the empathy repertoire can be strategically invoked to allow the speaker to flexibly construct a version of the recipient group that accounts for giving.

Extract1: ‘Throughout our own history...’

(from interview no: 1 with charity worker Mary):
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This extract is a typical example of the use of empathy in the interviews. Here the interviewee (a charity worker) discusses why it is that people give to her charity specifically. This example works to demonstrate primarily how the empathy repertoire can be invoked in talk. The action accomplished throughout this turn is to account for giving. This charity worker uses the empathy repertoire to serve this particular function in a number of strategic ways, all of which help to construct a version of the recipient group as similar and worthy of empathy.

First, the speaker deploys the category of Irish people in line 2. Second, she engages in an anecdotal description of Irish history as it relates to the help her particular charity provides (ll. 7-12). Finally, she furthers her account of giving by demonstrating the shared category membership of both donors and recipients and the consequences this similarity has for decisions to give. The speaker is alive to the implications associated with each category (Sacks, 1972) in which both donor and recipient group are members: the rural aspect of both groups, shared history, and shared experience are strategically constructed as accounting for why the speaker is placing both donor and recipients in the same category, based on similarity.

While the empathy repertoire as a resource in talk is variably used and strategic, it is evidenced throughout this analysis that charity workers were able to use this repertoire to account for giving in a way that appears more straightforward
than the complex ways in which non-charity workers construct their accounts. The previous extract illustrated a charity worker constructing a specific version of the recipient group as similar based on shared category membership due to history and shared experience. The following example is also from a charity worker:
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Extract 2: ‘it’s not that long since we’ve had famines in this country...’
(from interview no.3 with charity worker Sarah)

This extract follows the previous example as another way in which charity workers can draw upon empathy in talk. Here Sarah is presenting a case for why her donors give and are seen as charitable. The question asked about people in general, however the response centres on Irish donors specifically. This sequence of talk has one overarching function. The empathy repertoire is being invoked to account for giving. This is accomplished by constructing a version of the recipient group as warranting empathy.

Several aspects of this construction are particularly noteworthy:; past history and circumstances are made relevant in lines 11-14, which allow the speaker to imply similarities between donor and recipients; famine is deployed as a reason for shared category membership in line 12, the consequences of which are a successful account of empathy-driven helping; and finally Irish people are depicted as ‘emotional’ and ‘responsive’, category-bound attributes of an empathetic person, which further allows a construction of the recipient group as empathy-invoking.
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The speaker can also accomplish this and avoid issues of a staked account (Potter, 1996) by flexibly adopting two different positions throughout her turn (both actions achieve different functions). In lines 5-8 she builds the facticity of her account of the recipient group from her position as a charity worker. However, lines 3-4 and the use of ‘our’ in line 11 (adopting this particular footing position) allow the respondent to speak as an Irish person, and she has deployed this category strategically. This action has the consequence of successfully constructing a version of the recipient group as similar to Irish donors, as the speaker has an entitlement to speak on their behalf as a fellow Irish person and member of this category.

This entitlement to speak is either worked up or simply displayed (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998) in the talk of charity workers quite often. The following extract is a further example of this entitlement, and comes from an interview with an employee of an Irish social entrepreneurship organisation:

**Extract 3:** ‘there might be more of a connection now’
(from interview no. 4 with charity worker Gerry)

1. **G:** [...]*Em* (...) *there has been a dip this year(*.) in(*) the amount of giving, but it’s probably more to do with [Haiti(0.1)] rather than people actually not giving,
2. *but there’s (.)eh you know(.) people are still giving I think. And em(.)if I don’t think it’s changed people’s (0.1) the downturn itself hasn’t really changed people’s(.) views(.) on the issues that they’re donating to. They’re still pretty much the same issues. *Em but(.) they might have a bit more empathy now for eh (0.2) indigenous(0.1) issues(.) such as families and poverty, children and poverty, *that kind of thing. There(.) there probably is a bit more understanding of how that can(.) now(.) be possible, and eh (0.1)it’s worth supporting.* Whereas in the years of the Celtic [Tiger(0.1)] a lot of people eh,(0.1)
3. *those issues were just invisible to people. People never stumbled across them in their day-to-day lives. So there might be more of a connection now which means that they see(.) those(.) issues, em (0.2) more readily.

The action-orientation of this example, taken from an interview with an employee of a national charity, is accounting for giving in a particular context; in
difficult economic circumstances. This account is accomplished in a similar way to previous extracts in that its success depends on the way in which the recipient group is constructed.

However, the way in which this is worked up differs slightly from previous examples. The speaker constructs the recipient group as presently or currently experiencing similar circumstances as his donor group. This is worked up progressively throughout this turn, as first the economic downturn is deployed as a particular type of circumstance in line 4 that affects all members of a category. Then the speaker explicitly deploys empathy as an explanation for continued giving (l. 6) and finally categories of ‘families’ and ‘children’ are strategically deployed to help construct a version of the recipient group as falling into a shared category with the donors, who can identify similarities between themselves and others through a common-sense understanding of these category devices (ll. 7 & 8).

The extract above is a good example of how empathy is worked up and used as a licence in the interviews and in particular highlights the use of similarity to do so. Another way to invoke the concept of empathy is to present it as innate:
Extract 4: ‘it’s probably in the DNA’
(from interview no. 6 with Frank, a member of the board of several national and international organisations)

1. **I**: I mean, do you think there’s a almost a battle between “do we give money abroad or do we keep money here?”?
2. **F**: Eh no I think, they’re not incompatible, I mean, they’re mutually exclusive em(), inevitably in times when times get tough, people will be saying “why are we sending this money abroad”, but it’s You know? People are not generally dying of hunger in Ireland.
3. They’re not dying of malaria; (0.1) they’re not dying of anything whereas they are there.
4. (.) so it’s relative. Concern captured the time And that would(,) that would’ve kicked off a lot of the eh(,) charities, the(,) Trocaire,(0.1) I think Trojan and Concern around that period and that would again come out of a major famine. That was the first introduction here to the concept of famine.
5. on the scale we’re talking about and the idea of people being out there(,) so there was a thing in Ireland when we talk about famine, it’s(,) eh() probably in the DNA. So there’s a certain empathy(,) and that will(,) you know(,) we’ve always had a record of contributing pro rata probably more than most. (0.1)On a personal basis, that’s historic that’s genetic or(,) whatever.. [...].

Some participants evidently negotiated a dilemmatic aspect of charitable giving: whether it is better to help the ingroup or the outgroup. This is recognisably an ideological dilemma. The action here is working through this ideological dilemma (Billig et al., 1988; Gibson, 2009) of helping us or helping them, to eventually account for giving. This is accomplished by rhetorically constructing the recipient group as similar and as sharing category membership with the speaker and donors, but as well as deploying ‘the famine’ as a way of working up this category membership (similar to the charity worker in extract 2) this speaker makes relevant the attributes of Irish people.

This is achieved first by the use of the word ‘here’ in line 10 to ground both speaker and hearers of this utterance in the one geographical location; ‘here’ is ‘Ireland’, and with this the category of ‘Irish people’ is implied. This is then juxtaposed with the use of ‘out there’ in line 11, which works to allow the speaker to acknowledge the geographical difference between both groups but essentially construct them as similar in other ways.
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Finally the explicit deployment of empathy as a reason for giving, and the qualifying statements that follow this in lines 13-15 that imply Irish people have an empathic identity (with empathy a category bound attribute for this group) are used to one specific end: to construct a version of the recipient group as warranting the empathy of the Irish based on their shared category membership (which is based on historical similarities). This progression from the board of a number of Irish charities through the ideological dilemma of giving abroad or giving locally essentially produces an account in which they are presented as one in the same, and therefore giving abroad is constructed as the same as giving locally.

While group membership is not a focus of the overall analysis as such, unless it is made relevant by the speakers themselves (as a core assumption of DA work), a note is made about group differences. Charity workers, more so than members of the general public, are inclined to, or at least appear to, use the empathy repertoire in a way that strategically accounts for giving. Yet in most cases their talk avoids engagement with the ideological dilemma of who is worthy of empathy and who is not. This means that interview talk with a charity worker can present as part of a necessarily straightforward way of accounting for giving: recipients are in some way similar, people empathise and subsequently give a donation. This may be due to their position as tied down, as a professional in the third sector. However, as will be demonstrated in the second section of the analysis, interviews with members of the general public often present a more complex set of concerns being negotiated, such as worthiness and deservingness of the recipient.

Thus it is suggested that an entitlement to speak allows the charity worker respondents to produce a somewhat more straightforward account, in contrast to the complex discursive work being done by non-charity worker speakers. One extract that illustrates this pattern demonstrates the action of accounting for giving in the general public’s talk, and the way in which this sequence of talk progresses demonstrates the flexibility and strategic use of the empathy repertoire. It constitutes the only extract within this section that comes from members of the general public’s talk; however it also features (this particular extract) in the 2nd section. This is because of how the sequence of this particular interaction unfolds: the first participant can draw upon the empathy repertoire to account
for giving, as previous interviews have shown, yet the 2nd participant mobilises empathy as a resource to essentially justify not giving.

**Extract5: ‘personal experiences play a huge role’**
(from multiple participant interview no. 3 with Simon and Patrick)

1. S: yeah you know I think like personal experiences come(.) play eh(.)a huge role in
2. this like, if you have a (.).friend or a relative who suffered for from a certain
3. disease, you’re more [likely=
4. P: [yeah]
5. S: =like you’ll] have seen the (0.1) the evidence there in front of your eyes of how
6. bad the condition[ is and you’d be more likely to (0.1)eh (0.1) know what(.) say
7. cerebral palsy[ is and (0.2) the hard(.) hard work the family have to do to care
8. for someone with a condition like that(.) so if(.) yeah(.) think it comes into your own
9. interests, and how you are affected by some of the (0.1) I suppose (0.1)some of the
10. ills that the charities try to(.) try to prevent[†

This extract is from a multiple participant interview with two members of the general public (two friends). They are discussing which kinds of charities they would each be more inclined to give to, and why. First, personal experience is presented as giving an insight into the perspective of those in need of aid (illness presented here) and this forms the basis of similarity with others affected by this illness (with the family and the carers; l. 7 ‘the hard hard work the family have to do to care for someone’). In contrast to the previous extracts, personal experience is being used in the place of professional knowledge as an entitlement to speak (Edwards & Potter, 1992).

Secondly, the category deployed here is family, a close relationship that allows for the inference of caring and helping and empathic concern for those who reside within this MCD to be made. These category bound activities are implied as common-sense knowledge available to both speakers and hearers of these utterances. These category bound attributes of categories ‘friend’ and ‘relative’ (l. 2) are attended to from the outset to help produce this shared category membership - allowing for the inference that these are close to the speaker, therefore leaving it unnecessary to work up a reason for empathy and shared group membership as it is implied through these category labels.
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This example extract is part of a longer sequence of talk which will be presented in the next section. This second section will show how in such close sequence empathy can be used in two different ways to serve two different functions. Here it is drawn upon to account for giving by Simon, however the following sequence of talk will demonstrate how empathy can subsequently be mobilized by Patrick to justify withholding aid.

Overall then when a helping relationship is framed in terms of empathy, the speakers can account for giving by making relevant intergroup similarities that are seen to facilitate empathy. These accounts are then worked up by orienting to shared histories, personal and common experiences and working up inclusion of both donor and recipient in essentially the same category by presenting a version of the recipient groups as similar to donor or speaker.

4.5 Section 2: Accounting for withholding aid

The previous section demonstrated how empathy was used to justify giving, especially by charity workers who systematically used it to overcome the rhetorical barriers to giving. However, charity worker talk was generated and recorded in a context of individual interviews. This results in less opportunity to produce an account that requires staunch justification or negotiation. Members of the general public by contrast are engaged in multiple participant interviews, and thus could work through the dilemmatic nature of charitable giving and co-construct versions of recipient groups as worthy or unworthy.

DA is concerned with variability. Where non-charity workers’ talk demonstrated variability through their use of the empathy repertoire as accomplishing competing actions, charity-worker variability was found in the positions they adopted and the place from which they spoke as either a charity worker or an Irish national. This section will demonstrate ways in which the empathy repertoire can be invoked to account for not giving, by constructing a version of the recipient group as either dissimilar, or in some instances overly-similar and thus not warranting empathy. As such, most of the examples come from multiple participant interviews with members of the general public, such as this continued example from the previous section:
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Extract6: ‘if I’d had a close relative that was affected’
(from previously cited multiple participant interview with Simon and Patrick)

Lines 1-10 as before

This sequence of talk is a continuation of the discussion presented in the previous section in which two members of the general public are negotiating the charitable groups to which they would give. However it demonstrates how helping can be presented as contingent on similarity and empathy (and therefore contingent on sharing category membership) and shows how speakers can patrol the boundaries of a category they have previous deployed in order to account for their lack of giving.

This requires the speaker to make these boundaries available to the hearer (such as the speakers awareness of certain issues or charities) and then to explicate how this would naturally exclude those who fall outside of these boundaries from receiving help. First, the second speaker, Patrick, preserves the rationale in lines 11-12 that similarity of experience can facilitate empathy, and by constructing a version of himself as lacking in this shared experience he can account for not giving on the basis of the contingent nature of empathy and similarity. This is achieved by producing a version of the recipient group here as not sharing the same category as him.

Secondly, in line 14, his use of a disclaimer (Potter, 1996) works to maintain his identity as a moral and empathic donor (‘but I’m sure if I’d a close relative’), and the modals in this utterance (‘I’m sure if I’d a close relative it would have been on the top of my list’) also work to preserve his moral identity as giving is produced as something he generally ‘would’ do if the recipient group were to
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fall within the boundaries of this carefully deployed category of ‘close relative’ (Edwards, 2006).

This patrolling the boundaries of groups or category memberships is also evidenced here:

**Extract7: ‘...more identification with that than you would the animals..’**

(from multiple participant interview no.1 with members of the general public J.D., Julianne and Siobhan)

As seen in the previous example where Patrick made clear who or which charity fell within the boundaries of the groups he was aware of and subsequently was willing to help, these speakers draw upon a similar argument. They carefully police the boundaries of a category they would give to by deploying concepts such as ‘identification’, and therefore those falling outside of these boundaries do not receive help, and there is also a lack of requirement on the speaker to justify this (as it is presented as explained by lack of identification).

This example illustrates how the empathy repertoire can be invoked to depict empathy as contingent; giving as contingent on similarity, on shared category membership, on the ability to ‘identify’ (l. 10) with the recipient, and essentially the ability to empathise (l. 6). The function this repertoire serves dictates how it will be used, and subsequently how a version of the potential recipient group will be constructed.
The flexible nature of the empathy repertoire is evident here, as one of the various ways in which it can be used is by deploying specific consequential categories by non-charity workers (as well as charity workers with staked and vested interests) thus highlighting the empathy repertoire’s use as invoked to serve whatever function is necessary for the speaker within the particular context. While charity workers have been seen to produce more straightforward and unproblematic accounts of giving by drawing on the empathy repertoire, the opposite can be seen in the following deviant case (Silverman, 2001) with the founder of an NGO.

This particular extract is unique in that it appears as an example in both analysis chapters (The Empathy Repertoire Chapter 4 and The Responsibility Repertoire in Chapter 5). The reasons for its inclusion twice are twofold. First, as this speaker constitutes a deviant case in the analysis, it is by its nature an extract that differs from many of the others. It demonstrates how a charity worker can also engage in the dilemmatic aspects of giving to others but can find it difficult to negotiate this dilemma due to their identity as a charity worker with what can be viewed as a vested interest in their own organisation. The dilemmatic aspect led to its inclusion in both chapters as this extract demonstrates how in such close sequence both the empathy and the responsibility repertoire can be drawn upon to accomplish the same goal: justifying withholding aid.

The second reason for its inclusion is that this extract is the one indication throughout the analysis of the presence of an overlap between both repertoires, which occurs here in the guise of blame attribution. Therefore this chapter’s analytic focus will present an analysis of its use of the empathy repertoire as based on the over-similarity of the recipient group, and focus on how this is worked up and accomplished while the speaker can maintain a moral identity. The second use of this extract, in Chapter 5, will focus on the elements of the responsibility repertoire that appear towards the end of this sequence of talk and will discuss same in relation to the accountability dimension of the responsibility repertoire.
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Extract 8: ‘would I be more inclined to give to foreign beggars than local beggars?’

(from interview no. 5 with charity worker Neil)

In the initial lines of this charity-worker’s talk, the speaker works to present his account as based on the context of the giving situation or the opportunity (ll. 3-5). Subsequently the construction of the recipient group as overly similar results in the depiction of this recipient as unworthy of empathy.

This speaker, charity worker Neil, has a clear stake in this issue as he is the founder of his own international NGO based outside of Ireland in a third world nation. This is a concern for the speaker throughout the interaction, though, and on several occasions a staked account is warded off by the use of a disclaimer (e.g. l. 9 and l. 12). The speaker manages this stake and the maintenance of a moral
identity by deploying such turns as ‘I shouldn’t be judging him’ (l. 9) and ‘that could be me being totally judgemental here’ (l. 12).

However, the speaker finally responds to what could be viewed as the pushing of boundaries by the interviewer in terms of the account given this far, and this pushing of moral boundaries results in a further justification for a lack of giving. The charity worker resolves this dilemma by attributing blame to the recipient by the attribution work of the last few lines (ll. 16-21). The categories of ‘drug addict’ and ‘homeless’ imply blame associated with these recipients circumstances. This blame based on over-similarity of opportunities and shared category membership is used to negate empathic concern, and thus the empathy repertoire is used to function as a justification for withholding aid in this context (Jayussi, 1993).

This charity worker, founder of an international NGO, produces his account as knowledgeable from a professional perspective, but also negotiates this as a moral dilemma. That empathy is invoked as contingent is noteworthy. This remains an aspect and function of the empathy repertoire that highlights its strategic nature. Empathy can be used to construct giving as something contingent on similarity in so far as it produces an account of the recipient group as worthy of empathy, and therefore dissimilarity, or in this instance over-similarity, has the consequence of not invoking empathy in donors and thus justifying a lack of giving. Moreover, such use of the empathy repertoire allows the speakers to manage identity concerns, and preserve their (potentially) empathic and moral identity throughout.

This indicates the somewhat slippery slope between the aspect of the empathy repertoire that invokes over similarity and therefore elements of blame-attribution to the use of the responsibility repertoire (see Chapter 5).

The concept of shared category membership, and hence implied blameworthiness due to the failure of a member to fulfil any expectations of their ‘position’ (Sacks, 1972a: 585) is also illustrated in the following example. However, while similar to the previous charity-worker’s talk, here it is replicated in the talk of two members of the general public.
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Extract 9: ‘It’s easier to blame people for their situation in your country than it is abroad’
(from multiple participant interview no. 5 with Jim and Linda)

1. J: But would that not mean like kind of taking care of your own, charity begins
2. at home? (0.1) [Like]
3. L: [yeah it] could be perceived as that[ as well]
4. J: [yeah]", that’s what I would have thought anyway°
5. I: Do you think people are inclined to take care of their own? (0.2)
6. L: mm (0.3) sometimes. I(.) if(.) not everyone’s like that but(0.1) sometimes
7. J: It’s easier to blame(0.1) people(0.1) for their situation in (.).your (.).country than
8. it is abroad like so you see an ad like of someone abroad like, so you don’t really
9. know what their situation is, but over ↑here ↓like say like someone becomes(.) an(.)
10. alcoholic and then they’re homeless and you’re like ah sure they’re only
11. homeless because they’re an alcoholic(.) and (0.1)then you don’t really care(0.2)
12. But like you wouldn’t think the same way then about(0.1) things(0.1) that are exotic
13. or different.

The particularly noteworthy aspects of this sequence are how Jim negotiates a dilemma (l. 7): it may be right to give to those at home, but it is in fact easier to ‘blame’ those who are closer in proximity to you and those who share some category with you (national category and all this implies) (LeCouteur & Oxlad, 2010). This account is accomplished by first invoking similarity with those at home, the lack of similarity and identification with another group who is viewed as ‘exotic’ or ‘different’ (ll. 12-13), which in turn is accounted for by the lack of understanding of their ‘situation’ (ll. 8-9 ‘you don’t really know their situation’).

Also noteworthy and similar to the previous extract is that implicit in this is the understanding and knowledge the speaker has of the group who are ‘at home’ (in the same category as himself) and by making reference to possible reasons for their homelessness (including an assumption of alcoholism - line 11) which is then followed immediately by an exclamation of lack of empathy (‘you don’t care’) the speaker can account for withholding aid to a group, a group that is depicted as lying within the boundaries of a category that is shared with the speakers - Irish.

Silverman (1998) suggests that while Sacks doesn’t treat norms as simply descriptions of the causes of action, he is concerned with “how viewers use norms
to provide some of the orderliness, and proper orderliness, of the activities they observe” (Sacks, 1972a: 39). Therefore while blame is attributed to the recipients of help in these instances, it is worked up as due to the anti-normative way in which the recipients of help are acting - they are worked up as ‘too’ similar in many cases to the donor and therefore this similarity leads to an expectation of category bound actions that are left unfulfilled and thus withholding aid is explained through the construction of this recipient group as blameworthy. The suggestion that charity workers produce more straightforward accounts of giving via empathy than the perceptibly problematised versions produced by non-charity workers is further supported in the following extract, as it is another instance in which (as the deviant case; Silverman, 2001) one single charity worker engages in a negotiation of the dilemmatic nature of giving.

Extract 10: ‘it sounds incredibly harsh now if you’re a dog’
(from interview no. 5 with charity worker Neil)

This action of accounting for withholding is achieved by first deploying the categories of 1st and 3rd world citizens as all similar and all presented as ‘human’, allowing the speaker here to present a contrast between humans in general and animals. This presentation of human beings as universalistic - humans are the most important species on the planet - enables the speaker to include himself in this group ‘we’ and therefore present as similar (l. 9 ‘we’re the most important species’). Secondly, a footing shift (Potter, 1996) allows the speaker to close
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the distance between him and the hearer of this utterance accomplishing a general acknowledgment that interviewer, speaker and all other humans belong to a category that does not include the recipient group in question - animals.

Finally, animals are presented in an ironic way. It is implied that it would be ironic to identify with or think about what a dog would be thinking (l. 10 ‘it sounds harsh if you’re a dog’), presenting this sentiment in a light-hearted way. This is a demonstration once again of the contingent nature of empathy and similarity in helping relationships and the flexibility in which the empathy repertoire as a discursive resource can be deployed.

Members of the general public appear to problematise the issue of giving and thus produce more flexible accounts negotiating the many dilemmas associated with charitable giving, whereas charity workers are tied to a certain position and therefore must produce an unproblematic hedged account of why their charity helps (often demonstrating the staked and invested nature of their accounts).

4.6 Discussion

The analysis of this interview and multiple participant interview data with charity and non-charity workers identified many similar characteristics as previous discursive approaches to identity, prosocial behaviour and poverty more generally (Stevenson & Manning, 2010; Dalton et al., 2008; Harper, 1996; Radley & Kennedy, 1995). However, innovative contributions to this literature were also identified.

This discussion will work through three key significant points emerging from this chapter’s analysis, and how each relates to the previous literature. First, that an empathic interpretative repertoire can be used in talk to account for giving or not giving by making group similarities relevant; second that similarities can also present as problematic as issues of blame must be negotiated before empathy-based giving is deemed appropriate; and finally that this contingent aspect of the empathy repertoire, and empathic concern more generally, suggests that although promoted in previous literature as altruistic in nature (Batson et al., 1991) may in fact be more egoistic (or at least non-altruistic as it is used in talk).
4.6 Discussion

4.6.1 Giving based on similarity

The previously suggested (and demonstrated) pathway from identification with an ingroup member (identification as an ingroup member) to helping, through the medium of perceptions of similarity and subsequent feelings of empathy (Batson, 1991; Sturmer, Snyder & Omoto, 2005) is the first matter. The first section of the overarching analysis of this repertoire thus provides further evidence for this suggested similarity-empathy link, as speakers are seen to present similarity as a key part of the argument for giving, working up an empathic identity in the process.

Based on the common-sense knowledge and assumptions that can be derived from the categories or labels people use in their talk, Sacks’ analyses were seen as building an apparatus, in so far as he was looking at MCD as resources available to speakers but also the practices or norms of their deployment in talk. Sacks has suggested the ease of understandings that hearer and speaker can share with a simple category deployment: “Whatever we call it, we are looking for an account for the sorts of hearings and understandings such usages get, and for the practices that get them produced in a fashion that achieves these understandings” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 467). This useful approach to category deployment resulted in this chapter’s focus on the many categories used in speakers’ talk to produce versions of potential recipient groups, and how categories could be deployed that both implied similarity and invoked empathy.

In the study of political documents in the time of WWII in Bulgaria, one of the ways in which authors promoted the protection of the Jewish community was through category inclusion (Reicher et al., 2006). Similar to the ways in which category inclusion was constructed in the empathy repertoire, as recipient groups constructed as similar and lying within the boundaries of the ingroup, Reicher points that in his extracts inclusion wasn’t always achieved “through the use of national categories from the Union of Bulgarian lawyers, […] but it also contains a passage in which professional inclusion is stressed” (p. 60). Thus in actively constructing specific versions of recipient groups, as belonging inside or outside a strategically worked up ‘boundary’ of a particular version of the ingroup
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category, ingroup membership could be presented as based on similarity, leaving the speakers free to account for giving or not giving as they see fit.

This national category was also evidenced in the talk of Irish students as Stevenson and Manning (2010) found “the contents and boundaries of the national category, as well as its international relations, were proactively and strategically used to manage a moral identity in talk” (p. 5). The empathy repertoire is seen to resonate in its usage with previously identified ways in which people can account for or mobilize helping intentions - via shared group membership and similarity.

4.6.2 Over-similarity not warranting empathy

The discursive critique of attribution theory (Antaki, 1994; Edwards & Potter, 1992) has drawn attention to “the problems inherent in studying attributions and, more broadly, explanations, in isolation from the discursive contexts in which they occur” (Gibson, 2009, p. 405). As such this analysis was carried out on talk-in-interaction, with charitable giving and the managing of this behaviour in talk as the context. The second theme for discussion is over-similarity and blame attribution. Blame has been looked at previously by Gibson (2009) and Dalton et al. (2006) in terms of its discursive use. It is, from a discursive psychological perspective, a concept that can be worked up and flexibly deployed in conversation and used to achieve the business of the speaker.

Accounts of helping, whether this helping is in the form of charitable donations or in the form of support for government schemes to help others, often are laden with ‘blame’ words. Edwards’ talk of emotion discourse (1999) is helpful in so far as the empathy repertoire is built upon emotion words. However when blame is introduced and used in talk, empathy as an underlying emotion is a taken-for-granted absent emotion. The empathy repertoire was strategically invoked to account for not giving when recipient groups could be constructed as overly-similar, and in these instances the categories deployed lead to attributions of blame to the recipients. This allowed then for an account of withholding aid and an account of the recipient groups as not warranting empathy, while enabling speakers to maintain and manage a moral identity. This aspect of the empathy
repertoire, as empathy not being warranted or appropriate for recipients depicted as overly similar and (therefore) to blame for their situation, was seen most often in the complex and dilemmatic negotiations, co-constructions and talk of the general public. Thus, from a discursive perspective speakers can also be seen to be doing something else in their talk while orienting to the role of similarity - to provide accounts for not giving.

Similarity is presented as integral to helping (when giving is framed in terms of empathy and an empathic moral identity) and therefore when speakers can highlight and attend to the lack of similarity or the absence of identification with the potential recipient of help, this argument can be used to account for not giving. As such, a lack of similarity, lack of empathy and therefore the assumed relationship between these two concepts and eventual giving can work to justify withholding help. Consequently, it is the category work involved in constructing versions of the recipient group through the use of the empathy repertoire that is most noteworthy in this analysis.

4.6.3 Contingent nature of empathy: An altruistic motivation?

The third broad topic for discussion builds directly upon these two previous issues: empathy as an account for giving based on similarity, and over-similarity not warranting empathy. These two phenomena suggest the contingent nature of empathy. Batson (Batson et al., 1991), while in early work presented empathy as a fragile flower “easily crushed by self concern” (Batson et al., 1983, p. 718), has since promoted strongly that empathy-driven helping is altruistic. However, from the perspective this discursive analysis of talk lends, contingent empathy would present as non-altruistic.

While all talk is notably strategic, context-dependent and worked up for the purposes of the specific interaction, it appears empathy itself is also context-dependent. Altruism is “a motivated state with the ultimate goal of increasing another’s welfare” (Batson et al., 1991, p. 6), and it is acknowledged that motivation to help is altruistic “to the degree that it is evoked by an empathic emotional response to the victim’s distress” (Batson et al., 1991). So while empathy may not
necessarily be egoistic in the extreme, not all empathy-based talk (giving and not giving as accounted for by drawing on the empathy repertoire) in this individual and multiple participant interview data could be construed as altruistic.

4.7 Conclusion

While category-deployment forms the basis of the empathic repertoire in action, the following chapter will present the analysis of the second repertoire identified, the responsibility repertoire, in terms of its function, construction and variable nature. Thus, while the empathy repertoire can be shown to aid in the construction of recipient groups in accounts of charitable giving, the following chapter highlights the responsibility repertoire and its utility in aiding the construction of relationships of responsibility between recipient and speaker-as-donor. Therefore, while throughout the use of both repertoires flexibility is evident while they are drawn upon to account for giving or justify withholding depending on the particular context of the interaction, and the identity-demands of that context, the way in which these accounts are accomplished differs in terms of the construction work being done. The categories deployed in the empathy repertoire work to construct versions of the recipient group, while categories deployed in the responsibility repertoire work to construct versions of a relationship.

Thus the aim of Study 1 was to look at how concepts of empathy and responsibility are understood and invoked in talk in relation to charitable giving and helping behaviour more generally. This chapter aimed to demonstrate how empathy, as the first of two interpretative repertoires identified throughout the analysis, is used in talk and to what end. This contributes to our understanding of empathic concern as potentially inconsistent, and this aspect of the analysis will be returned to in more detail in the discussion in Chapter 8.
Chapter 5

The Responsibility Repertoire

This chapter presents the analysis of the second interpretative repertoire identified in Study 1. The talk of charity workers and members of the general public was analysed from a discursive psychological perspective in the context of charitable giving. The previous chapter focused on the use of the empathic repertoire. This chapter will take as its central concern the use of the responsibility repertoire.

The construction of a relationship of responsibility in talk as something that is strategically and rhetorically produced became evident throughout the analysis of the group and individual interview data. As such, a more fine-grained method of analysis (MCA, Sacks, 1972) was also adopted to understand the ways in which categories were deployed, and how the relationships between these categories were subsequently worked up to serve different functions. These functions or actions serve as the basis for the structure of the analysis section; the first section presents examples whereby the repertoire of responsibility is used to account for giving; the second section of the analysis provides worked examples of instances where respondents invoked this repertoire to justify a lack of giving. The ways in which both of these actions are successfully accomplished are also presented. The results of this analysis of the repertoire of responsibility as action-oriented, constructive, flexible and strategic are finally discussed in relation to both previous discursive work and as a precursor to further quantitative investigation.
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5.1 Introduction

While previous quantitative studies on helping behaviours have largely overlooked the role of self-ascribed responsibility in charitable giving, a number of qualitative studies have begun to investigate how responsibility can be used strategically in talk. Both approaches to helping behaviours will first be reviewed briefly in terms of how responsibility has been conceptualised and examined from a quantitative and a qualitative perspective.

5.2 A Quantitative perspective: Social psychology and responsibility

The social psychological literature thus far has often approached an understanding of responsibility through the lens of blame-attribution. In the literature on blame attribution, responsibility is assumed, or at best suggested, as being attributed in tandem with assigning blame. If a victim is to blame for their situation they are also presumed responsible for the solution. As such, responsibility of the victim or the one in need of help has been investigated (Zagefka, Noor, Brown, De Moura, & Hopthrow, 2011).

However the role of the giver of help, and consequently how the concept of responsibility relates to this giver, has been largely overlooked, except through its absence. While the perceptions of the blameworthiness or responsibility of the target have been considered to affect group-level behaviour, less attention has been paid to how the observer’s sense of responsibility affects their helping behaviour. The literature on bystander interventions goes so far as to provide explanations as to when a bystander to an emergency helping situation will not intervene to help by examining the role of group size and its effect on the phenomenon of diffusion of responsibility (Latane & Darlay, 1970; Lay et al., 1974; Latane & Nida, 1981). Much of this bystander literature fails to emphasise the relationship between the helper and helpee and how this relationship is understood in situations that both result in helping and withholding help.

However, recent work at a group-level of analysis adopting a social identity and self-categorisation theory approach (Levine & Thompson, 2004) suggests
that outside of the monopoly of similarity- and empathy-based explanations for helping, obligation as felt by a fellow ingroup member to help could be an important consideration also. Levine & Thompson manipulated British and European identities in an attempt to gauge whether re-categorisation and the salience of a subsequent ‘re-categorised identity’ would result in greater levels of helping. They suggested that “as different identities become salient, the places for which people feel a sense of responsibility may also shift” (p. 233). This concept of obligation and responsibility felt for fellow ingroup members or essentially those who may fall within the boundaries of the ingroup could be a useful point of departure for a further examination of the concept of responsibility.

Weiner (1995) proposes an in-depth theoretical model that suggests perceptions of controllability in terms of causal attributions can consequently result in a decision to either help or not help. Weiner frames this perception of responsibility as leading to either anger or sympathy, and in doing so argues for the role of such causal beliefs and their consequences as perhaps more “relevant” than previously recognised. However, much of the engagement with responsibility in social psychology remains outside of the realm of self-ascription.

In intergroup terms, Brickman and colleagues’ (Brickman et al., 1982) model of responsibility attribution does focus on self-ascribed responsibility, as forming part of a four-pronged approach to helping and recovery in a clinical setting. This model presents as a promising introduction to conceptualisations of responsibility in helping relationships that could move away from blame attribution towards more positive outcomes. Their work, which is mainly in the field of clinical psychology, has been adopted for use in studies in intergroup prejudice and cooperation and helping (Quinn, Ross, & Esses, 2001), as has been reviewed in more detail in Chapter 2. The nature of these studies and their focus on such a broad model, however, leaves the role of self-ascribed responsibility to help in a situation outside of one’s own problems (initial clinical model developed to cope with and recover from alcoholism) buried beneath an array of blame-driven motivations.

Consequently, it could be suggested that adopting a quantitative methodological approach to the study of helping can often-times leave certain stones unturned. This broader point is illustrated by this brief review of studies on
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helping that take responsibility into account in a somewhat limited fashion. The focused and controlled design which many of these studies require results in the role of responsibility being largely overlooked, or what can be viewed as only ‘half of the story’ regarding the contribution of self-ascribed responsibility in helping situations being told.

However, the role of responsibility in helping behaviours has more recently benefited from a different type of approach; a more exploratory and inductive qualitative approach that looks at how responsibility can be used in talk.

5.3 A Qualitative perspective: DP, DA and responsibility

Responsibility has emerged in recent studies as a concept worthy of investigation from a discursive psychological perspective. Some DA studies that focus on the concept of responsibility and how it can be used in talk include Gibson’s (2009) review of online chat-room users’ discussions about welfare recipients in the UK, Dalton et al.’s (Dalton et al., 2008) investigation into how young New Zealanders negotiate their own understandings of poverty, and also Reicher et al.’s, (Reicher, Cassidy, Hopkins, & Levine, 2006) analysis of documents in Bulgaria during WWII which promoted the saving of their Jewish population. All of these authors used the concept of responsibility as forming part of their explanation of their research. Outline below are the various ways in which this has been done, but demonstrate the gap that remains in understanding the systematic use of responsibility as a complex and nuanced rhetorical tool to construct relationships of obligation.

Reicher and colleagues’ study of the political rhetoric of the Bulgarian political defence of the Jewish minority during the Nazi occupation highlights the role of moral obligation in political talk of the need to protect this minority, but this remains of secondary importance in their analysis to the rhetorical construction of ingroup inclusion (as identified in Chapter 4, The Empathy Repertoire). Also, while Dalton and colleagues’ (2008) study focused on how New Zealand youths understand poverty by analysing their discursive co-constructions of the concept,
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the authors also focused on how participants construct their understandings of charitable aid appeals in relation to poverty at a more general level.

They found that speakers would construct versions of themselves as self-responsible when producing accounts of their own charitable behaviour. Speakers would do so in order to account for their position as a non-donor due to the responsibility they had for their own locality, and even at a national level this relationship of responsibility was worked up against any counter-claim or argument (Billig et al., 1988) of responsibility or duty to give aid to other nations.

As Dalton and colleagues state, “meanings are to be found in the relations between things rather than in the things themselves” (p. 494) and through their discursive approach to charitable talk they demonstrate how speakers produce versions of their concerns through identity and positioning work. The construction of such “relations between things” and the consequences of such an account are of central importance to discursive psychological perspectives on any social phenomena, and as such is a concern for more fine-grained methods of analysis that focus on category deployment and the relationships between these categories (see Sacks’ membership categorisation analysis, 1972a; 1972b; 1992).

Previous work on charitable giving by Sargent (e.g. Sargent, 1999) focused on the importance of the relationship between the “fit” of the charity and the donor’s self-image in a model of charitable giving. Once more this suggests the importance of how a donor works up their own understanding of the relationship between him/ herself and either the charity or the recipient group the charity helps, and the instances in which this relationship can be presented to account for giving or be produced to account for a lack of giving.

Gibson also demonstrates how responsibility has been used in talk, by analysing speakers’ use of concepts of effort and responsibility in his analysis of website posting about welfare recipients in the UK after a change or reform in the welfare system (2009). Gibson shows how speakers will work up a version of welfare recipients as lazy, and attend to effort and self-help in a strategic and occasioned way. In order to account for their situation the speakers produce a picture of welfare recipients as unworthy. “Where the attribution of responsibility is at stake, issues of accountability are central” (Gibson, 2009, p. 397; Antaki, 1994). Throughout his analysis Gibson highlights the function being served by these
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posters’ use of responsibility talk, and how they make relevant the accountability of the government to not only help those in need but more often to cease payments to those who are not really in need. Moreover, they are presenting the relationship between the government and recipients as one of responsibility, albeit under the guise of blame attributed to the government (a concept picked up again in more recent work by Gibson, 2011). Thus while this paper illustrates the use of responsibility in talk, it does not systematically address how it is used and what its functions are specifically, yet works to provide evidence of the concept’s importance.

Gibson’s more recent focus is on the ideological dilemmas associated with unemployment and issues of citizenship, concentrating on how these can be managed in talk amongst British citizens (2011). The concept of the responsibility to contribute to society at large (in relation to unemployment) is a key concern and is worked up in his respondents’ talk by making “effort” relevant. Essentially, the focus remains on the speakers’ use of rhetorical strategies in different contexts based on the different ideological dilemmas that are present in these interactions (an analysis of the data which is grounded in these issues of rhetoric and ideology). However, the loose use of the term “responsibility” throughout indicates how the concept in its unclear articulation remains somewhat illusive (as will be shown through some direct quotations presented throughout this section).

Billig and colleagues (1988) theory of counter-arguments and dominant or popular discourse are also attended to throughout Gibson’s 2011 analysis, by looking at the ideological dilemmas of poverty explanations: individual explanations in opposition to societal explanations. And while individual explanations may be seen to be played out more often in recent studies (Dean, 2004), this does not presume that the opposite discourse is also apparent in talk. One can assume that “these ‘solidaristic’ themes” (Gibson, 2011, p. 451) don’t just refer to social solidarity as seen in the previous chapter’s discussion on empathy and shared experiences/ circumstances, but more in terms of the relationships of responsibility apparent within a society, as responsibility for one another.

Gibson’s work refers to the “no rights without responsibilities” concept of welfare systems across the UK - and therefore at a two-way relationship between recipients of welfare and their society/ government. Once again the construction
of a relationship between two categories is of interest for the current analysis, and builds upon some of these studies of relationships depicted as ones of responsibility. These qualitative studies demonstrate how responsibility has been identified as of evident importance in people’s talk, yet it remains an ambiguous and indeterminate concept. Therefore, the rhetorical construction of relationships of responsibility, and the particular functions they serve within the context of charitable giving, remains an unexplored arena. This chapter will thus work systematically through how responsibility can be used in talk of helping behaviour to further explore how people understand and use this concept in their everyday talk.

5.4 The current analysis

This following analysis, from a Discursive Psychology (Edwards & Potter, 1992) perspective employed a thematic Discourse Analysis and concepts from Membership Categorisation Analysis (Sacks, 1970). The different discursive tools that will be analysed in this chapter will be grounded in looking at types of discourses or interpretative repertoires. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, interpretative repertoires are a set of terms used in explanations, recurring patterns in talk. Therefore, following from the previous chapter that looked at how empathy as an interpretative repertoire was used, this chapter’s analysis focuses on the strategic use of the responsibility repertoire.

This analysis introduces and works through a taxonomy of ways in which respondents draw upon this repertoire of responsibility in their talk of charitable giving. This involves constructing versions of a relationship of responsibility to accomplish the business of each interaction, and thus relationships are constructed to both account for giving but also to justify a lack of giving. This differs from the way in which the empathy repertoire was invoked, as respondents in the previous chapter were seen to draw on empathy to construct versions of the recipient group as opposed to relationships necessarily. Similar to the empathy repertoire analysis, the first section in this chapter’s analysis will address the first action being accomplished by the speakers - accounting for giving. The second section will focus on the second action, and illustrate instances whereby speakers justify
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a lack of giving, thus acknowledging the action-orientation of talk within this set of interview and group interview data, and the functions this talk can serve.

The choice to deploy several different categories to help construct a particular version of a relationship as one of responsibility can be seen as dependent on the action-orientation or function of the sequence of talk (Hester & Housley, 2002). The following analysis will demonstrate how respondents deploy categories of responsibility, duty or obligation (for example ‘parent’, ‘adult’, ‘1st world citizen’) in order to construct a relationship of responsibility with another category that implies dependency and inability (for example ‘child’, or ‘3rd world citizen’). In doing so, respondents can account for giving. Alternatively speakers can deploy categories that imply a lack of responsibility or dependency to justify a lack of giving. MCA allows the devices associated with, and characteristics implicit within, each category and description deployed in the talk of respondents to be looked at more closely.

5.4.1 Section 1: Accounting for giving aid

This first section will focus on the first main function identified in the respondents’ talk, accounting for giving. As such, it will present examples where this action is accomplished and will illustrate the various ways in which this can be carried out, both by charity workers and members of the general public. This initial part of the analysis, therefore, will concentrate on the three broadly discursive concerns in talk: action or function, construction, and variability. Also, more specifically, this section will look closely at how relationships of responsibility are rhetorically constructed in talk to serve the function of accounting for giving.

The examples presented come from the same sample as the previous chapter, individual interviews with charity workers and multiple participant interviews with members of the general public. As such, the interview number and name of participants will be carried over for the sake of continuity from the empathy repertoire chapter.

This first extract acts as an initial demonstration of how a repertoire of responsibility can be invoked in a turn, and to what end. The action accomplished
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throughout this short segment is to account for giving. This is achieved by depicting
the vulnerability of the chosen target group. This charity worker accomplishes
this depiction of vulnerability in order to account for her charity’s work by con-
structing a specific version of a relationship between her donors and the recipients
of help.

**Extract1**: ‘And children are so vulnerable’
(from interview no. 2 with Sarah)

---

1. S: when(0.1) like(0.1) answering calls during Haiti when you ask people “so, d’you
2. know, what made you donate to UNICEF” they say “Oh, it’s terrible what’s
3. happening to the ↑children↑ over there”. People are really, If you’re (.), I think if
4. you(.), our donor base tend to be older as well, just in general it seems to be a little
5. bit older, and(.) well(, ) a lot of them would have kids themselves. And if you have kids
6. or have any connection with kids you know how ↑vulnerable they are you know↑ And
7. children↑ are↑ so vulnerable, so that’s(, ) that is the big reason why people donate to
8. us.

This sequence of talk shows Sarah discussing why people might continue to do-
nate to her charity and the characteristics of her donors are subsequently attended
to. The construction of a relationship of responsibility is accomplished in the fol-
lowing ways. Drawing from an MCA perspective on this construction, ‘children’
is deployed as a category in lines 6-8. The accompanying category-bound at-
tributes implicit within this deployment are vulnerability (explicitly stated here)
and inability to self-help, implying requirement of those who can to do so. How-
ever the constructive work within this interaction does not simply involve the
deployment of the category of ‘children’, but the subsequent relationship of re-
sponsibility that can be worked up by deploying the category of ‘adult’ relative
to the child-recipients of aid. This relationship is attended to as a relational pair,
children and adults, as the donor base is explicitly stated as being ‘older’ (l. 5).
This demonstrates the obligation that can be imputed from a simple descrip-
tion of a category and the responsibility that one member of this category (or
standardised relational pair) has for helping another.

This construction of a relationship of responsibility in order to accomplish
certain discursive business, namely accounting for giving, is an example of what
Sacks referred to as Collection R: “A collection of paired relational categories that constitutes a locus for a set of rights and obligations concerning the activity of giving help”. In Sacks’ original work, the initial example of a category bound activity associated with a particular category member described how a baby cried - the mommy picked it up (relational pairs - Sacks, 1972). This inference-laden description of a relationship is one that implies obligation. A construction of a relationship based on obligation, implying membership in a particular category and therefore adherence to the category-bound activities that this lends weight to, can be seen in this (ll. 6-8) and subsequent extracts. This relationship of obligation and responsibility has been termed a particular type of “standardised relational pair” (Sacks, 1972a) and as such this is known as constituting part of Collection R. Speakers can invoke shared knowledge of such categories in order to resolve any ambiguities or incongruities presented by talk of helping.

This short sequence of talk from a charity worker therefore helps to illustrate first how the repertoire of responsibility appears in action, and secondly one of the ways in which it can be used to account for giving (constructing a relationship based on common-sense categories). However this Collection R, and the construction of relationships of responsibility between speaker and potential recipient of help is strategic, in that it is used to accomplish certain interactive goals, and flexible, in that it can be used to manage different concerns. The following extract is a further example of the variable and flexible way in which these relationships can be constructed.
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Extract 2: ‘animals are much easier’
(from multiple participant interview no. 2 with Lisa and Marie)

1. L: as somebody who’s worked(,) with animals ↑and people↓, animals are much
easier(,) People are ↑messy, complicated, contrury objects! {Huhh {huhh}
2. M: yeah] {huhh huhh}(,) Well come here it comes back to what ↑you were saying
3. before, the big brown ↑eyes [thing
4. L: Oh yeah]
5. M: it’s like a kid, (,)you think the same.(0.1) Kids are not wicked, ↑animals are.
6. L: yeah(.) If you’re ever going for a loan to see the bank manager, bring your ↑cutest↓
7. child with you!
8. M: yeah {huhhhuhh}
9. L: And sit them their on your lap and tell them “↑eye-ball the bank manager”!
10. {huhhhuhh} you know
11. M: yeah(.) We don’t see them as threat around, do we,(0.1) as kinda threats,
12. Threatening(.) eh (,)creatures

This extract forms part of a discussion with multiple participant interviewees Lisa and Marie. It illustrates how the same action, accounting for giving, can be achieved by constructing a version of the relationship between the speakers as humans (deploying the category of ‘people’ l. 2) and non-human animals or children as one of responsibility. This responsibility is worked up by the category bound attributes associated with animals and even children, and the explicitly mentioned non-threatening nature of these two categories (l. 12).

The speakers are in part referring back to a quote presented for discussion (‘It’s much easier to show compassion to animals, they’re never wicked’) and as such can mobilise this quote in order to work up their argument for the vulnerability of both children and animals as recipient groups. This is accomplished by first humorously invoking the concept of the utility of a child’s vulnerability, and using the ‘big brown eyes thing’ (l. 4) as a category bound attribute of children. Secondly, the speakers construct a hypothetical scenario whereby a meeting with a bank manager, and the implied category bound attributes of such a person, would benefit from a child’s presence (ll. 7-11). Finally the speakers accomplish their account by attending to the responsibility an adult has for a child as constructed as a common-sense relationship of duty and obligation to help.
Along with the constructive work in this extract, the action of accounting for giving also involves the speaker invoking a sense of entitlement to speak on behalf of a charity and assert her knowledgeable status (in lines 1-2 ‘as somebody who has worked with animals and people’) thus allowing this speaker to draw on experience and present opinion as close to fact (Potter, 1996). Her knowledge of these two groups, in turn, is then used in her construction of the relationship she has with animals and later children as one of informed responsibility.

In deploying the category of ‘kids’ in such a manner as both speakers do in the last few lines of this extract, they are demonstrating how strategic it can be to use a non-threatening and vulnerable group to their advantage due to the sense of responsibility-led helping it could result in (i.e. meeting with a bank manager). This work mirrors the speakers’ own strategic use of such a category in order to accomplish their discursive business at hand - accounting for helping.

The following example works to further demonstrate this flexibility associated with the responsibility repertoire and how constructing a very specific version of a relationship of responsibility between speaker and recipient of help can serve the function of this particular turn, accounting for giving. However, this extract is from an interview with a charity worker. It shows Brenda, the founder of an animal welfare organisation, recount a recent situation whereby her role as a charity worker is evident - giving an injured and rescued animal back to their potentially abusive owners. The gardai are involved only in so far as the law requires the animals to be returned to their ‘rightful owners’, and not in the capacity in which as a charity worker the speaker would like to see.
Extract 3: ‘I just couldn’t hand her back’
(from interview no. 7 with charity worker Brenda)

1. B: people would say to you(0.1) even the gardai, “↑why would you put
   your life on the line for a horse↓”, you↑ know? Basically. (0.1)Because
2. eh(0.2) we(0.1) what kills me is sometimes we take them in and these guys
3. come along that you↑ know↓ haven’t treated the horses well and you’re
4. told (0.2) you know there really is no proof so you hand the horse back↑ to
5. them. That’s (0.1) so I finished up with them. [...] I just couldn’t↑ the day
6. the guy came for her I (.)just(.) couldn’t hand her back. [...] The guards
7. said she had to go back(0.2). She wasn’t in terrible bad condition, but this
8. fella was known not to be ↑good↓ to his horses

The speaker accomplishes her account by juxtaposing two different relationships throughout this sequence of talk. This is done by constructing first a version of the relationship between animals and the gardai as one of failed expectations and a failure to take responsibility. Secondly the speaker constructs a version of the relationship between animals and herself or her organisation as one of responsibility.

In line 1 the founder of an animal charity introduces the ‘gardai’ (the Irish Police), deploying them again in line 7. They are presented as a membership categorisation device (Sacks, 1972) - they are part of a peace-keeping system linked to the government. Therefore without direct mention, the implication is that a category bound activity for the gardai would be to protect and take responsibility for their citizens and others less capable of self-help (in this instance, animals). This expected or assumed relationship of obligation is further constructed in lines 2-3 where the speaker reports speech from a member of a category usually associated with helping behaviours (the gardai) where they make explicit the differences between these two categories - ‘why would you put your life on the line for a horse?’

The second relationship of responsibility is constructed by first building upon this failed relationship of duty previously depicted between the gardai and animals through her deployment and depiction of these category members as less helpful
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despite what one could impute from these categories (i.e. the category bound attributes associated with the gardai). Subsequently, the speaker uses this as a way of constructing her own version of a relationship of responsibility with animals as helpless, as seen in line7 ‘she was in terrible bad condition’. The rights and obligations associated with the relational Collection R pair works to acknowledge and display the responsibility to help invoked by the speaker. In addition, the knowledge implied via her professional responsibility is acknowledged through the deployment of Collection K.

This sequence of talk further illustrates the many ways in which relationships can be rhetorically constructed and subsequently used to account for giving in flexible and strategic ways. It also therefore shows the variable use of this repertoire of responsibility in both charity worker and lay peoples’ talk. Another example of the responsibility repertoire in action comes from a MPI in which the speakers together are in the process of actively co-constructing their version of what responsibility means, through a description of the differences between third and first world countries (categories deployed strategically by the speakers to account for giving).
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Extract 4: ‘why was I so lucky and they weren’t’
(from multiple participant interview no. 3 with Simon and Patrick)

1 S: em (.), I(.,) well maybe not to expect any financial reward, but(.) but I’d say people
2 ‘would be motivated by seeing(.) em(.) their money progress sing
3 P: Yeah (.) exactly
4 S: or I seeing the good work that
5 P: Yeah it’s a different kind (of reward isn’t it
6 S: that(.) their] donations give
7 P: I think guilt is probably a bit of it
8 S: Guilt as well?
9 P: what do you mean by guilt?
10 P: yeah that’s probably your(.) your pet concept(.) I don’t know (0.1) like, I don’t
11 know
12 F: no it’s not don’t worry [huh huh]
13 P: No no! I don’t know I just think people(0.1) sometimes(.) people sometimes I know
14 definitely give because they feel guilty you know(.) it’s hard (.) not to sometimes you know?
15 It’s not a bad thing, its just the way people are isn’t it. You know, you see people who are
16 much less well-off than you and you feel bad and you
17 want to help them. So(0.2)
18 S: yeah (0.1) definitely, like, that’s the reason(.) when(.) you’re(.) growing up like and
19 seeing the pictures on the [news of starving children (.)and(.) even(.) as a kid you would be
20 thinking like, so why (0.1) why was ‘if so lucky and they(.) weren’t’, So perhaps(.) perhaps
21 then the element of guilt comes in.

Once again this extract demonstrates the action of accounting for giving. The function of this sequence of talk is to produce an account of giving that preserves the rational character of the speakers. However this is achieved by constructing a version of a relationship that is based on criteria different from what has been used previously (seen up until now). Previous extracts have depicted recipients as vulnerable, and worked up accounts of donors as capable, responsible and helpful due to the recipient’s inability to self-help.

Here the speakers also attend to some of these concerns, but focus on fatalistic concerns also. Initially, these speakers deploy the categories of 1st and 3rd world citizens to imply a sense of ability and inability, and it is eventually worked up as a relationship of responsibility between themselves as donors and the recipients as ‘unlucky’ people (l. 20). This relationship of obligation and duty is presented as based on the fatalistic nature of where one is born. Subsequently, we can see the speakers attending to differences between both groups, and their use of
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a generic ‘you’ implies it is a category bound activity for 1st world citizens or members of this category (‘you feel bad and you want to help’ ll.16-17). Finally this relationship of responsibility is further constructed by deploying another category, children, (ll. 18-21) whose deployment, as we can see, has powerful and important consequences within this sequence of talk. The activities assumed as part of being a child would involve a generally inquisitive nature, questioning the way things are in the world and why they are this way.

This presentation by the speaker of himself, and again the generic use of the word ‘you’, invites the interviewer and the other speaker to be a part of this assumption, that as a child he would attend to this difference as a concern. However deploying a modal word is of interest here - and consequential. The use of a modal tense here implies the regularity of such thoughts and the generic and common-place nature of them (Edwards, 2006). In working up this as something that ‘would’ have occurred, the speaker can orient towards this way of thinking in adult donors also - ‘even as a kid you would be thinking’ can work here to be read as ‘and now we think the same still’. This has notable consequences. By constructing this relationship of responsibility due to ‘luck’ and chance as essentially something that even a child would question and therefore as something of fundamental importance as an adult, the speaker can accomplish his business. Drawing on the category bound attributes that differ between a child and an adult (an adult would or should be even more aware of this relationship of responsibility) allows the hearer to understand the obvious nature of what the speaker is accounting for.

While the action-orientation of this extract is accounting for giving, and much of the construction focuses on depicting a version of a relationship between speakers and recipients as one of responsibility, based on chance and lucky circumstance, there are several other concerns from a broadly discursive analytic perspective that are evidenced within this extract which help to serve the overarching function of these turns of talk (accounting for giving). For example, footing shifts (Goffman, 1981; Potter, 1996) in lines 13-17 are evident where the speaker presents his construction of guilt as something that is what ‘people’ in general feel, at a group level, and then as something he feels himself (line 16 ‘you feel bad’) at a personal level. This works to remove any responsibility for this statement.
5.4 The current analysis

from the speaker himself, as a shift from fact to opinion. This also allows the speaker more flexibility in terms of how he can proceed to construct relationships between the groups in question (as general opinion, or his own personal opinion).

The final lines of this extract see the speaker Simon mobilise the inferred attributes of what it is to be a child in a 1st world country, by relying on shared cultural values and conventional knowledge (La Couteur & Oxlad, 2010). As such the speaker can invoke the repertoire of responsibility by constructing the relationship between the donor (as a member of the category ‘1st world citizen’) and the recipient (as an un‘lucky’ member of the category 3rd world citizen/impoverished group) as one of responsibility, thus serving the function of this entire account.

There are several noteworthy aspects within the following extract also (extract 5). First it is noted that the work being done throughout, the real function of this talk, is to account for giving, similar to the previous extracts. However here the speaker is accounting for giving to a typically marginalised group (while the others have centred around children’s charities and animal charities - ones more readily and typically associated with vulnerability). This account is accomplished in several ways, through the careful construction of a relationship of responsibility between the speaker and this marginalised group.

Here we see Brenda, the founder of the animal welfare charity, recounting an experience she had outside of her professional work with her own organisation. It was an experience of doing charitable work with members of the travelling community in Ireland. While this extract is lengthy, it is necessary to see how this account is accomplished. The incident in question is a day in court where the charity worker was representing a group who were seeking to remain on a halting site (a camping ground for the travelling community) and to have the local county council fit it with some basic facilities for them.
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Extract 5: ‘For a minute there I thought I’d slipped back into the middle ages’

(from interview no. 7 with charity worker Brenda)

1. B: [...]I remember seeing down like a woman and she had about fourteen children and she had one basin of water and maybe 2 little bits of towels and she’d be trying to wash fifteen children’s heads in a basin on the floor. They’d have to kneel down and put their head into the basin and she’d have a jug with one lot of water. She didn’t have any water, she only had, she might have had a drum of water. That’s why I, that’s why I went to the court, I just couldn’t stand that. You know, And the judge said yes, I mean yes like this.

2. You had the court council there and they were all there, they were barristers and rows of legal people up in Dublin and I had to bring two of them up with me. The two I brought were illiterate, they didn’t even know how to read anything and but the two men to represent the crowd, the McCarthy’s, but eh I had written an affidavit about what I had witnessed around here [...]. Justice Baron, he was very elderly, he seemed to be asleep all the time and I said we’re going to lose this case like you know, But then in the middle it all fell together. I think it was 1997, and eh asked the fella from the council to approach the bench. And he said ‘Would you refresh my memory? What is this?’ And he was listening to what was going on, and he said ‘For a minute there I thought I’d slipped back into the middle ages.’ Are you telling me these people have no water? They have no toilets?” So the next morning the council came out and put a tap outside the college gate outside going in, and temporary port-a-loos along the wall.

First, a version of the relationship between herself as a charity worker and the recipient group (members of the travelling community) as one of obligation-to-help and responsibility is constructed in lines 11-12. This version is presented by attending to their inability to read. This allows the speaker to present herself as having this ability and therefore having a responsibility to help them in this particular situation. Secondly, the speaker’s use of the verb ‘witnessed’ in line 13 further works to present this relationship as one of responsibility, and a reference to Sacks’ Collection K. She constructs a strategic version of herself as knowledgeable of their circumstances, as an expert in this area, which affords her an entitlement to speak about the group in question (Potter, 1996).
This has been seen before in previous extracts where a speaker will work up the relationship of responsibility between themselves as helper or donor and a recipient group by presenting this responsibility as based on the fundamental knowledge they have of a situation or a groups’ circumstances, and their inability to opt out of the donor-recipient relationship due to this knowledge (see extracts 2 and 3). The duty-of-care and obligation to help becomes a category-bound attribute of a ‘witness’ to the circumstances of this group. This is a qualified account based on knowledge and experience and works to allow the respondent an entitlement to speak on this subject. Moreover, it allows flexibility in terms of how the speaker can rhetorically construct a relationship of responsibility between herself and her animal recipients of help.

The extracts within this section have been selected to demonstrate how relationships can be constructed and used flexibly within talk of charitable giving to serve the function of accounting for giving. The categories deployed and subsequently used to depict relationships of responsibility included ‘children’ and their ‘adult’ counterparts, ‘animals’ and their ‘human’ helpers, and even ‘1st world citizens’ and the ‘3rd world citizens’ that fulfil the standard relational pair.

While both charity workers and members of the general public can claim responsibility as a reason for giving, only those members of the general public who do not work in the charitable sector negotiate extensively the more complex issues embedded in the practical and conceptual dimensions of ‘responsibility’. As such in this first section much of the talk that draws on responsibility comes from charity workers.

However, section two will present accounts for withholding help, or justifying not giving and it is evidenced within the second section that responsibility is available more to members of the general public when accounting for not giving than is available to the charity worker speakers. This may be due to the professional position of responsibility that charity workers find themselves in when accounting for the work of their organisation, whereas members of the general public are able to draw freely and more flexibly on the responsibility repertoire to account for not giving and justify it. The dilemmatic aspects of responsibility are open to be negotiated more so for the non-charity worker respondents.
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Similar to the previous chapter which presented the use of the empathy repertoire in the talk of this same sample, one interviewee who deviates from this pattern and who appears to have the same set of concerns as members of the general public is the charity worker Neil (the founder of an International NGO), as will be seen in the final extracts of this chapter.

5.4.2 Section 2: Accounting for withholding aid

Responsibility could also be used to justifying a lack of giving. Within this section relationships are constructed by speakers in various ways, to serve this main function. However, more so in this section than the previous one, speakers must also be concerned with working to manage a moral identity and stave off accusations of being unhelpful and self-centred. This is the second overarching action or function seen in the talk of respondents, justifying and accounting for not giving. Just as the previous section provided illustrations of instances in which speakers accomplished their discursive business through the careful and strategic construction of versions of a relationship between themselves as donor and the recipients of their help as one based on duty, obligation and responsibility, this section also provides examples from the talk of this same sample. However here the extracts demonstrate the many alternative ways in which relationships of responsibility, or lack of responsibility, can be constructed in the context of justifying withholding help; thus highlighting once again the variable and flexible nature of the responsibility repertoire and demonstrating one of the key concerns made relevant by discourse analysts (Wetherell & Potter, 1987).

This first extract demonstrates how the responsibility repertoire can be invoked in the context of accounting for not giving and illustrates one of the many ways in which this can be accomplished. It is taken from a MPI with 2 male participants, who are negotiating which charities they would be likely to donate to.
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Extract 6: ‘It should be taken care of by the state’
(from multiple participant interview no. 4 with David and Graham)

1. D: that (.) oh (.) teenagers would be your top one ↑here?
2. C: yeah, (0.) out of the ones ↑left ↑[...]
3. D: ...I still think teenagers (0.1) before the age of eighteen, you should be(.) more or
   less taken care of by the state.
4. C: [yeah.
6. C: Actually that's (.) that's(.) a very good point, and the same with school books
7. actually.[...]
8. D: I think if ↑somebody↓ came up to me( ) and (.) said( ) to( ) me that “oh I don't have
   school books, I'm a disadvantaged ↑child”, I'd be more inclined( ) to ring a
9. politician as opposed to give them money (.) because I would feel that it's not
10. my (0.1)... I don't want to be consistently giving money to them to make sure(0.2) ...[but
11. C: yeah cos they have another 10 years of school {huhhuh}
12. D: exactly] yeah! I'm not going to be able to fund them for the next ten years!

While the overarching action-orientation of this first extract is accounting for
not giving, it is at once important for both speakers to work towards preserving
a moral character as social actors. This is accomplished by presenting themselves
as rational and thoughtful (ll. 9-12). The constructive work of both speakers
in their turns requires effort to demonstrate a relationship of responsibility that
exists outside of themselves. This is accomplished by deploying categories such
as ‘disadvantaged child’ (l. 10) whereby the implication is they are lacking the
advantages other children citizens have and therefore require state-help.

The speakers also attend to the autonomy-oriented nature of the help they
are more inclined to give, suggesting that they have no wish be ‘consistently
giving them money’ (l. 12) themselves. This further highlights the ability of a
more organised institution such as the government to deliver such a long-term
programme of help, while allowing the speaker to avoid claims of being selfish
or uncharitable - there is simply a better route to helping in this case, and it is
the responsibility of the government (once again a relationship of responsibility
is being worked up, but one that does not directly involve the speakers).

Sacks’ Collection R, which includes standardised relational pairs, is evidently
deployed here. However in contrast to extracts in the previous section of the
analysis, the context in which it is constructed here is accounting for withholding help. This relational pair is one that involves the needy recipient, yes; however the category deployed as responsible, as fulfilling the other half of this pair, is not the speakers themselves but the government as an outside institution. In other words the responsibility is attributed to the Irish government instead. This flexible use of the responsibility repertoire can then successfully account for not giving to this group while both speakers manage to preserve a moral character throughout the interaction. A further example can be seen in another group interview, with Lisa and Marie, who are discussing experiences of charity events and why donations are made specifically.

**Extract7: ‘I feel the government should be doing more’**

(from multiple participant interview no. 2 with Lisa and Marie)

1. **L:** and its *interesting* *(0.1) cos it *(.) I was curious about the effect of Limerick Animal Welfare doing *better* than say *(.) Milford Hospice *(.), which is a *highly* regarded local *(M: yeah)*(.), like you have to take a comparison, like they are both
2. *local* *(M:_pdf)*, and *(.) you know *(.) I subtly asked a few people *(.) you know *(.) “why this and you know *why”, you know *(.) mention the fact and “why do you think Milford *(.) and *(.) Limerick Animal Welfare and Limerick Animal Welfare won on both occasions *(,)”. Some of the *answers* I got back were you know *(.) “I pay my taxes for health and really I feel the government should be doing *more*”,
3. **M:** oh *(.) so I wonder is it *(.) to do with the situation the government situation at the moment *
4. **L:** eh, yeah yeah
5. **M:** people are more *(0.2) standoffish and [that]
6. **L:** yeah *(.) cos it was *interesting* *(.) em *(0.2) and *(.) em *(0.1) some people just felt that
7. again em the health sector was a huge *(.) sector *, and *(.) somehow there was enough
8. funds in there to keep things ticking over but animals *(0.1) you know *(.) they didn’t get
9. *any particular* *(.) help from the government, *(.) and *(0.1) em *(.) *that’s why they tended to give a little bit *more* *(0.1) to that *(.) em *(.) one than say Milford.

The function of this sequence is to account for not giving, illustrating how specific versions of relationships can be constructed in particular ways at particular times within any discursive interaction to serve a particular function. It is accomplished in a way similar to the previous one in that a relationship of responsibility is worked up between speaker and recipient of help and subsequently used
to construct a strategic version of another relationship; between the government and the elderly in Ireland as one of responsibility.

However it is useful to illustrate how one relationship can be juxtaposed with the other. This strategy enables both speakers to successfully account for withholding aid from this ‘other’ group.

The first relationship, used specifically to justify a lack of giving on the part of the speakers (while preserving their moral character) is one between the government and the elderly as a group in need. This is constructed in the following way; by attending to the lack of obligation for this recipient group (ll. 7-8), and subsequently basing this lack of obligation on a relationship of responsibility between the elderly and the state (l. 14, ‘the health sector was a huge sector’). Once more the concept of government responsibility based on citizenship is oriented to here (see Gibson, 2011).

The second relationship, a duty the speakers have for an animal charity, is constructed by presenting a relationship between the donor group and animals as one of responsibility due to the previously constructed relationship of obligation between government and elderly which leaves the animal group unattended (as they don’t get ‘any help’ from anyone else i.e. the state (ll. 15-16).

Thus even within this short extract and sequence of talk it is possible to see the strategic nature of the responsibility repertoire as it is worked up through the deployment of different categories in order to accomplish a different action. First, to account for not giving to a group based on their relationship of responsibility with the government, and secondly to account for giving to a group due to a relationship between government and animals that is lacking in responsibility. Therefore this is an example of how even in close sequence relationships can be rhetorically constructed to serve particular functions at particular times within any discursive interaction.

Another way in which speakers are seen to draw upon a repertoire of responsibility to account for not giving to a particular group is to construct a version of the recipient group as capable of self-help and therefore unworthy of the help of the speakers. This works against a conceptualisation of Sacks’ *Collection R*, as the obligation to help a member of this relational pair is made irrelevant and attended to as inappropriate and unwarranted.
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The relationship between donor and recipient in this instance does not lend itself to that kind of membership category device - the relationship is not one of obligation similar to the previous extracts presenting children or animals as worthy. This lack of a relationship based on responsibility is accomplished by displaying and strategically using the speaker’s own responsible identity as a resource in accounting for withholding aid. The sequence of talk is from a MPI (illustrating again the frequency with which responsibility was drawn on to account for not giving by members of the general public) with Simon and Patrick. The discussion is about donating and fundraising efforts at the time of Hurricane Katrina in the U.S.A.

Extract 8: ‘the richest country in the world should be able to do more’

(from multiple participant interview no. 3 with Patrick and Simon)

1 P: em, I know I didn’t give any \down money for anything like that. I think(.) there
2 was a big problem \up there\ in that their country didn’t kind of,(0.1) well the
3 government were very slow in kind of looking \after the people there(0.1). I don’t:
4 know(.), I think(.), I don’t know maybe its just \me, but I didn’t get the impression
5 that international kind (0.1)of the [S: yeah] international kind of community didn’t
6 give money because (.)perhaps(.) maybe there was a , (0.1) well and it would have
7 been rightly so, the Americans could(,), well \should\, be able to look after that kinda
8 thing themselves.
9 S: yeah, I like(.) that’s how I felt alright. Just that, em,(0.1) in a way(0.2) even
10 though it was a disaster \there it seemed to have been preventable in a few ways
11 (0.1). Like I remember(.), I think(.), hearing that the eh New Orleans city council had
12 Applied for funding to build levees
13 P: yeah
14 S: and it had it turned down,(.) and like I saw some... I mean I \know there’d be(.)
15 different \say departments(.) but the \money\ that the US spent that year say(0.1)
16 funding some(.) em paramilitary organisations in Columbia
17 P: yeah!
18 S: was \more than it would have cost to look after their \own \citizens(.) [P: yeah]
19 so yeah so like my attitude to \that was like that the (0.2) \richest country in the world
20 \should be able(.) to do more

The variable nature of the repertoire is again illustrated as both speakers work to present themselves as rational yet moral social actors while accounting for not giving. This is the main function of this particular extract, justifying a lack of
The current analysis

giving, and it is accomplished through a careful construction of the relationship between the speakers and the potential recipient by first attending to the ability of both 1st world nations, and secondly using this ability to construct a version of the needy group as self-responsible.

More specifically, it is the categories deployed throughout this extract that allow the speakers to work up this relationship. This extract demonstrates Jayussi’s (1984) perspective on Sacks’ framing of obligations and rights of certain categories and the actions these categories entail. The suggestion that these activities, while inferred, are socially recognisable is key in Sacks’ MCA (1972, 1992). As stated by Jayussi, in an explanation of the moral inferential logic of MCA, “Sacks’ notion of category bound actions, rights and obligations not only points out the moral features of our category concepts, but also provides thus for the very moral accountability of certain actions and omissions” (Jayussi, p. 240). As such, it is the actions of giving donations and omissions of withholding this aid or help that is attended to here.

Sacks’ framing of how the construction of membership categories and everything they entail is intrinsically linked to the very presentation of an identity as moral is evidenced throughout this extract. The category that is being attended to is a 1st world country, and while the speakers work up the attribution of blame for the cause in lines 9-13 and 14-16, much of the beginning section is attributing responsibility for the solution to the country itself (‘the Americans could, well should be able to look after that kinda thing themselves’ ll. 7-8). This construction of the relationship as lacking in responsibility or duty to help serves to justify a lack of helping. The footing shifts (e.g line 7, ‘could, should’) also further consolidate the account as it demonstrates how speakers are constantly negotiating the dilemmatic nature of charitable giving and managing a moral identity throughout the contextual and temporal changes in any discursive interaction.

As such, throughout these extracts causal explanations as to the circumstances of those in need of help are attended to by the speakers. Silverman (1998) suggests that while Sacks doesn’t treat norms as descriptions by themselves of the causes of action, he is concerned with “how viewers use norms to provide some of the orderliness, and proper orderliness, of the activities they observe” (Sacks, 1972a, p. 39). Therefore while blame or responsibility to help is attributed to the
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recipients of help in these instances, it is worked up as due to the anti-normative way in which the recipients of help are acting - they are worked up as similar in many cases to the donor and therefore this relationship of similarity leads to an expectation of category bound actions that are left unfulfilled and thus can be explained through the blameworthiness of this recipient group.

To sum, this extract demonstrates how the action of accounting for not giving aid can be achieved in a discursive interaction by carefully constructing a version of the relationship between speaker and group in need as lacking in obligation by making relevant the ability of the recipient group to help themselves.

One further example of how this type of relationship can be constructed, but in a different context, can be found in another MPI, with David and Graham. However, as this analysis attends to the categories deployed and the inferences to be made from these categories by the hearer, this extract is particularly noteworthy. It attends to the explicitly responsible nature of the relationship between pets and their owners.

Extract9: ‘pets... [...] They have owners’
(from multiple participant interview no. 4 with David and Graham)

Consequences are intrinsic to the function and action-orientation of any turn in talk. Here the consequence of the speakers’ discursive work is to account for not giving to charities for ‘pets’. This is accomplished by constructing a relationship
of responsibility between pets and their owners, carefully deploying these cate-
gories and invoking the implication that duty and obligation are category bound
attributes of the category ‘owner’. This works to exclude the speakers them-
selves from a similar relationship of responsibility with animals, and removes any
obligation to help.

While pets as a category can oftentimes immediately imply a relationship of
responsibility with an unmentioned ‘owner’, the following extract demonstrates
not only the flexible nature once again of the repertoire of responsibility in con-
structing specific versions of relationships to accomplish certain actions, but its
variable use even within the same topic of conversation; a further discussion about
the category ‘pets’.

It (the following extract) also indicates a potential explanation for the ap-
pearance of mainly MPI in this section of the analysis. Similar to in the analysis
of the empathy repertoire, charity workers appear more tied to their position.
They are speaking on behalf of a charitable organisation with which they have a
professional relationship. However, members of the general public are not so tied
to any particular position, and as such can draw on the responsibility repertoire
in flexible ways. As well as claiming it, they can work up relationships of respon-
sibility outside of themselves. The following 2 extracts demonstrate how this
comes about in the interactions where speakers are able to freely negotiate the
dilemmas inherent in both the concept of helping or giving and of responsibility
itself.
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Extract10: ‘I would rather there was more em legislation against the pedigree breeding’

(from multiple participant interview no. 3 with Simon and Patrick)

1 I: [...] Would you give up to an animal charity if they were collecting on the street, or do you see a lot of ads for it?
2 S: em yeah you(0.2) I do alright(0.1) and (...em ...) just I(...) I per personally I wouldn’t em, like I, (0.4) I don’t know is it because I think a lot(...) of animal suffering happens in the wild as well and em we don’t prevent that, but...)
3 ↑yeah(...) like, even though(0.2) like I’d rather give em(0.3) money to a charity preventing say(...) domestic cruelty rather and child abuse, if that can happen(0.1)
4 rather than animal cruelty. Just(...) just a
5 P: I don’t know I find that (0.1), I don’t know like just what you said there like(0.1), I you feel that animals would suffer in the wild as well. Like I agree I agree, but at the same time(0.2), I what if I would look at it is(...) I would rather there was more em legislation against the pedigree breading and all that sort of stuff that seems to be, [...] And all of this kind of carry-on.
6 S: yeah
7 P: And I think that, (0.1) people if they want a pet(.) should go to the shelter and (...) pick(...) a dog(...) or(...) a(...) cat(...) or whatever they want and if that was I think it’s something that people may be, (.) even though its common, although a lot of people mightn’t be aware of it, if they think they want to get a dog(...) or a cat for their child for Christmas I think their first instinct would be to go to(...) a(...) breeder to get a pedigree dog, [...]
8 S: [yeah]
9 P: Em, and I would much(...) rather(...) people look after those animals first and the(...) the market for these designer dogs was kind of cut out of it a bit and then the problem would be less(0.1) I also feel very strongly against things like horses and the travellers shouldn’t be allowed have them(0.1), I just like I(...) nearly, there’s a halting sight down the road towards my house and(0.1) night(...) time I have(...) several times nearly hit horses
10 S: [what]?
11 P: yeah. And you see them, like, they’re standing in the middle of the road and I go past(...) and(...) you see them getting beaten and(...) all(...) sorts of horrible behaviour and(...) they get left to starve [...] That kind of stuff can be prevented and I(...) think(...) its the job of the local government to(...) to(...) sort that out
12 S: yeah I think)
13 P: rather than(...) charities you know up
14 S: yeah I think it’s(...) a(...) criminal issue really(...) like(...) there should be(0.2) harsher sentences for em, [...] P: yeah yeah exactly
15 S: So(0.2) I(...) suppose if some animal cruelty charities could lobby for stronger legislation that would be a ben(...) a benefit
16 P: definitely
The core concern from a DP perspective as evidenced throughout this sequence of talk is variability. The action-orientation of this sequence of talk is to preserve the speakers’ moral character while presenting ways in which they can justify not giving to these groups. Here we see two speakers negotiating what Billig would term the ideological dilemmas (Billig et al., 1988) associated with helping. In lines 3-5 we can see Simon construct a relationship between himself as a donor and a possible recipient group of animals that lacks responsibility, by orienting towards the natural state of their circumstances (‘suffering in the wild’).

While the overarching function of this extract is to account for not giving, the ways in which this is accomplished is especially noteworthy as the different category-deployments used to construct versions of relationships of responsibility illustrates the flexible and variable nature of language-usage, particularly of responsibility as a resource.

As this interaction progresses there are several specific elements that are of interest. First, this absence of a relationship of responsibility with animals is juxtaposed with the speakers relationship of responsibility with children, as in line 7 Simon constructs a version of another possible recipient group (child abuse) as unnatural ( unlike animals suffering in the wild for example) and therefore more worthy of his help. Secondly, the second speaker Patrick mobilises this concept of natural suffering and furthers his argument and account for withholding aid by working up a version of the relationship between the state and animals as one of responsibility - there should be more legislation against what could be presented as the causes of cruelty to animals (ll. 11-12). Finally, this relationship of responsibility is attended to as one of prevention to avoid these situations, a responsible approach to a situation.

The invocation of ‘criminal issues’ and concepts of ‘lobby’-ing work to present the category bound activities of such legal and governmental bodies as roles that are assumed to be of a helpful nature, also has consequences throughout this extract. It once again presents a version of a recipient group as engaged in a relationship of responsibility with someone other than the speakers themselves (as seen in extract 6). Thus the speakers are able to carefully negotiate this ideological dilemma and manage to maintain their responsible and moral identities.
Accounting for not giving is the function of this entire extract, although the dilemmatic nature of this topic of charitable giving requires the speakers to work hard to present this account as logical and rational. Once again this account of their behaviour is accomplished by constructing versions of relationships. One version is constructed whereby the relationship between the group in question, animals, and the government is one of responsibility. This allows a second relationship to be constructed, one in which the speakers have no responsibility for animals (or less responsibility).

The same respondents from the previous group interview example are seen in the following extract to demonstrate how the responsibility repertoire can be invoked in managing an ideological dilemma of giving or not giving and illustrate how this can be further exacerbated by concerns about institutionalised helping. It must be noted that this MPI involving Simon and Patrick constituted one of the MPI that was conducted with participants who were well acquainted with each other (see Chapter 3, section 3.6.3. for the benefits of this approach to sampling). Thus we can see the discussion in comfort and familiarity allows for lengthy negotiation work among the two friends.

The overarching function of this extract is to account for not giving, by constructing a version of the relationship between the speakers and recipient of help as one of mediated responsibility or obligation. This is accomplished by deploying the category of government through talk of tax and suggestions that giving would increase through such structured systems were they in place.
Extrac11: ‘does it mean as much do you think if people are forced to give...?’
(from multiple participant interview no. 3 with Patrick and Simon)

First, by invoking the concept of a responsible citizen who is duty-bound to care for other citizens, the use of the word ‘support’ in line 2 works to present this type of aid as less ‘charity’ based and more in line with social responsibility (using ‘support’ instead of ‘help’/ ‘give’). This responsibility is worked up by attending to the concept of waste (line 17 ‘I don’t like to see my tax money wasted on stupid things’) and therefore presenting the speakers as responsible
because they rationally choose not to give to a cause that could be construed as wasting valuable resources.

The use of many modals within this sequence, for example ‘would’ (e.g. 1. 20 ‘I suppose people would probably, even if we had a charity tax, people would probably still give on top of that anyway, wouldn’t they’) demonstrates the speakers’ work to present the normative regularity of such ‘opinions’ (Edwards, 2006). It allows the speakers to maintain a responsible, moral identity as it demonstrates that they are negotiating certain dilemmas within this sequence and are actively attempting to find solutions to the issues under discussion. It also allows them to generalise many of these suggestions or opinions to the interviewer, the hearers of these utterances and the Irish public.

However, this type of giving, as institutionalised and structured, is then presented as troublesome, as a relationship of compassion is constructed as being potentially more important (ll. 30-32). This sequence therefore works to show how speakers can engage in this type of dilemma, which fundamentally revolves around a careful construction of the relationship between a donor and a recipient - should it be a relationship of responsibility (as seen in many of the previous extracts) or based on emotions of empathy shared with the recipient (as seen in many of the extracts in the previous chapter). Essentially the speakers are engaging in a negotiation that is attempting to manage a relationship of responsibility between donor and recipient against one that is more empathy-based (‘it may not have the kind of, the kind of... the heart behind it I suppose’ line 30-31).

While the function of this extract is to account for not giving and preserve a moral identity, the noteworthy aspects centre on the negotiation work the speakers are engaged with as they construct versions of two possible relationships between themselves and recipients. One of these relationships is of mediated responsibility (through the government and taxes); the other is of empathic concern and compassion. The dilemmatic nature however still results in neither speaker suggesting that they give help, thus serving their function of accounting for not giving but constructing such an array of carefully strategized relationships that they manage to maintain their identity as moral and responsible social actors - which can be seen as the actual overarching action-orientation of this entire account.
Thus these two examples (extracts 10 & 11), albeit from the same MPI with two friends, illustrate the negotiation work required to account for not giving when drawing on the repertoire of responsibility. It also demonstrates the broader point that members of the general public are more at liberty to avail of responsibility as a discrete resource in their talk to justify withholding help yet preserving a moral identity as they are not tied to a specific position and do not, via their profession for example, need to claim responsibility themselves.

Justifying withholding help as the function of talk is demonstrated in this last example of section two, illustrating a final way in which relationships can be rhetorically constructed to serve a certain function: attributing responsibility to help to the needy recipient but not due to ability to self-help but to accountability for their situation. This final extract is taken from an interview with the charity worker and founder of an international NGO Neil.

As within the empathy repertoire analysis, this particular charity worker is the only one to appear in this section where responsibility is being invoked to justify withholding aid. It is seen as a dilemma to be worked through, as the speaker attends to issues of blame inherent within the broader concept of responsibility, but it also illustrates the identity work being done by a speaker who is somewhat tied to his position as a charity worker and who presents as evidently interested and with a stake in the topic of charities more broadly. Thus to inoculate this, the concerns are negotiated in a similar way to that seen by members of the general public.

This extract was also used as an example in the previous chapter, and was justified within that chapter as appropriate due to the deviant nature of the speaker (Neil constitutes the results of a deviant case analysis, see Silverman, 2001). It also indicates the ability for speakers to shift between repertoires in quick succession, to accomplish the same discursive business, here accounting for withholding aid from a recipient group. Neil appears to be engaged in an ideological dilemma akin to the ones negotiated by members of the general public, which could provide an explanation for his ability to draw upon both repertoires in a short sequence of talk. This extract however ultimately draws attention to the somewhat slippery slope of blame-attribution (which has been detailed and acknowledged throughout the previous literature on prosocial behaviour) and how it can be invoked in talk.
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under the guise of over-similarity and lack of empathy (as was the analytic focus in the previous chapter) or under the guise of accountability and responsibility of the recipient (as is the analytic focus here).
5.4 The current analysis

Extract 12: ‘would I be more inclined to give to foreign beggars than local beggars?’

(from interview no. 5 with charity worker Neil)

Jayussi’s (1984) reference to “relevant category environments” is useful here as the construction of a particular category is accomplished, and the category bound activities inferred from this for its members (here homeless in Ireland) can be imputed while managing to allow the speaker to maintain his identity as moral. Moreover, the invocation of a repertoire of responsibility here enables the speaker, the founder of an international NGO, to create a relevant category environment by presenting himself as responsible and using this as a resource to accomplish his discursive business, which in this instance is accounting for not giving.

This action is accomplished in a number of ways. First the relationship between speaker and needy group is constructed as one that should imply equal-ability and equal-footing (not one of responsibility necessarily) ll. 10-11. The speaker then works to highlight the joint-membership in a category that both he and the group in need of help share, therefore making the audience alive to the
self-ascribed responsibility expected of the recipient group to help themselves (ll. 6-7/ ll. 10-11). This is demonstrated through the working up of the recipient group by making relevant the opportunities they have had. The speaker constructs a relationship between himself and the recipient group, placing both in the same category as Irish or 1st world citizen, thus producing a version of this group as to blame for their circumstances, and therefore unworthy of his help. The category deployed here is inference-laden, and the recipient finally is depicted as unworthy without explicit mention of why. Yet in terms of Sacks’ ‘positioned categories’ it appears that blame is invoked due to the failed expectations the speaker perceives of a fellow category member. This all helps with the speaker’s construction of a relationship based on a lack of responsibility.

This extract illustrates how category-bound activities and actions can work to account for various attributions, as the speaker relies on the shared knowledge and assumptions that such categories as ‘homeless’ and ‘drug-user’ will present for the hearers of these utterances (as seen in l. 17 ‘inflicted huge self-harm’, and in l. 18 ‘you’re the one that your own free will entered that stuff in your body’). This also works to enable the speaker to attribute blame to this category member, and to display his responsible identity in reaction to this possible recipient - ultimately working to construct and present a version of the relationship between the speaker and the possible recipient of help as one that lacks responsibility, as the recipient should be capable of self-help.

While this extract builds on a similar use of the responsibility repertoire as seen in extract 8 (throughout the Hurricane Katrina discussion) whereby a relationship is constructed as lacking responsibility, here the function remains the same, accounting for not giving. Yet in this instance it is achieved in a different context, not one where a nation is justified in not helping another nation due to ability to self-help, but one in which one speaker is justifying withholding aid from a particular hypothetical individual due to their own accountability for their situation of need.

This further highlights the flexible nature of the responsibility repertoire, and the various ways in which relationships of responsibility or lack thereof can be rhetorically constructed to accomplish a particular action. However it also illustrates the different ways in which most charity workers, who are tied to a particu-
lar position due to their profession, draw upon responsibility as a straightforward claim, in contrast to the flexible ways in which members of the general public can use this repertoire: as a resource to aid in the negotiation of a dilemma of giving, which can be used to account for giving or to justify a lack of giving, allowing them to manage the many concerns this multifaceted concept can evoke.

5.5 Discussion

Sacks’ (1963) early works stemmed from an interest in the use of language in interaction, first looking to phonecalls to a suicide helpline as data to work with. It was within this initial study that the relationship of responsibility that is attended to within this chapter was first acknowledged. Sacks attempted to understand not just the turn-taking and conversational sequences of such talk in these phone calls, but also to understand the underlying assumptions available to the speakers (both caller and answerer) and the inference-rich categories invoked throughout these often short conversational interactions. Sacks demonstrated how the answerers in such helpline centres were instructed to go through a procedure of investigating who was available to the caller in terms of support and help, and the helpline workers would begin to list people who could help those with suicidal thoughts often starting with a spouse and moving then to parents, to friends, and so forth (1972a).

These prompts were in response to what most callers would initially state, something akin to “I have no one to turn to”. It was the nature of the inference-laden categories that the helping workers invoked that became of interest, and that is of particular interest within this current chapter’s analysis of the single and multiple participant interview talk. All of these categories - spouse, parent, friend - imply an obligation to help, and form part of Sacks’ standardised relational pairs as they are culturally constructed and subsequently understood in talk as being a relationship of responsibility (husband- wife, parent-child, friend-friend). It is this relationship of responsibility that is attended to throughout the extracts in this chapter.

Certain categories are associated with certain actions (i.e. adults responsible for children) or with classes of attributes “that can conventionally be imputed
on the basis of a given membership category” (Watson, 1978, p. 106). This inference of responsibility upon the category of donor within the speakers’ talk is often an assumption and worked up to form a reasonable account of why they would give to a particular recipient group. LeCouteur and Oxlad (2010) present attributional matters in discourse as always strategic, and within this context of accounting for or accounting for not giving this strategic element is evident. “Attributional matters such as agency and blame can therefore be examined as discursive accomplishments: we can analyse how descriptions are put together to make the accepting of” (in this case in Extract 3) “or refusing of” (in this case in Extract 6) “responsibility come off as credible or acceptable” (LeCouteur & Oxlad, 2010, p. 7).

The various ways in which the relationships between speakers and the needy groups in question are constructed resonates with the work of both Gibson (2009, 2011) and Reicher and colleagues (2006). Gibson has looked at how relationships of responsibility are rhetorically constructed between government bodies and welfare recipients, as largely based on obligation and the duty associated with the role of government officials. Further work of Gibson’s has focused on the effort made by citizens and the relationship constructed between government and citizens as one of two-way responsibility. This type of standardised relational pair, as it relates to the current analysis in this chapter, would imply duty and obligation that goes both ways. This way of constructing a relationship of responsibility was lacking in the current analysis, where the various means of depicting relationships were based on self-ascribed responsibility, responsibility lying with another body (i.e. the government/ pet-owners) or an outright lack of responsibility within a relationship between two able-bodied individuals or two capable 1st world nations.

A relationship of responsibility as constructed by leading political and religious figures in Bulgaria during the 2nd World War emerged in an analysis conducted by Reicher and colleagues (Reicher et al., 2006). This relationship of responsibility implied that Bulgarian citizens had a duty to act out and help the Jewish population in Bulgaria against Nazi racism. However, the way in which this relationship was constructed differed from the various ways addressed in the current analysis. The documents Reicher analysed demonstrated the strategic
deployment of the categories of Bulgarians and Jewish Bulgarians in order to imply a relationship of solidarity between both groups, and furthermore to include the latter within the boundaries of the former group. Thus the relationship of responsibility was worked up as based on the norms of the Bulgarian people and the moral identity they wished to preserve. While this element of identity management, and the maintenance of a moral identity, was identified as a key concern of many of the respondents in section 2 of this chapters’ analysis, the main concern for participants when constructing a relationship of responsibility to account for helping (as seen in section 1) was in the depiction of the recipient group as vulnerable, incapable of self-help, or unlucky.

Another examination of how aspects of responsibility are seen in talk is Cohen’s study of denial and the development of Denial Theory (2001). Cohen presents denial as consisting of literal denial (“it just didn’t happen”), interpretative denial (“it happened, but it doesn’t mean what you think it means”), and/or implicatory denial (“it happened, but it has nothing to do with me”). It is this final form of denial, implicatory, that could potentially speak to the latter use of the responsibility repertoire as it is presented in this chapter: accounting for withholding aid. “Denial theory claims to understand not the structural causes of the behaviour (the reasons), but the accounts typically given by deviants themselves (their reasons).” (Cohen, 2001, p. 58). Respondents in this latter section of the analysis were seen to invoke a repertoire of responsibility to present a version of the situation of need that essentially lies outside of their own realm of responsibility. This can be seen in the extracts in which speakers work up a relationship of responsibility between a needy group and an ‘other’, most often the government. In this way, they can acknowledge the need of another, but can deny their responsibility to engage in some sort of action (e.g. helping) by claiming that it is someone else’s responsibility.

The flexible and strategic nature of the responsibility repertoire can be demonstrated throughout this chapter, as it can be deployed as a discursive resource in interaction to achieve certain ends. The consequences of drawing on this as a repertoire in conversation about one’s own and other’s charitable giving is that speakers are able to account for either giving to a charity or withholding donations from a charity by working up and making relevant the relationship between
5. THE RESPONSIBILITY REPERTOIRE

the speakers themselves as potential donors and the recipient group the charity is helping - a relationship that can be presented as one of responsibility or one that is lacking in responsibility. From a discursive psychological perspective, then, this chapter furthers our understandings of the action-orientation and functional use of language in interactions that centre on such accountable matters as charitable behaviour. It also demonstrates the utility of constructing versions of accountability in giving to a ‘needy’ group by working up very specific versions of the relationships between the speakers as donors and the recipient groups.

The previous chapter discussed the use of the empathic repertoire in accounts of charitable giving, and this was also seen to be deployed strategically in talk to account for giving or withholding help to different groups. However, with the empathic repertoire speakers were doing something different from what can be seen with the use of this chapter’s responsibility repertoire - the speakers were drawing on a discourse of empathy to present a specific version of the recipient group as worthy or unworthy of help, as warranting or not warranting empathy through either shared experience/ history or attributions of blame due to oversimilarity. Within the use of the responsibility repertoire, in contrast, speakers are seen to work up not simply a version of the recipient group as warranting help, but a specific version of the relationship between donor and recipient as one of duty, obligation, and ultimately responsibility.

Thus this contributes to the main drive of this thesis. The research question Study 1 wished to address was how empathy, similarity and responsibility relate to each other and to helping behaviours, and how they are invoked in everyday talk. Furthermore the aim was to generate a more grounded understanding of how people themselves understand responsibility. In the previous literature responsibility has been identified as a complex, multi-faceted concept that has been examined in several ways and through several lenses, the minority of which have focused on the self-ascription dimension. As such, through an analysis of talk this chapter has identified responsibility as a discrete discursive resource deployed in talk through its reliance on understandings and constructions of the relationship between donor and recipient.
5.5 Discussion

5.5.1 Can the role of responsibility be further investigated beyond its strategic use in talk?

Building on this qualitative and exploratory analysis of how relationships of responsibility can be constructed to serve particular functions in particular contexts, the question remains as to whether or not this analysis can be used as a platform for further, more systematic, investigation into the potentially important influence of responsibility in helping situations, and the return to a quantitative perspective.

Responsibility of the victim or the one in need of help has been investigated (Zagefka et al., 2011). However the role of the giver of help, and consequently how the concept of responsibility relates to this giver, has often been overlooked in quantitative studies. Thus this attribution of responsibility to the giver of help, in a situation that warrants help, presents itself throughout this analysis as a variable that needs to be taken into consideration and requires further examination beyond what has already been studied from a bystander diffusion of responsibility perspective (Latene & Darley, 1970; Levine & Thompson, 2004).

The attention paid to constructing the recipient as sharing category membership with the donor, and also attributing blame to a member of the same category, all present as identity work of the speaker. These constructions (as similar or to blame) are examples of speakers working to manage their identity as moral social actors (be that through the frame of an empathic identity as seen in the previous chapter). However, in the helping relationship, which is framed by responsibility, speakers are seen to do something different. Instead of managing their own individual identity, they are seen to be managing the self in relation to the other, and the relationship of responsibility between donor and recipient is worked up and constructed in these accounts of giving or not giving in strategic ways. This suggests a new way of thinking about the helping relationship in the broader social psychological literature, not just from a discursive analytic perspective, but as an intergroup dynamic rather than simply a socio-cognitive process.

Nadler (2002) has begun to engage with helping as an intergroup dynamic in terms of an intergroup helping as status relations model. However, this presents
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the dynamic as resting on power relations and orienting towards status hierarchies between groups. Within this particular chapter of the responsibility repertoire, this ‘intergroup dynamic’ is focused more on the construction of a relationship of responsibility and obligation between recipient and donor. This could essentially be due to power relations, and perhaps a further investigation along these lines would identify responsibility for another group as another dimension of the power relations dynamic. However it must still be considered and taken into account when looking at charitable giving. By looking at simply one intergroup relationship, one of power or status, there is a risk of overlooking something that could potentially be vital in intergroup helping research. Therefore, as Nadler’s model is heavily based on a Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) perspective, social identity paradigms should begin to take intergroup relations into consideration over and above those based on competition.

5.6 Conclusion

This chapter has presented in its analysis of the talk of charity and non-charity workers their use of the responsibility repertoire in the context of charitable giving. Within this analysis, the focus has been on the many ways in which two broad functions (accounting for giving and justifying withholding help) have been served. More specifically, the analysis has demonstrated the strategic ways in which relationships of responsibility can be constructed by respondents to accomplish their discursive business.

While this discursive analysis contributes to our overall understanding of how people can use repertoires strategically in talk, and how responsibility can be invoked when accounting for one’s charitable behaviour, it does not offer any definitive solutions to the broader problem of the role of self-ascribed responsibility as often absent in the social psychological study of helping behaviours more generally. In order to rectify this and perhaps work towards bridging the gap between a qualitative understanding of self-ascribed responsibility and a more objective, deductive and quantified description of how self-ascribed responsibility functions in helping situations, it may be beneficial to adopt another methodological approach to further investigate the role of responsibility in charitable giving.
As such, the remainder of this thesis will present the various ways in which the role of self-ascribed responsibility can be investigated, including how it relates to the previous chapter’s repertoire of empathy, as empathic concern is incorporated as another variable of interest in the subsequent chapters. The discursive approach to both empathy and responsibility as they relate to charitable giving will be returned to in the overall discussion chapter at the end of this thesis.
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Chapter 6

Empathy and Responsibility: The Intragroup Level

This chapter details the development of a survey designed to further investigate different motivations to help, as based on the findings of the previous qualitative study. The survey study (Study 2) presented here enabled the development of a measure of responsibility as it is conceptualised in this thesis, and as it emerged from Study 1: the perceived obligation, duty and responsibility to help another. Previous literature has suggested that while empathic concern can lead to charitable giving, self-ascribed responsibility to help may also play a positive role. Therefore this study also afforded an investigation of these two possible determinants of helping. Results of the survey study demonstrate that in a sample of Irish students, empathy and responsibility as psychological constructs contribute independently to intentions to donate. These results are discussed in light of the previous literature already addressed on empathy and responsibility illustrating how they have been investigated in the context of a social psychological perspective on prosocial behaviours.

The results are also discussed as a precursor to the development of an intragroup-level experiment (Study 3) which primes either empathy or responsibility as an aspect of the participants national identity (Irish students), and subsequently examines willingness to donate to two needy ingroup targets, experimentally varied in terms of the ingroup target’s level of perceived blame for their situation. The aim of this study, building upon an understanding gained from Study 2 that
both empathic concern and responsibility influence decisions to donate, was to
demonstrate the more unique and specific impact on helping when characteris-
tics of the helpee are varied. Study 3 found those primed with empathy to be
more discriminating in terms of who they were willing to help (higher levels of
willingness to donate to the perceptibly innocent more so than the blameworthy
target group) than those primed with responsibility. Responsibility as an aspect
of the participants’ salient identity was therefore seen to overcome blame attribu-
tions, and suggests that empathy-motivated helping is contingent on perceptions
of blameworthiness whereas responsibility-motivated helping does not make such
distinctions.

Thus the studies presented in this chapter demonstrate a move from a qualita-
tive approach, which afforded the investigator a more grounded understanding of
self-ascribed responsibility from the perspective of people in their everyday talk,
and how this relates to concepts such as empathy and similarity. The studies
presented here also demonstrate how shifting to a quantitative approach allowed
for the development of the concepts emerging from the qualitative investigation
through a more specific analysis of the separate impact of empathic concern and
responsibility on helping behaviours (intentions to donate). Finally, as this move
to a quantitative approach also afforded a certain amount of control in terms of
the research designs, the experimental study moves away from an initial under-
standing of these concepts (as in Study 1) and an investigation into their unique
effects on helping (as in Study 2) towards an understanding of their different
influences on helping when certain characteristics of the target group are manip-
ulated. Thus the final study in this chapter (Study 3) aims to build on elements
that emerged from the two previous studies in order to demonstrate the differing
predictive powers of empathic concern and responsibility in a helping situation.

6.1 Introduction

This chapter begins with a review of the relevant motivational, situational and
individual differences or personality-level accounts of helping as they relate to
empathy and responsibility in the individualistic and interpersonal traditions.
The second study which shifts from this individual level to an intragroup level
6.1 Introduction

of analysis will be preceded by a more focused review of the group-level criteria predicted to impact upon empathy- or responsibility-motivated helping.

However first this section will provide a brief justification for the move to a quantitative approach, as based on the rationale presented in Chapter 2, by looking at studies that have adopted this approach to good effect. Then this section will illustrate in more detail how the methods chosen for the subsequently quantitative studies of this thesis suit the research questions as laid out in Chapter 2, Section 2.9 (p. 75).

6.1.1 The move from qualitative to quantitative

Many studies within or outside of the social psychology tradition have chosen to investigate certain phenomena by using a variety of methods. Oftentimes, however, it can be throughout this move between various ‘types’ of methods that the topic under investigation can become lost in a sea of ontological arguments and justifications for epistemological perspectives. The following set of studies aims to showcase how best a mixed methods approach has been managed in previous literature. This is seen to be accomplished most often by retaining a clear focus on the overarching aims of the study (an overarching research question, similar to those put forward on page 75) and carefully selecting a method to suit the specific questions being asked at each milestone in the investigation. While the following studies therefore demonstrate how a mixed methods investigation can prove fruitful when conducted in a careful manner, they also highlight the richness of materials and depth of understanding made available to the mixed methods researcher.

Verkuyten (2005) combined a discursive and experimental approach to the study of multiculturalism. He employed interviews to examine how categories of immigrants were rhetorically constructed in talk in the Netherlands. Initially, two interpretative repertoires (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) were identified in talk of multiculturalism as lack of choice and personal choice. This broadly discursive study was then used as a platform for the development of an experimental study, whereby the two repertoires were conceptualised as constructs and manip-
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ulated to investigate their consequences on endorsement of multiculturalism as the dependent variable among participants.

Verkuyten posited that these two repertoires were socially available as interpretations, and could therefore be “used to construct different versions of immigration, which subsequently, could provide a framework for evaluating multiculturalism” (p. 233). As such, in the design stages of the studies discussed in this current thesis, empathy and responsibility (as the two interpretative repertoires identified in the initial qualitative study, see Chapters 4 and 5 respectively) could essentially be viewed as socially available repertoires which can be used to construct different versions of helping behaviour and decisions to help, and therefore could provide a framework for such choices, justifications or accounts. Verkuyten approached the two repertoires of lack of choice and personal choice as two different positions taken on multiculturalism, and as explanations for expressed evaluations of this phenomenon. He then chose to examine in a “more controlled and restricted way” (p. 233) the evaluative effects of the two repertoires as experimental manipulations. In an attempt to tackle the dilemmas and complexities of such interpretative processes, “combining different methods, techniques and theoretical perspectives may prove useful (and even necessary)” (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 238). This argument was also presented by Augoustinos and Quinn (2003) in which they stated that combining discursive and experimental methods would be beneficial in the examination of ideas about the constitutive nature of language.

Recently Reich (2010) adopted a mixed methods approach in an investigation of social networking sites and their ability to engender a psychological sense of community. The author engaged in a post-hoc analysis of focus group and survey data in an attempt to synthesise this data from both a confirmatory top-down approach (i.e. confirming a psychological sense of community among participants) and an exploratory bottom-up procedure (identifying patterns and themes that emerged in talk) (Reich, 2010, p. 687). This broad methodological perspective was chosen as best placed to promote the development of this field, as it was deemed an under-researched area. Thus the use of mixed methods offered the author “more detailed and richer data than a standardised measure (of a psychological sense of community)” (p.703).
DeAnstiss and Ziaian (2010) also recently adopted a mixed methods approach to their study of the mental-health help-seeking behaviours of adolescent refugees in Australia, conducting both focus groups and a survey study. The focus groups were claimed to add an “informative layer” to the results of the survey on help-seeking behaviours (p.30).

In a more specific area of interest in terms of the methodological debate and techniques used for knowledge-creation, Hitchcock and colleagues (Hitchcock et al., 2005) present a case for the use of mixed methods when initially attempting to operationalize constructs in later psychological survey studies (much like what has been adopted as an aim and an approach in this thesis). Looking at a match between ethnographic and factor analytic approaches to cultural questions, an iterative process was recommended whereby qualitative and quantitative triangulation of data could be useful in validating culturally specific constructs. In terms of the current investigation and related research questions, this approach was applied to the generation of the responsibility concept, and its subsequent operationalization as a construct in this chapter’s survey study (Study 2). Within Hitchcock’s approach issues of emic and etic perspectives were raised. Emic refers to the view and perceptions of the participants in a research project and the knowledge and information this can generate, etic refers to the subsequent interpretation of this information by the researcher (Creswell, 2002). Such triangulation of emic and etic findings allows then for the study of additional contextual elements that may not have been taken into consideration or understood initially to be of importance (Hitchcock et al., 2005).

Regarding this particular debate about the utility of adopting a mixed methods approach to the validation of (in this case culturally-specific) constructs, Gay and Arasian have also claimed that “focused interviews [. . . ] can be analysed for patters and data saturation [. . . ] that are typically used to begin construct development” (2003). Indeed, Morowski has also asserted the benefits of adopting such an approach, as qualitative and quantitative are framed as “becoming allies in the search for scientifically better understandings of psychological phenomena” (Morowski, 2011, p. 261).

A final study of interest that also used a mixed methods perspective in approaching the topic of culture is from 2006. Sibley and Liu (2006) investigated
support or opposition for cultural diversity in New Zealand. In order to do so, they generated hypotheses about attitudes towards cultural diversity by basing these hypotheses on the “content rich analysis of discursive work” that had been conducted in the field previously. They looked at both the discursive psychological tradition and how these studies have approached the topic of cultural diversity in talk (for example Wetherell & Potter, 1992, and their work on the language of racism) and also at the literature on attitudes and attitude development. Therefore, their mixed methods approach to the topic of cultural diversity differed from the previously cited studies in that they merged two theoretical approaches and then, by extension, methodological approaches: social cognition and the study of attitudes, and social representation theory and the discursive analytic approach to attitudes as emerging out of everyday talk (Billig, 1990). They generated their predictions in an experimental study based on the interpretative repertoires reported in previous studies on race talk in New Zealand and elsewhere, and in the broader biculturalism literature.

“The thinking society is both a society of talkers, linked to one another through interpersonal and institutional communication networks in social space (Latane & Liu, 1996) and a society of thinkers, attaching emotional significance to psychological structures” (Sibley & Liu, 2006, p. 12, emphasis in the original text). As such, in a similar vein to the approach taken by Verkuyten (2005), Sibley and Liu draw upon interpretative repertoires used in discourse to map out further quantitative (survey and experimental) studies.

6.1.2 Fit between research question, method and design

Before moving forward to engage in a discussion based on the previous literature on empathic concern, responsibility and helping which sets up a rationale and argument for the theoretical basis behind Study 2 and 3, this section will first lay out in a general sense the justification for the choice of methods for Study 2 and 3.

The previous section has provided an overview, as built upon the rationale given in the latter part of Chapter 2, of the merits of a mixed methods approach in a social psychological investigation. Chapter 3 detailed the reasons behind
a qualitative approach and the choice for the specific designs and methods of analysis. This chapter presents two studies, both of which were designed from a quantitative perspective. The initial research questions put forward in Chapter 2 asked first and foremost how people in their talk understood concepts related to helping, such as empathy and responsibility. However, this study was exploratory in nature in terms of its aims: the results and conclusions were meant to instigate further investigation, as was reflected in the 2nd and 3rd question that formed part of the overarching aim of this thesis (as seen on page 75 as Q2 and Q3):

2) From Study 1 how do perceptions of responsibility for a charitable target affect charitable giving independently of feelings of empathy?

3) Are the effects of reported empathy and responsibility on charitable giving systematically affected by the characteristics of the target group and what implications does this have for charitable giving more generally? More specifically, by priming normative aspects of a group’s identity as empathetic or as responsible, will this impact on giving when the target group is manipulated to present as blameworthy, as an outgroup, or as posing a threat to the ingroup donor?

Study 2 aims to answer the first of these questions. As was noted in Chapter 2, charitable donations were chosen as the route through which more general helping behaviours would be studied. It is within these quantitative studies that this choice is shown as most useful, suitable and convenient, as the design features of the survey (Study 2) and experiment (Study 3) involve the use of a vignette which comes in the form of a charitable appeal. In order to address an interest in how perceptions of responsibility for and empathy towards a target can affect giving independently, a survey design was chosen as best placed for Study 2. By presenting participants with a charitable appeal (a format familiar to many) it afforded the researcher the ability to investigate subsequently how giving was influenced by participants’ levels of self-ascribed responsibility or empathic concern.

This survey study, followed by several self-report items, also allowed for the generation of a measure of responsibility as it is understood following the qualitative investigation. This ensured a clear link between Study 1 and Study 2: the items generated for the responsibility measure as used in Study 2 to investigate levels of responsibility and their impact on subsequent intentions to donate
were grounded in the data and analysis of same from Study 1. Indeed, the experimental studies (Study 3, 4 and 5) continued to rely on the understanding of responsibility that emerged from both the previous literature and more importantly the conclusions from Study 1 in their design, as responsibility became one of two primed characteristics of the participants’ ingroup identity.

Study 3, and Studies 4 and 5 in the following chapter, aim to address the 2nd of these quantitatively framed questions. Do characteristics of the target group influence the effect empathy or responsibility (as primed elements of a participant’s identity) have on intentions to donate? If Study 1 has generated an understanding of empathy and responsibility as they relate to helping behaviours as grounded in people’s talk, and Study 2 has harnessed this understanding and found (via a measure of responsibility developed from this understanding) that both empathy and responsibility operate independently, the subsequent experiments wish to further these conclusions by investigating specifically the predictive powers of empathy and responsibility when presented with different target groups and a choice of giving or withholding help. Thus an experimental design that allows for the priming of an empathic or a responsible ingroup identity, followed by a vignette of a charitable appeal whereby the characteristics of the target group in need are manipulated, was chosen as best placed to answer this question and essentially provide a more informed conclusion as to the different effects empathy and responsibility have on decisions to help, and the consequences of being primed with either.

6.1.3 Empathic concern and helping

Theory linking prosocial behaviour and motivations with empathic concern was initially developed by McDougall in the early 20th century, proposing that helping behaviours resulted from “tender emotions” that were generated by a parental instinct (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005). This concept has since been the concern of many investigations into prosocial intentions, both in terms of the tender emotion proposed in the empathy-altruism hypothesis (Batson et al., 1991) and also in terms of the parental instinct suggested in more recent theorising on nurturant tendencies (Batson, Lishner, Cook, & Sawyer, 2005).
Batson has illustrated many ways in which empathy can be invoked to result in helping - demonstrating that empathy is separate to ‘personal distress’ (Batson et al., 1991) ‘guilt’ (Batson et al., 1988) and ‘sadness’ (Batson et al., 1989). Batson and other theorists have also suggested that there are three main routes to empathic concern: acknowledging the need of another, taking the perspective of another, and perceptions of similarity between the self and another. Trait similarity has been examined (Batson, Klein, Highberger, & Shaw, 1995), as has affective similarity (Houston, 1990) and similarity of experience (Barnett, 1984) regarding their association with empathic concern. These biological, developmental and socio-cognitive perspectives all provide evidence for not only a link between empathy and helping, but also point towards a strong association between similarity and empathy.

Extending the debate concerning the altruistic basis of empathy-driven helping, Cialdini and colleagues, in suggesting its primarily egoistic grounding, provided an alternative explanation for the empathic pathway to helping. “The powerful impact of empathic concern on helping was consistently eliminated when oneness - a measure of perceived self-other overlap - was also considered” (Neuberg, Cialdini et al., 1997), thus indicating the possibility of variables close to, yet outside of, empathic concern exerting an influence upon helping.

*Principle of care* has also been shown an important determinant of helping behaviours (Wilhem & Bekkers, 2010), and from a heavily developmental and biopsychological perspective empathy is presented as simply a first step to something that eventually, with maturation, develops into “the endorsement of a moral principle that one should help others in need” (p. 11). Empathy as an innate reaction observed in young children who have not yet reached the cognitive ability for higher level thinking is transformed through maturation into a more rational less emotion-based drive or motivation to help others - one based on the moral obligation to care for others (Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010). Similar to Cialdini’s work on oneness, this study demonstrates the role of principle of care in helping in addition to empathic concern, by looking at empathy as a dispositional trait, and including a measure of principle of care to illustrate their differences. The present survey study (Study 2) attempts to investigate in a similar manner the relationship between both empathy and responsibility and helping behaviours,
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focusing specifically on whether or not these two separate concepts also operate as separate constructs, and essentially result in independent pathways to helping.

Much of the literature presented in the literature review chapter of this thesis focused on perceptions of similarity or empathic concern as precursors to helping. Moreover, those studies that do attempt to deviate from the monopoly of empathy-based motivations as predictors of giving have generated alternative motivations as important determinants of helping behaviours. Batson’s nurturant tendencies (2005) were described as instinctual drives to protect and help those who were perceived to be vulnerable, Wilhelm and Bekkers (2010) presented principle of care as a moral understanding of who should be helped, and Batson’s concept of ‘acknowledging the need of others’ (Batson, Eklund, Chermok, Hoyt & Ortiz, 2007) is based on first acknowledging your own ability to help.

All of these factors, although presented differently in terms of how they relate to empathy and similarity, engage with one or more aspect of responsibility - obligation, duty to help, protection of the vulnerable, ability to help, and therefore ultimate accountability if help isn’t given (see Chapter 2 for a detailed discussion on defining responsibility). This conceptualisation of responsibility as it relates to helping behaviours emerged from the qualitative findings previous to this chapter as an important and distinct route to helping outside of the empathy dimension.

6.1.4 Attributions of Responsibility

In terms of responsibility as a discrete concept in the social psychology of helping, it has been previously investigated in terms of its negative impact on helping intentions. Weiner’s causal attribution model of helping behaviours (1985; 1995) suggests that depending on the perceived controllability of the victim’s circumstances, the observer or potential helper will engage in affective reactions of anger or sympathy/pity. This emotional response is then followed by a decision of whether to help or not. Controllability in this sense refers to attributing responsibility to the victim for their own situation. This model of processes involved in a helping decision (with personal responsibility for the cause as a key determinant of helping) suggests social actors engage in a series of judgements starting with

![Weiner's Model of Responsibility Attribution](image)

**Figure 6.1: Weiner’s Model of Responsibility Attribution** - An example of the processes involved in Weiner’s Model of Responsibility Attribution in a prosocial behaviour context (Weiner, 1995).

However, the effects of locus of causality, agency and subsequent perceptions of responsibility fall short of this thesis’ conceptualising of responsibility: attributing responsibility to help to the observer him/herself. While this model was developed from many empirical findings, and its theoretical basis has subsequently been supported, there are instances whereby this model of causal attribution could in fact be only one of several potential descriptions of underlying processes and explanations. An example comes from a well-known study in which unsuspecting subjects were witness to either a drunken male ‘confederate’ or an elderly male ‘confederate’ falling to the ground in a subway carriage.

This particular study by Piliavin and colleagues (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969) found subjects were more likely to offer assistance to the elderly man than the one perceived to be under the influence of alcohol. Piliavin and colleagues suggested this was because “people who are regarded as partly responsible for their plight would receive less sympathy and consequently less help than people seen as not responsible for their circumstances” (p. 290).

However, as the elderly man with the cane was helped 95% of the time, while the ‘victim’ who smelled of alcohol was helped on only approximately half the occasions, this may be due to more than a causal attribution of responsibility
6. EMPATHY AND RESPONSIBILITY: THE INTRAGROUP LEVEL

on the part of the drunkard. The emphasis of this study was on comparing both contexts; on the difference between an innocent-of-their-fate victim and a perceivably-responsible-for-their-fate victim regarding who would receive more help. Yet this chapter would argue that the explanation for why the elderly victim received help an impressive 95% of the time is the more relevant and interesting question.

Following Weiner’s causal attribution model, the drunken victim elicited anger, while the elderly victim elicited sympathy. This chapter would suggest that this finding could also be due to another process; namely attributing responsibility to help the disabled-bodied victim to the observers themselves as able-bodied people, driven by a sense of responsibility (self-ascribed responsibility). If self-ascribed responsibility does in fact contribute to helping independent of such an important factor as empathic concern (something Study 2 aims to investigate) then these blame-attribution and also bystander studies could benefit from the reversed explanation, one that emphasises the important and influential role of responsibility as a positive determinant of helping behaviours when one is helped. Instead of a model that focuses on the role of perceived responsibility of the victim in helping behaviours, this current survey study explores whether there is scope for considering the role of perceived responsibility of the helper in such situations.

6.1.5 The psychology of responsibility

The concept of self-ascribed responsibility has been linked to helping behaviours in a further key domain in the social psychological literature thus far. Research on the traditional bystander effect proposes that “the presence of other people serves to inhibit the impulse to help” (Latané & Darley, 1970, p. 38.) This inhibition is conceptualised as related to self-ascribed responsibility attributions (or more specifically a lack-thereof). The vast amount of research that stemmed from the infamous Kitty Genovese incident in 1964 (Latané & Darley, 1968; Manning, Levine, & Collins, 2007) have mainly involved manipulating group size in an emergency situation and measuring whether or not/ the amount of which a participant would intervene to help. Emergency scenarios have included subjects
in a waiting room that begins to fill with smoke (Latané & Darley, 1968), a fellow participant suffering a seizure (Schwartz & Clausen, 1970), and subjects witnessing an attack and potential rape (Harari, Harari, & White, 1985) among others. Non-emergency helping situations such as helping someone pick up a stack of dropped pencils in an elevator (Latané & Dabbs, 1975), helping with a flat tire (Hurley & Allen, 1974) or simply answering a door (Freeman, 1974) have also resulted in similar conclusions; the greater the number of people around, the less likely someone is to offer help.

Some of these results are explained by social inhibition, while others are described as due to a diffusion of responsibility. Latané and Darley’s original approach to bystander behaviour led to their development of what can be termed a ‘decision tree’ whereby an observer must follow through with 5 steps of processing and decision making before he/she will intervene. These include observing the critical incident, acknowledging that it is indeed a situation that requires help, acknowledging their personal responsibility to help, recognising their ability to help, and the resources to help that are available to them. It is Step 3, and the inhibiting role of a diffusion of responsibility, that is of most relevance to the current study. These studies assume responsibility is present (there) to begin with and therefore capable of being withdrawn or diffused in specific circumstances. However the focus remains on these specific circumstances, as opposed to examining the role of responsibility itself before its disappearance.

Fischer et al. (2011) provide a meta-analysis of studies that have investigated bystander behaviour over the previous decades. They present an overview of factors that prevent people from helping, but also situational factors that encourage helping, implying that when diffusion of responsibility is overcome it allows a common-sense moral duty to help to prevail. Thus the phenomenon of the diffusion of responsibility amongst many bystanders to an emergency situation must be said to work on the assumption that a bystander would largely and initially acknowledge a responsibility (or their responsibility) to help in the first instance.
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6.1.6 Empathy and Responsibility as one in the same?

Finally, to move away from the motivational and situational accounts of individual or interpersonal helping behaviours, from a prosocial personality perspective studies have suggested that empathy and responsibility both form one part or one trait of a two-dimensional prosocial personality. Agreeableness and Helpfulness are these two dimensions, whereby Agreeableness consists of empathy and social responsibility, and Helpfulness refers to one’s general self-concept as helpful (Pennefer, Fritzschke, Craiger, & Freifeld, 1995; Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007; Oliner & Oliner, 1988).

However this chapter argues, not from a prosocial personality perspective but from the perspective of the expected actions associated with any particular identity, that empathic concern differs from responsibility both in its meaning and identity content, and in its ability to influence prosocial behaviour. Essentially, although viewed from a personality perspective as potentially forming one aspect of an identity, Study 2 aims to investigate empathy and responsibility as situationally different concepts that will lead to different processes and therefore different consequences in any helping situation.

Thus the subsequent sections will detail the move from a qualitative approach to the investigation of empathy, responsibility and helping to a quantitative approach. The link between Study 1 and Study 2 (and the subsequent experimental studies) lies mainly in the understanding of responsibility as generated from the qualitative data. Study 2 aims to address the 2nd question put forward in Chapter 2, under the more general overarching research question of the relationship between empathy, self-ascribed responsibility, and helping behaviours. Study 2 aims to develop and test a measure of responsibility as it is conceptualised in this thesis (self-ascribed) and as it was understood in Study 1. Study 2 also aims to demonstrate the unique and independent routes that both empathic concern and responsibility present towards helping intentions. A survey design with a vignette is the form of a charitable appeal was chosen to address these questions.
6.2 The development of the survey

“The heated, often divisive, debates over critical realist and relativist epistemologies eventually gave way to pragmatism” (Creswell, 2009) and thus follows the mixed methods pragmatic (Morgan, 2007) approach adopted in this thesis; choosing an appropriate method that is best placed to address the concerns of each research question and therefore acknowledging the accompanying epistemological and ontological concerns associated with each methodological approach.

The previous two chapters presented the findings of a qualitative study that used interview data with the general public in Ireland and those who are employed in the charitable sector to conduct a discursive analysis of how people account for their own and others charitable giving in talk. The analysis looked at the many discursive resources available to speakers, and the ways in which these resources can be invoked in talk to accomplish certain discursive business - which was seen to be accounting for or justifying a lack of giving. Two main interpretative repertoires (Potter & Wetherell, 1987), or ways of talking about giving, were identified in talk as empathy and responsibility.

Literature on the relationship between empathy and helping has often included a pathway that involved perceptions of similarity, be they at an interpersonal (Batson et al., 1991), an intragroup (Houston, 1990) or an intergroup (Sturmer, Snyder & Omoto, 2005) level and the empathy repertoire mirrored this link. Speakers were shown to draw upon the empathy repertoire to account for giving by deploying categories that imply similarity via shared membership of certain ‘groups’. Speakers were also seen, however, to invoke the empathy repertoire to deploy categories that denied membership to potential recipients of help, depicting them as dissimilar, and therefore account for withholding their donations. Finally within this repertoire speakers were seen to strategically invoke an empathy repertoire and within it deploy a category worked up as ‘overly-similar’ (the implicit inference of such a category being one of blame due to failure to fulfil the expectations of such category membership: Sacks, 1972a).

Therefore within the realm of a discursive analysis of talk-as-action, people were seen to do being charitable by invoking concepts of empathy and similarity in their talk, but also by orienting towards the double-edged sword of similarity.
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Blame and the worthiness of a recipient group were consistently made relevant, and speakers drew upon the empathy repertoire as a functional device to help in their accounting - constructing specific versions of the recipient groups enabled them to accomplish this (this aspect of blame was further explored in the intragroup experimental study, Study 3, following the initial survey study below, Study 2).

The responsibility repertoire was invoked in talk of charity and non-charity workers to many of the same ends as the empathy repertoire; to account for giving, to justify withholding aid, and to at once present as a moral and rational social actor. Speakers accomplished these accounts by deploying certain inference-laden categories, and by working up relationships of responsibility. These relationships were oriented to by deploying categories such as children and animals, who through common-sense and cultural knowledge available to the speakers and hearers of the interaction (La Coulteur & Oxlad, 2010) were associated with concepts of vulnerability, helplessness and dependency, and by deploying categories such as adults, parents, and humans that implied ability, obligation and duty, in order to produce accounts for giving. To account for withholding aid, speakers were able to draw upon a responsibility repertoire to construct a version of a relationship of responsibility that existed outside of themselves - by deploying categories such as government and ‘pet owners’, all of which implied a choice to be dutiful and responsible in their positions, and which allowed the speakers to inoculate themselves against any obligations to help. Some of the categories invoked within this functioning of the repertoire of responsibility, to account for not giving, implied a certain element of self-responsibility for their own situation and for their own help - an element of blame was implicit in these particular instances and these constructions of recipient groups.

Consequently the emergence of both repertoires within the discursive analysis of interview talk required further consideration. Research from this discursive perspective on helping has illustrated similar ways in which speakers can work up their identities as moral and charitable (Stevenson & Manning, 2010) and can draw upon a discourse of inclusion (Reicher, Cassidy, Hopkins, & Levine, 2006) or orient towards aspects of blame (Gibson, 2009) or responsibility to self-help (Dalton, Madden, Chamberlain, Carr, & Lyons, 2008) in talk. However, all of
these investigations had a primary focus that lay elsewhere outside of these main concerns, thus the formation of the first qualitative research question (see Chapter 3).

Thus the social psychological literature on helping and the concepts that emerged from the qualitative analysis (the empathy and responsibility repertoires) informed the development of the current survey study. The choice to move from a qualitative to a quantitative approach is reflected in the question this current study wishes to address: whether empathic concern and responsibility have a unique influence on decisions to help, independent of each other.

6.3 Study 2: Rationale, Aims and Predictions

To review, empathic concern has been identified in the first study of this thesis as an important factor in helping (regarding its use as an interpretative repertoire in accounts of giving). The literature from an individual and interpersonal approach to helping behaviours has also highlighted and focused particularly on the role of empathy in prosocial situations.

Responsibility has also been identified as an important aspect of the helping relationship in the first study, and previous literature in psychology has focused mainly on the attribution of responsibility to the victims themselves for their plight.

The bystander paradigm has emphasised the importance of the diffusion of responsibility in explaining when and why people do not intervene to help, however little attention has been paid to the processes involved in the reversal of this specific aspect of the bystander effect phenomenon (the effect of an increased sense of responsibility on helping).

Therefore it was predicted that while both empathy and responsibility would both be closely correlated with levels of donation proclivity, (and both may also be quite closely intercorrelated), they would in fact be found to contribute separately to donation proclivity thus demonstrating their independent routes to helping.

As such, the survey was designed to develop and test a measure of responsibility appropriate for the way in which it is conceptualised within this thesis
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(self-ascribed responsibility to help) as effectively demonstrating the internal reliability and importantly the predictive validity of such a measure (Thrash & Elliot, 2009).

Moreover, this survey aims to elucidate whether empathy and responsibility form separate pathways to helping, and contribute independently to donation proclivity. From a more general perspective, Study 2 aims to contribute to the broader helping literature by teasing apart concepts of empathy and responsibility, that have until now been so often intertwined, and by demonstrating the important role responsibility (as a concept untangled from empathic concern and influential in its own right) can play in prosocial behaviour.

6.3.1 Pilot Study

A Pilot was conducted with 27 participants (9 males, 18 females) in an online survey (surveymonkey) with the link emailed to university students to validate the scales to be used. See section 6.1.2 for a detailed justification of the design features of this the pilot and the subsequent main study (Study 2).

6.3.2 Materials and Procedure

Subjects were presented with the following charitable appeal:

The people’s republic of Bangladesh is located bordering India in South Asia. Since their independence in 1971 this new state has had to endure famine, natural disasters and widespread poverty, and also situations of political unrest. Some of Bangladesh’s poorest communities have no choice but to live in the flood-prone swamp lands of its river basin or coastal areas as frequently cyclones strike. Many people drown in floods and water-borne diseases kill even more. Life is made even harder for families who already fight to make a living through farming as they need to rebuild their destroyed homes and livelihoods almost every year. These farmers also have to battle for fair prices for their produce as limited negotiating power and exploitation has resulted in extreme poverty. Many must go without food for long
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periods of time, and must travel long distances to collect safe drinking water for their families. This charity will help the Bangladeshi people better prepare for dealing with disasters, safeguard their livelihoods and improve their future by giving them life-saving skills and strategies.

This was selected as it mirrored a generic charitable appeal (closely matching one by the charitable organisation Oxfam and their 2010 appeal for flood victims; [http://www.oxfam.org/en/emergencies/pakistan-floods](http://www.oxfam.org/en/emergencies/pakistan-floods)). This appeal was designed to include aspects which could instigate both empathic concern and a sense of responsibility. Participants were then instructed to rate their level of agreement with a number of items. Each item had a Likert-style response format that ranged from 1 strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree. Means, standard deviations and Cronbach’s alpha for all measures are shown in table 5.1. The one measure that was developed from the qualitative study of this thesis, namely the responsibility scale, was subjected to a factor analysis, results of which are reported below. All other measures were adapted from previous empirical studies in the psychological literature on prosocial behaviours.

6.3.3 Measures

**Empathy** Empathic concern was assessed using a 10-item scale adapted from Batson (Batson et al., 1983). In Batson’s original study subjects were required to report on a 7-point scale (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely) how strongly they were feeling each emotion described in a list of emotion-related adjectives. This list included eight adjectives assumed to reflect the vicarious emotion of personal distress (alarmed, grieved, upset, wounded, disturbed, perturbed, distressed and troubled) and six adjectives assumed to reflect empathy (sympathetic, moved, compassionate, tender, warm and soft-hearted). 10 adjectives from these combined lists were selected for use in the present study, on the basis of their sufficiently spanning the diversity of empathy-related adjectives.

**Responsibility** This construct was measured by a scale that was developed subsequent to the results of the first discursive study of this thesis. Hitchcock has promoted the utility of such an approach to the generation and validation of
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constructs, by focusing on qualitative analyses, suggesting that the triangulation of emic and etic findings allows for the study of additional contextual elements that ‘may not have been initially understood’ (Hitchcock, Nastasi, Dai, Newman, Jayasene, Berstein-Moore, Sarkar, & Varjas, 2005, p. 265). The 10 items generated were selected from common themes, words, categories and phrases that were identified as part of the interpretative repertoire (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) of responsibility. These included statements such as ‘I feel it is my duty to help the group receiving aid from this charitable organisation’, ‘I feel the group receiving aid are reliant on my help’ and ‘I feel I should help the group receiving aid from this organisation’.

These items and the development of this survey (as detailed in section 6.2) further demonstrate the link between the different methods chosen throughout this thesis and the different studies themselves, as the items used here were based on what emerged from the data and analysis of Study 1. Responsibility in Study 1 was seen to be invoked in talk by constructing a specific version of the relationship between the speaker (as donor) and the recipient or the recipient group. The items that are included in this measure of responsibility reflect the different ways in which this relationship was worked up, as they include duty, obligation, accountability and vulnerability of either the speaker (here the participant filling out the self-report measures) or the recipient (here the target group presented in the charitable appeal vignette).

The 10 items of the Responsibility Scale were subjected to principal components analysis (PCA). Prior to performing PCA, the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of most coefficients of .3 and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin value was .83, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970, 1974) and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. Principal components analysis revealed the presence of 2 components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 56% and 14% of the variance respectively. An inspection of the screeplot revealed a clear break after the first component. Using Catell’s (Catell, 1964) scree test, it was decided to retain only 1 component for further investigation. The 1 component solution explained a total of 56% of the variance.
6.4 Main survey study: Study 2 Participants

Donation Proclivity Levels of willingness to donate to the charitable organisation in question was assessed using a 10-item measure. This scale was derived from measures used by Zagefka and colleagues (Zagefka et al., 2011), and from Levine and Thompson (Levine & Thompson, 2004).

Similarity Similarity items were adapted from Glaman et al., (Glaman, Jones & Rozelle, 1996) in terms of similarity of values, and those used by Westmaas and Cohen Silver (Westmaas, & Cohen Silver, 2006) in terms of general attitudes or beliefs, and similarity in personality (Klohen & Luo, 2003, and Byrne & Clore, 1970). A total of 5 items were used. Items for all measures may be found in the Appendices.

Table 6.1: Means, standard deviation and cronbachs alpha for all variables for Pilot Study 2: A group-level survey study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empanthy M(SD)</th>
<th>Responsibility M(SD)</th>
<th>Donation Proclivity M(SD)</th>
<th>Similarity M(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.70 (1.13)</td>
<td>3.15 (.96)</td>
<td>3.72 (1.05)</td>
<td>3.10 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Correlation of all variables for Pilot Study 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation P</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p <0.01  *p <0.05

6.4 Main survey study: Study 2 Participants

Participants were 77 undergraduate students at the University of Limerick (24 males, 53 females, mean age 21.88). They received course credit for their participation. Similar to the pilot study, students were chosen. It was necessary to choose to administer the survey and the subsequent experimental studies on a
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homogenous sample such as students, so as to allow for the systematic examination of the impact of empathy and responsibility on willingness to help, such that it be conducted in a controlled environment.

Furthermore, although the concepts being examined as constructs in this study were generated from the findings of the ‘real-world’ Study 1, the purpose of this survey is to investigate how these constructs contribute to willingness to help in terms of their independent nature. Thus a student sample was deemed appropriate for the present purposes.

6.4.1 Materials and Procedure

Participants were each presented with a paper and pencil questionnaire. They were required to first read the vignette with the charitable appeal that was used in the pilot study above, and then asked to fill out the self-report measures also used in the pilot study (empathy, responsibility, donation proclivity and similarity). Means, Standard deviations, and Cronbach’s alpha for all measures can be seen in table 5.3.

6.4.2 Results

Relationships between variables Results show donation proclivity was positively correlated with both empathy ($r = .706, p < 0.00$) and responsibility ($r = .721, p < 0.01$). Empathy was also positively correlated with responsibility ($r = .635, p < 0.01$). Similarity was not shown to be correlated with empathy ($r = .176, p = .126$), but was correlated with responsibility ($r = .427, p < 0.001$) and with donation proclivity ($r = .319, p < 0.001$).

Table 6.3: Study 2: Survey Study - Means, standard deviation and cronbachs alpha for all variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Donation Proclivity</th>
<th>Similarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.86(1.12)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3.17 (1.05)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 Discussion

**Table 6.4:** Correlation of all variables for Study 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation P</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Predictors of donation proclivity** Stepwise regression analyses were performed for each of the measures. Stepwise instead of hierarchical regression were performed as existing literature does not provide much theoretical or empirical guidelines for determining the order of importance of the various factors (empathy, responsibility and similarity) as predictors of donation proclivity (Sinha & Watson, 1997). The first model included only responsibility and explained 51% of the variance, while the second model included both responsibility and empathy, explaining 62% of the variance. Similarity did not emerge as a significant predictor of donation proclivity and so was excluded from both models.

**Table 6.5:** Regression Model: Variables predicting donation proclivity for Study 2 - Survey Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>$R^2$ change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.721**</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.458**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.415**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.103**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5 Discussion

This survey study aimed to elucidate whether empathy and responsibility as psychological concepts could predict helping behaviours independent of each other. Results suggest that as psychological constructs, responsibility and empathy do
contribute to helping as it is operationalised here (self-reported willingness to donate) through separate pathways or routes. Furthermore, similarity, although correlated with willingness to donate in both the pilot and main study, does not appear to predict helping and was excluded from a predictive model which placed responsibility as the strongest predictor before empathic concern. While perceptions of similarity were related to empathic concern in the context of the initial pilot study, this pattern was not repeated and the main survey found perceived similarity to be more closely correlated with feelings of responsibility.

Wilhelm and Bekker’s (2010) investigation of helping as predicted by a factor termed principal of care outside of the domain of empathy yielded similar results to this survey study, as helping was predicted by responsibility outside of the domain of empathy. The findings also speak to Batson’s (Batson et al., 2005) examination of nurturant tendencies, as several aspects associated with how Batson presented nurturant tendencies are akin to how self-ascribed responsibility is conceptualised.

While the survey’s findings are an addition to the support from the previous literature of empathy-motivated helping, it also suggests that when responsibility is introduced, it presents as a separate and potentially stronger or more robust predictor of helping intentions. While empathic concern as a motivator for helping in many different contexts has been investigated (Batson et al., 1991), this survey examined how two important concepts in the literature on prosocial behaviour relate both to each other and predict helping intentions in relation to each other.

However, certain limitations must be taken into account when considering these results. The student sample chosen may have identified as similar to the target groups in terms of the historical context (former colony), but not similar enough to invoke a sense of empathy. In fact, students may have instead construed this historical context as a motivator to help due to feelings of obligation and responsibility as opposed to the emotional concerns of empathy. This sample would also be quite alive to the continuous international debates and coverage of events abroad, human rights issues and third world problems, and thus such issues could be more salient and prompt similarities to be associated more with a duty to help as opposed to a feeling of compassion. In either case, the materials used may have been less relevant to an Irish student population, and this is addressed
in the second study of this chapter where an appeal is presented that is more
localised and ‘close to home’ allowing an Irish student sample to engage at a
more in-depth level with who the recipients are.

The aim of this quantitative approach to the understanding of how empathy
and responsibility differ from each other and impact upon helping behaviours was
to demonstrate their unique impact on intentions to donate. This signified the
move from an initially qualitative approach, which illustrated the different ways
in which empathy and responsibility could be invoked in talk and to what end.
Understandings of empathy and responsibility as identified in Study 1 formed the
basis of the measures of empathy and responsibility as used in Study 2, thus en-
suring that any conclusions made could be grounded in a real world understanding
of such concepts. While this highlights the importance of the initial qualitative
study, and also contributes to the broader helping literature by showcasing the
independent importance of responsibility in decisions to help, it also sets up the
following experimental studies. In order to investigate the differences between
these two concepts in terms of their impact on helping in different situations,
and their predictive power in terms of helping different target groups, Study 2
had to first indicate that these concepts were operating somewhat independently.
Thus Study 2 allowed for the move to a more controlled and systematic exami-
nation of the consequences of priming empathic concern and/ or responsibility in
participants on intentions to help.

6.5.1 A new perspective on responsibility

As indicated above, much of the research linking responsibility and prosocial
behaviour focuses on the role of perceived responsibility of the victim for their
situation (the bystander phenomenon aside). Weiner (1995) proposed an in-
depth theoretical model that suggests perceptions of controllability in terms of
causal attributions can consequently result in a decision to either help or not
help. Weiner framed this perception of responsibility as leading to either anger
or sympathy, and in doing so argued for the role of such causal beliefs and their
consequences as perhaps more “relevant” than previously recognised. This survey
study demonstrates the relevance of the role of responsibility, but as self-ascribed
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in a helping situation as opposed to attributed to the victim in need of help. While reporting the results of a cross-cultural study by Kojima (1992) which looked at the effects of familiarity, attribution and affect on helping, Weiner noted the following:

‘This partitioning of the variance or the predictability of the helping judgments clearly is consistent with the position that not all of the determinants of helping are mediated through thoughts about responsibility and emotions and that responsibility has some effects on helping that are independent of anger and sympathy.’

One interpretation of the findings of this study suggests that this is indeed the case; responsibility can act as a precursor to helping outside of emotions such as anger (which would be related to blame-attribution and less help) or sympathy (which would be related to empathic concern). The experimental study to follow aims to investigate the effect on helping that responsibility has independent of Weiner’s suggested anger and sympathy, and in comparison to the previous suggestions of empathic concern.

6.6 Summary

Earlier literature on the prosocial personality (Penner, Fritzche, Craiger, & Freifeld, 1995) has indicated that both empathic concern and a sense of responsibility reside within the singular dimension of Agreeableness (where the second dimension within a prosocial personality is Helpfulness). This survey has attempted to further develop the suggestion that empathic concern and responsibility are in fact different, not simply from a personality and individual differences perspective like the traits in these dimensions, but in terms of the social psychology of helping. Empathy and Responsibility can be construed as different in terms of the content and meaning they represent as an aspect of identity for any particular group, be they social or national groups. Thus the aspects associated with any particular identity and the content of this identity (the implication aspects such as empathic or responsible have for this identity and the behaviour of members
of this group) could result in a group being both empathetic and responsible, but shouldn’t necessarily imply they are one and the same, nor that they would lead to similar amounts of help-giving.

This survey study contributes to the literature by demonstrating the existence of separate pathways of empathy and responsibility toward levels of donation proclivity in an Irish student sample, together with the development of a scale of responsibility as it is conceptualised in this thesis. Nevertheless while these findings suggest these two constructs contribute independently to helping behaviours it cannot explicate much in terms of the potentially different processes by which these pathways exert their influence or how they would impact upon helping behaviours in different contexts. Understanding the impact of responsibility on helping different target groups who display a variety of characteristics is necessary. Furthermore, to develop this understanding in comparison to the impact of empathy could have both beneficial theoretical and practical implications. Therefore the following section of this chapter aims to address exactly this; how empathy and responsibility as important aspects of a social identity primed in participants can influence their decisions to give in an intragroup setting.

6.7 Study 3: Introduction

Study 3 constitutes the first of 3 experimental studies that aim to build on the results of Study 1 and 2, and ultimately further our understanding of empathy, responsibility and their impact on helping behaviours. From the initial qualitative study a measure of responsibility was developed, and the measures used in Study 2 (empathy and responsibility) were based on the understandings of these concepts from the perspective of people in their everyday talk. This enabled the investigation of the influence empathy and responsibility exert separately on helping decisions. Study 3 now aims to begin a systematic examination of these influences, by looking at the consequences each have for the perception of different target groups and they help they might recieve.

Empathy is a complex motivator. Psychologists and philosophers have debated over the existence of genuine altruism compared to egoistic motivations, and in the prosocial literature altruism has been most often linked to empathic
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concern. That is to say, the proponents of the existence of a completely altruistic form of helping claim that empathy can facilitate or instigate this prosocial behaviour (Batson et al., 1991; Batson et al., 1983; Batson et al., 1997). However, further empirical findings suggest that empathy is a construct often confounded with oneness (Cialdini, Brown, Lewis, Luce, & Neuberg, 1997; Neuberg et al., 1997). Such suggestions indicate that within the aforementioned empathy-altruism hypothesis, certain aspects of empathy (that Cialdini and colleagues term oneness) are actually egoistic motivations.

Thus the aim of this quantitative approach to the understanding of how empathy and responsibility differ from each other and impact upon helping behaviours was to demonstrate their unique impact on intentions to donate. This signified the move from an initially qualitative approach, which illustrated the different ways in which empathy and responsibility could be invoked in talk and to what end. Understandings of empathy and responsibility as identified in Study 1 formed the basis of the measures of empathy and responsibility as used in Study 2, thus ensuring that any conclusions made could be grounded in a real world understanding of such concepts. While this highlights the importance of the initial qualitative study, and also contributes to the broader helping literature by showcasing the independent importance of responsibility in decisions to help, it also sets up the following experimental studies. In order to investigate the differences between these two concepts in terms of their impact on helping in different situations, and their predictive power in terms of helping different target groups, Study 2 had to first indicate that these concepts were operating somewhat independently. Study 2 allowed for the move to a more controlled and systematic examination of the consequences of priming empathic concern and/ or responsibility in participants on intentions to help.

This argument is presented as based on the overlapping sense of self (oneness) that implies helping someone else is in fact helping oneself (due to a shared self-concept). The authors (Neuberg, et al., 1997; Cialdini et al., 1997) go so far as to claim that, on re-examination of many of Batson’s original studies pertaining to the empathy-altruism hypothesis, empathic concern may predict a subject’s decision to help or not help, but it does not predict how much that subject will help. Empathic concern was seen to be related to the most cost-less helping, the
minimum amount in most cases, leading Neuberg and colleagues to claim that empathic concern can merely predict superficial helping. Thus the debate about how self-less and altruistic empathy-motivated helping really is continued.

Empathy as a precursor to helping intentions and behaviours has been investigated from a group-level perspective as well as the individual-based approaches of Batson, Cialdini and others. A Social Identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) approach to helping would argue that empathic concern is facilitated by perspective taking and perceptions of increased similarity, and from a Self-Categorisation Theory perspective (Turner, Oakes, Hogg, Reicher & Wetherell, 1986), by perceived interchangeability between helper and helpee.

Ingroup bias and ingroup favouritism in social identity studies demonstrates time and again the desire to help one’s own group over another once group membership is made salient (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy & Flament, 1971).

6.7.1 SIT and Helping

From a Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categorisation theory (Turner et al., 1987) perspective, identification with a particular group leads to increased helping among group members (Levine, Prosser, Evans, & Reicher, 2005; Levine & Thompson, 2004). Identification leads to a sense of a shared identity among group members (Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994), which will lead to perceiving other members of your group as similar and therefore interchangeable with oneself. Therefore, the perception of similarity of characteristics, expectations and purpose of group members is seen to be central to the impact of identification upon ingroup helping. However, in the broader literature on prosocial behaviour the relationship between perceptions of similarity between victim and observer and helping has not always been straightforward, as oftentimes similarity can be shown to have a negative impact on helping behaviours contrary to SIT predictions.

Victim-blaming literature often looks towards perceived similarity for their explanations of why rape victims (for example) would be derogated more by those of the same sex or economic class (Grubb & Harrower, 2008; Jones & Aronson,
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1973). Lerner’s (1980) Just World Beliefs theory can also help to explain the motivations for lack of willingness to help similar others, and Walster (1966) claims that in order to self-protect from the anxiety and fear of some similar misfortune happening to themselves, people will attribute blame to the similar other, enabling a distance to develop from the grieved individual, and also allowing for justifying a lack of willingness to help. These reactions are more common in studies where the victims of such incidents are presented as similar.

At an intragroup level, SIT predicts a desire to maintain a positive social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Brewer, 1991). However when an ingroup member appears to pose a threat to such positive social identity, by, for example, acting counter to the norms of the ingroup, such deviant behaviour can lead to what Marques has termed the **black sheep effect** (Marques, Robalo, & Rocha, 1992). Such a **black sheep effect** requires that an ingroup member, while still acknowledged as such, is not adhering to the expected standard or norms of the group (behaves in an anti-normative way). It is suggested that in such circumstances, ingroup members may subsequently feel little empathy for the ‘black sheep’ and thus the empathy-helping route is weakened substantially.

6.7.2 Study 3: Priming methodologies

Study 3 is the first of 3 experimental studies in this thesis. Studies 4 and 5 will be documented in the following chapter. The design features of this experimental approach have been briefly identified and justified in section 6.1.2. However, to forefront this first experimental study a review of previous literature that has adopted a similar methodological approach, the use of vignettes and priming methods, will be presented. Many of these previous studies have also had some variety of helping behaviours as the dependent variable.

Levine and colleagues (Levine, Cassidy, & Jentzsch, 2010) investigated concepts of deindividuation and accountability regarding their role in helping behaviours. Deindividuation is the term given to explain the finding that people in groups produce more aggressive, deviant, anti-normative or socially unacceptable behaviours (Guerin, 2003), and as a construct has up to recently been viewed as exerting a solely negative impact on helping behaviours (for example Zimbardo’s
infamous prison experiment whereby deindividuation amongst the student guards led to increased antisocial behaviours; Zimbardo, 1970). Garcia and colleagues have adopted deindividuation theory as a way of explaining the phenomenon of diffusion of responsibility (Garcia, Weaver, Moskowitz, & Darley, 2002). However, at a more fundamental level, deindividuation can also be simply said to lead to behaviour that is normative within the social context (Postmes & Spears, 1998).

As Bargh, Chen & Burrows (1996) have demonstrated, priming methodologies similar to the one adopted in the design of Study 3 can be used to look at how knowledge structures can influence such social behaviour and prime it as normative. Levine and colleagues also use priming methodologies, as they consider “the relationship between the content of different personal and social identities and the meaning of different types of helping behaviours” (Levine et al., 2010, p. 786) in their studies on deindividuation and helping when subjects were primed as a student versus non-student (and in groups versus alone). Their studies build on those by Garcia, whereby the use of group immersion as a form of deindividuation is used to argue for its positive effects in that “depersonalisation leads to greater awareness of shared group identity and group norms and values” (p. 786).

This concept is adopted in the design of the current experimental study, whereby the normative aspects of group identity as either empathetic or responsible are made salient in the context of the Irish nation as a whole, and helping behaviour is predicted to be influenced by what these normative aspects of identity mean to participants - identity content as knowledge structures that can affect social behaviour such as willingness to donate. While the Levine studies manipulate group size, which is of less relevance to the current study, they also manipulate group membership in the form of student or non-student. The authors can therefore make predictions based on their linking of deindividuation, depersonalisation and increased social awareness. They predicted that students would be less likely to give a donation to a charity (due to the salience of their identity as a student and the group norm that students rarely have superfluous cash to give away) but more likely to volunteer their time to take part in studies in their psychology department (due to the salience of their student identity and
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membership in this group, and thus the norm that students volunteer for such activities as it demonstrates commitment and loyalty to their university).

The current study builds on this rationale and manipulates the normative aspects of the ingroup of Irish participants, as either empathetic or as responsible. The implications the content of such identities as an empathetic Irish person or a responsible Irish person has for who will receive help - those perceived to be innocent of their fate, or to blame for their circumstances as the manipulated aspects of the target group in question - are subsequently investigated.

Previous literature and the findings from Study 1 suggest that empathic concern is contingent on several aspects of the recipient group’s identity before it will result in helping: namely, perceptions of similarity and an ability to evoke empathy and compassion in the helper (Batson et al., 1991; Sturmer, Snyder & Omoto, 2005). The aim of Study 3 is to examine the different impact empathic concern can have on decisions to help in comparison to the impact of responsibility, when either characteristic is primed in participants as an integral part of their ingroup identity. This aim builds on an understanding from Study 2 that both empathic concern and responsibility independently predict decisions to help.

The prediction for this study therefore is that not only will empathy and responsibility as normative aspects of the ingroup’s identity lead to different levels of willingness to help, but that the processes through which they work will differ. This would then suggest that empathy-driven helping may have a different set of considerations and be less forgiving when an ingroup member displays behaviour that deviates from the norms of the ingroup, and will only help in so far as the ingroup can evoke compassion (demonstrating its contingent nature).

Responsibility-led helping, however, would be less contingent on emotional influences and therefore should not discriminate between target groups to such an extent. Therefore the hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis1: When empathic concern is primed as a normative aspect of the participant’s ingroup identity, this will result in different levels of help being offered to an innocent-of-their fate target ingroup and a blame-worthy target ingroup.

Hypothesis2: When responsibility is primed as a normative aspect of the participant’s ingroup identity, this will result in similar levels of help being offered
to an innocent-of-their-fate target ingroup and a blameworthy target ingroup.

6.8 Pilot Study

Piloting of materials for perceived blameworthiness of target group A pilot study was run to assess the perceptions of blameworthiness of two charitable appeal-vignettes for use in the intragroup experiment. This was a within-subjects design. Participants were 33 students at the University of Limerick (11 males, 22 females, mean age 18.96yrs) This involved sending via email link (surveymonkey) a survey which required participants to read both the adult (blameworthy) appeal or the child (innocent) appeal and respond to several statements of agreement. Following from a limitation of the first study of this chapter, this experiment chose the national population to allow the Irish sample to be less removed from the helping context and engage more readily with making a decision to donate or withhold help.

6.8.1 Materials and Procedure

Participants were presented with the following appeal in the ‘child target group’ condition:

‘Leanbh’ is an Irish charity that helps a large number of at-risk children each year in Ireland. A safe home is something many of us take for granted, however the children who are helped by this organisation are usually those who come from an underprivileged background, who currently live with some form of emotional or mental mistreatment in the home or who suffer from serious neglect - even finding it difficult to remain fed and watered on a daily basis. This organisation aims to help these children through service provision (support and guidance, removal from the home, buddy-systems) but also to advocate for the rights of neglected children. As funding is tight, and with the increasing number of children falling into this at-risk category, Leanbh is appealing for donations.
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Participants were presented with the following appeal in the ‘adult target group’ condition:

‘Anduil’ is an Irish charity that works with adults suffering from addictions. This organisation provides support groups, counselling services, placements in addiction clinics and financial assistance to those who are afflicted with addictions such as drug and alcohol abuse. Many of the people receiving help from this charity are below the poverty line and often have found themselves homeless and without food or nourishment - and can also be left without any support system or assistance from family or friends, leaving them isolated. This organisation aims to help re-build lives and tackle the ills that addictions can create. However, in the current economic climate funding is tight and Anduil are now appealing for charitable donations so as to continue helping this marginalised and at risk group of people.

Participants were then instructed to rate their level of agreement to a number of items. Each item had a Likert-style response format that ranged from 1 strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree. Means, standard deviations and Cronbach’s alpha for measures of blame attribution for the child target group and the adult target group across all 33 participants are shown in table 1. Measures 4 items of perceived blame attribution, or the extent to which the victims could be perceived to have played a causal role in their circumstances, were used from Zagefka and colleagues work (2011).

6.8.2 Results

Single samples t-test was run on the pilot data to see if the means of blame attribution were significantly different in the child target group and the adult target group. The adult group were attributed a significantly higher amount of blame for their situation (M=5.09, SD=1.18) than the child target group (M=1.73, SD=1.04), t (32) = 11.36, p <0.001.
### 6.9 Study 3 Design

**Table 6.6:** Intra-group Study Pilot: Means, standard deviation, cronbach alpha for levels of blame attribution to child and target groups for Pilot Study 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child and Adult Target Groups</th>
<th>Child Blame</th>
<th>Adults Blame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.73(1.04)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>5.09(1.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.9 Study 3 Design

This was a 2 (Condition: empathic Vs responsible) x 2 (Target Group; Blame-worthy Vs Innocent) between subjects factorial design. The dependent measure was donation proclivity. Identification with the ingroup as Irish was included as a covariate, to later identify if the participants did in fact engage with the task from the perspective of their national group (their social identity) as Irish.

6.9.1 Participants

78 Irish undergraduate psychology students at the University of Limerick took part in the experimental session for course credits (52 males, 26 females, mean age 18.68yrs).

6.9.2 Procedure

Participants were randomly allocated to one of the 4 experimental conditions. They were instructed to first read a short article on charitable giving in Ireland, and were then asked to fill out an ingroup identification measure and manipulation check to see how much they agreed with the article.

Those in the empathy condition were asked to read the following:

Ireland has a long history of being perceived across the world as a charitable nation. Recent statistics show that even over the past few years, when Ireland’s economy was in crisis and the Celtic Tiger days were definitively over, giving and donations have remained quite stable. A recent survey of the Irish donor population found that people
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tend to feel a certain solidarity with those who are suffering. Feelings that unify people with the larger community that is the Irish Nation means that donors are still extremely generous towards Irish charities and non-profit organisations - and this survey showed that continued giving was due to this shared sense of community here in Ireland.

Those in the responsibility condition were asked to read the following:

Ireland has a long history of being perceived across the world as a charitable nation. Recent statistics show that even over the past few years, when Ireland’s economy was generally acknowledged to be in crisis and the Celtic Tiger days were definitively over, giving and donations have remained quite stable. A recent survey of the Irish donor population found that people tend to feel a certain obligation to those who are suffering. Feelings that exert a sense of duty and moral responsibility for the Irish nation means that donors are still extremely generous towards Irish charities and non-profit organisations - and this survey showed that continued giving was due to this sense of obligation and responsibility amongst the Irish people.

Participants were then thanked and asked to turn the page and proceed to ‘the next part of the experiment’. They were then instructed to read through one of the two charitable appeals tested for blameworthiness in the pilot study, and to then rate their level of agreement to a number of items. Each item had a Likert-style response format that ranged from 1 strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree.

6.9.3 Measures

Donation Proclivity Levels of willingness to donate to the charitable organisation in question was assessed using a 5-item measure. This scale was derived from measures used by Zagefka and colleagues (2011), and from Levine and Thompson (2004) but also drew on several words, phrases and concepts that were identified within the first discursive study of this thesis and had been used as a 10-item
scale in the first survey study. 5 items shown to decrease the reliability of the scale from the results of the survey study were removed (see appendix for item list and details). This was also decided upon so as to decrease the task demands on the participants, with 5 of the remaining items $\alpha = .82$.

*Ingroup identification* Identification with the ingroup of Irish was measured using a 3-item scale ‘I identify with my national group (i.e. Irish)’, ‘I am glad to belong to my national group’ and ‘I feel strong ties to my national group’ (Haslam, 2010).

*Similarity* A single similarity item was chosen for use in this experimental study, which simply asked the participants to rate on a scale of 1 to 7 how similar they felt the group receiving aid were to them (where ‘1’ was ‘absolutely different’ and ‘7’ was ‘absolutely similar’) (Haslam, 2003).

### 6.9.4 Results

*Manipulation check* A manipulation check was conducted by generating a mean score from 3 items that required participants to rate their level of agreement with the theme of the vignette they read. The empathy condition had items such as ‘I feel Irish people can easily empathise with others’, ‘I don’t think Irish people share a general sense of community’ (reverse scored), and ‘I am glad that Irish people are seen as generous to those they feel similar to’. The responsibility condition had items such as ‘I feel Irish people are dependable’, ‘I think Irish people shy away from their responsibilities’ (reverse scored) and ‘I am glad that Irish people are seen as willing to take responsibility for others’.

Participants who scored below 3 in their self-reports over all three items were excluded from the analysis (only 3 participants were excluded).

*Interactions* A Two-way ANOVA showed no significant interaction between primed condition and target groups, $F (74) = 1.31, p = .25$. Also there was no main effect of primed condition, $F (74) = 2.25, p = .14$. ANOVA sees a main effect of target group ($F (74) = 5.03, p = .03$) with children receiving more. When strength of identification is included as a covariate there is a main effect of identification, $F (74) = 5.15, p = .02$. There is no effect of similarity.
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Table 6.7: Intra-group Study: Means, standard deviation for empathy and responsibility for Study 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blameworthy</td>
<td>3.91(1.01)</td>
<td>4.63(1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>4.83(1.24)</td>
<td>4.92(1.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.2: Results per condition - Study 3 - Means for Donation Proclivity in Empathy and Responsibility condition.
A priori hypotheses Tests of the a priori hypotheses (that there would be a difference between the means of donation proclivity towards the two target groups in the empathy condition, but no difference in the responsibility condition) were conducted. Results indicated that the mean level of donations to the target group perceived as blameworthy were significantly lower in the empathy condition (M = 3.91, S.D = 1.01) than were the levels of donations to the target group perceived as innocent in the empathy condition (M = 4.83, S.D = 1.24), F (3, 71) = 3.04, p = .02.

However the difference between levels of donations to the blameworthy target group in the responsibility condition (M = 4.63, S.D = 1.20) was not significantly different to donations to the innocent target group (M = 4.92, S.D = 1.24) in the responsibility condition, F(3, 71) = 3.04, p = .45. Further comparisons show a significant difference between levels of willingness to donate to the blameworthy group in the empathy condition (M = 3.91, S.D = 1.01) and the responsibility condition (M = 4.63, S.D = 1.20), with responsibility resulting in higher levels of self-reported intentions to donate, F (3, 71) = 3.04, p = .05.

6.10 Discussion

This experimental study was built upon the results of the previous study which investigated the independent pathways to donation proclivity both empathic concern and responsibility predict. As such, the main concern in the Study 3 was how these constructs as variables could predict helping in different contexts, as well as in direct comparison with each other. The aim was to prime empathic concern or responsibility as a key characteristic of the participant’s ingroup identity, and subsequently examine how this would influence their levels of willingness to help when a target group was presented as either to blame for their fate or innocent - essentially manipulating certain characteristics of the target group and investigating the consequences of being primed as empathic or responsible on which group would receive more help.

Thus empathy or responsibility as a normative aspect of the ingroup’s identity was primed in Irish participants. They were subsequently seen to display differing
donation behaviours depending on the nature of the target group with whom they were presented through the format of a charitable appeal.

Results demonstrate that when subjects were primed to think about the Irish (and themselves as Irish nationals) as generally empathic they were more likely to discriminate between which needy group they were willing to give more help to than when subjects were primed to think of the Irish as responsible. Moreover, while participants in the empathy condition were seen to give significantly more to the children’s appeal, shown to be perceptibly more innocent-of-their-fate, than to the adult’s appeal, shown to be perceptibly more to blame for their situation, those in the responsibility condition did not make such a distinction. Levels of willingness to give in the responsibility condition were relatively similar across both target groups, suggesting that by priming responsibility as a normative aspect of their social identity, participants were able to overcome attributions of blame and continue to give in an intragroup context.

Therefore this first experimental study built upon the conclusions drawn from Study 1 and 2, as they relate to how empathy and responsibility are conceptualised and understood (and subsequently operationalised). While Study 1 afforded an understanding of the different ways in which these concepts are understood and subsequently invoked in talk to achieve certain business (justifying helping or not helping), and Study 2 allowed for the development of this understanding and the investigation of the different pathways to helping that empathy and responsibility can provide, Study 3 had a different purpose. Taking what conclusions had been drawn from these two previous studies, Study 3 aimed to look specifically at how empathy and responsibility can influence decisions to help in different ways depending on the target group in need of help. The results, that empathy and responsibility do indeed lead to different decisions in terms of who will receive help, contribute to our understanding of these two concepts and to the literature on group-level helping more broadly. Study 3 also allows for the further examination of these concepts in terms of the specific research questions raised in the latter part of chapter 2. Therefore chapter 7 will proceed to demonstrate how the question of intergroup helping, and the impact empathy and responsibility can exert on helping decisions, when the target groups are out-group members, or even those who pose as threatening. However, presently this
6.10 Discussion

This chapter will conclude with a more general discussion of the results of this Study and how they relate to the previous literature on prosocial behaviour.

6.10.1 Intragroup processes

Levine and colleagues (2005) demonstrated the identity-motivated dynamics of intragroup helping, and the importance of ingroup identification as a precursor to ingroup helping, in their study that looked at social category memberships of both victim and helper in an emergency helping situation. Such an SIT and SCT perspective on helping would indicate that the phenomena of ingroup bias and ingroup favouritism will lead one to help a member of their own group. This approach appears less useful however when an ingroup member poses a threat to the positive social identity of the helper. In Study 3 this is operationalized through the perceived blameworthiness of the adult target group for their situation. An SIT perspective would predict that ingroup members attempt to manage the self-esteem related to their particular social identity in several different ways (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), and when an ingroup member deviates from the accepted norms associated with this identity this could have consequences for whether they will be helped or not (black sheep effect, Marques et al., 1988). This chapter’s experimental study would suggest that the consequences of such a situation will be negative when people are motivated by empathic concern, but positive when motivated by responsibility.

This interpretation, that ingroup members who deviate from accepted norms could suffer negative consequences, was also investigated by Castano and colleagues (Castano, Paladino, Coull, & Yzerbyt, 2002) who looked specifically at deviants from ingroup stereotypes as opposed to norms; “A poor performance or the negative behaviour of an ingroup member can jeopardize the ingroup reputation [...] suggest(ing) that the derogation of the black sheep might be functional in its protection of the ingroup stereotype.” (p. 366).

Outside of the psychology of stereotypes, this phenomenon of derogating the deviant or anti-normative ingroup member is evident in this intragroup experiment, whereby those primed with empathy gave significantly less to a perceptibly blameworthy subsection of the ingroup. However, within the responsibility
condition where participants were primed to view their group as normatively responsible for helping others, the deviation from an ingroup norm, or the attribution of blameworthiness, was overcome by the responsibility prime and those participants reported similar levels of intentions to help to both innocent and blameworthy ingroup victims.

6.10.2 Responsibility and a SIT approach

From this SIT perspective, ingroup bias and ingroup favouritism can facilitate empathic concern and giving. However outgroup derogation is often framed as the reverse of or the outcome and consequence of ingroup favouritism. An approach that emphasises the positive role of responsibility in helping situations would appear to be predictive of sentiments of responsibility for one’s own ingroup. Donation behaviour can be informed by the normative context, and when a participant is operating as a member of a group (as in Study 3’s context) these norms will play an important role (Haslam, 2006). This aspect of the impact of responsibility as a normative aspect of an identity in contrast to that of empathy in intragroup settings was borne out in this experimental study. Sturmer and colleagues (2005) found that empathy motivated helping ingroup members, whereas attraction led to helping outgroup members. This current study focuses simply on helping at an intragroup level where both target groups were ingroup members (as identity was primed at the national level as Irish), however the findings suggest that while empathic concern can indeed motivate ingroup helping, this help is contingent on several factors: one of which centres on the blameworthiness of the target members.

6.11 Overall discussion

To return to some of the initial comments in the introductory section of this chapter, Neuberg and colleagues (Neuberg et al., 1997) suggested that empathy should not be expected to play a unique role when the cost of helping is high. Their suggestion that empathy can predict helping, but not the amount of helping, and that the egoistic nature of helping (such as is their claim) results in superficial
helping, feeds also into the suggestion that the contingent nature of empathy is at worst unpredictable, at best predictive of a specific kind of help.

The results of this current experimental study would suggest that this may indeed be the case; while empathic concern did lead to helping, it led to a greater amount of helping when the target group were ingroup members who were perceived as innocent-of-their-fate. Set in contrast to the amount of help given to both target groups as predicted by responsibility more telling was the lack of significant difference in the responsibility condition between levels of intentions to help the target groups (blameless and blameworthy ingroup members). From this perspective, the self-ascribed responsibility in question could be interpreted as the more dependable and rationale giver, whereas, in support of what even Batson conceded at an early stage “empathy [appears to be] a fragile flower” (Batson, O’Quin, Fultz, Vanderplas, & Isen, 1983, p. 718). It will result in willingness to help, but only in so far as certain criteria are met, criteria that evoke the emotion of empathy sufficiently.

### 6.12 Limitations

There are certain limitations, however, that must be acknowledged and taken into account when both interpreting the results of these studies, and also moving forward to further investigate empathy and responsibility in the next chapter. Outside of blame, certain elements of the vignette appeal may have contributed to the participants’ responses. The child appeal does allude to a certain amount of maltreatment, whereas this is not evident in the adult appeal. However, this is not considered as a major limitation, as this could also add further to the element of innocence to the one group (the child appeal) as a vulnerable recipient.

The age group of the student sample may also have contributed to the results obtained. As late adolescents (aged 17-19yr old mainly) the majority sit somewhere between the two target groups in terms of their stage in life. This could have had an unaccounted for impact upon their tendency to view themselves as similar to either group and therefore engage at a level that could evoke empathic concern more successfully. This was addressed in the subsequent studies by the use of only one age group in both target appeals.
One further concern that relates to the student sample is that the university campus often draws specific attention to issues of addiction, substance abuse and in particular the problems of alcohol abuse. This awareness could have impacted on the participants decisions to donate. It is difficult to see if this consistent promotion of awareness among students of these issues may have lead to differences in their engagement with the adult appeal (attributing more or less blame, or not allow those judgements to influence their decisions too strongly for example). Again this potential limitation is addressed in the appeals used in the next two experimental studies.

6.13 Conclusion

This study was developed and informed by the findings of the qualitative analysis of interview data looking at how people ‘do’ being charitable in their everyday talk. The two interpretative repertoires (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) that were identified as forming the main modes of talk were empathy and responsibility. This chapter has presented how these two concepts have been previously investigated in the social psychological literature on prosocial behaviour, and to what end. This chapter has also highlighted certain gaps in knowledge relating to how these concepts can influence helping behaviour and charitable giving more specifically. A survey study was designed, aiming to elucidate if empathy and responsibility predict donation proclivity, and to investigate if they contribute separately. Results suggest that both psychological constructs are predictive of donation proclivity (outside of the influence of similarity) and demonstrate independent routes to helping.

Theorists have suggested that “people who are regarded as partly responsible for their plight would receive less sympathy and consequently less help than people seen as not responsible for their circumstances” (Piliavin, 1982, p. 290; Weiner, 1995). The intragroup experiment in the second half of this chapter demonstrated that when Irish people are primed with empathy as a normative aspect of their identity this statement of prediction holds true: those perceived to be partly to blame for their circumstances received less help than others. However, the real contribution of this chapter lies within the concept of responsibility.
Responsibility has been shown to contribute to self-reported intentions to help outside of the empathic concern domain, and the processes involved in a responsibility to helping pathway appear to be able to overcome blame-attributions that remain problematic in an empathy to helping pathway. Thus responsibility as a potentially important consideration has been demonstrated within an intragroup context.

Essentially, empathy is seen to inhibit helping when it is primed as content for a salient social identity, and the target group or people in need are seen as to blame for their own situation - unlike priming responsibility which is not seen to inhibit helping in such circumstances.

Thus the aim of these two studies was to demonstrate the unique role of empathy and responsibility, concepts which emerged as important from Study 1, in helping intentions and to further examine the different consequences for target groups who display a variety of characteristics when primed with either empathy or responsibility. Study 3 was the first of 3 experimental studies which manipulate this ‘variety of characteristics’ in order to demonstrate the predictive powers of these two concepts and how they differ.

Within an intergroup context and within a context of identity threat from an intergroup perspective (where power relations and political dynamics are thought to play a role) will responsibility also appear to give regardless? The following chapter of this thesis aims to investigate the role of self-ascribed responsibility in helping situations further, taking into account the many additional considerations that come with a move to the intergroup level.
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Chapter 7

Empathy, Responsibility and Intergroup Helping

This chapter builds on the results of the previous studies in chapter 6 that demonstrated the unique and independent contributions both empathic concern and responsibility make to helping (where helping was framed as willingness to donate or raise funds for a specific charity). It also works to further investigate the suggestion of the contingent nature of empathic concern and the non-discerning nature of self-ascribed responsibility as ingroup norms when impacting upon intentions to help. As such, this chapter will present an approach to helping that includes both constructs, but acknowledges the differences in both how these have been conceptualised in the prosocial literature so far, and in how they exert their influence on helping in terms of the processes involved.

Two further experimental studies, in line with Study 3, will be presented. They both aim to examine the consequences for target groups displaying a variety of characteristics for receiving help when the participants are primed with either empathic concern or responsibility. The first study, Study 4, manipulates the target group in so far as one is presented as ingroup, the other as outgroup. Study 4 hypothesises that when primed with empathy, there will be a difference in the levels of willingness to donate or help these two target groups. The same is not predicted for responsibility. This builds upon the conclusions drawn from Study 3 and controls for blame by presented both target groups as children, perceptibly innocent of their fate.
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Results of the intergroup study (study 4) further the suggestion that, from an SIT perspective, empathic concern is contingent on ingroup membership, while self-ascribed responsibility gives equal amounts to both in- and out-group members.

The final study of this thesis (Study 5) is subsequently presented, and continues at an intergroup level of analysis, with identity threat as a potential consideration that could impact upon willingness to donate. The aim is to present a target group to participants who are primed with either an empathic or a responsible social identity and investigate intentions to donate when this target group is perceived as threatening to the ingroup. Thus a further variation of the characteristics of the target group, one that is relevant and appropriate a consideration at an intergroup level of investigation. Results show further support for the positive role of self-ascribed responsibility in helping situations, as those primed with responsibility demonstrate a significantly greater willingness to donate to those in the threat condition, when compared with participants primed with a norm of empathy. Results are discussed from both a social identity and a defensive helping (Nadler, Harpaz-Gorodeisky, & Ben-David, 2009) perspective.

7.1 Fit between research question, method and design

Before moving forward to present a discussion and argument for the theoretical basis of the following two studies as based on the previous literature, this section will briefly link back to the overarching research questions of this thesis, and set out the relationship between methods used so far and those adopted in this chapter.

Study 1 demonstrated two main ways in which people talk about helping others: via empathic concern and responsibility. As the previous literature had indicated the importance of both concepts, Study 1 adopted an exploratory qualitative approach to develop an understanding of both, responsibility in particular (due to its under-researched role, see Chapter 2), grounded in data from people’s talk. A qualitative approach was chosen as appropriate to address the concerns of
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the first of 3 sub-research questions that together make up the overarching drive of this thesis’ investigations (see page 75 for full list). A mixed methods design was chosen in order to investigate in a broader sense the role empathy and self-ascribed responsibility play in helping intentions at the level of the group, and as such the first qualitative study formed the basis of the subsequent quantitative ones.

Study 2 developed a measure of responsibility as based on what emerged from the Study 1 data, and aimed to demonstrate the unique pathway to helping intentions that both present. This signified the move to a quantitative approach to the questions presented in Chapter 2 (page 75). This study used a survey that followed a vignette in the form of a charitable appeal as the basis of its data generation. This design was chosen as best placed to suit the aims of the study, but also as such appeals are familiar to many, and to the particular sample used. The conclusions drawn indicated that indeed both empathic concern and responsibility impact upon decisions to help independently.

Building on the results of Study 2, the first in a set of experimental studies was conducted and presented in the previous chapter. Study 3 aimed to investigate the consequence of priming empathy or responsibility as an important part of one’s social identity. In order to do so, an experimental design was chosen whereby the participants were presented with a vignette that primed their in-group identity and the specific dimension (empathy or responsibility) appropriate for the condition, and subsequently presented the participants with a vignette in the form of a charitable appeal. Once again, and as was briefly addressed in Chapter 2, the use of vignettes in the form of a charitable appeal was chosen as a specific form of helping. This type of appeal used was suitable as it is close to the real-world scenarios in which people are presented with campaigns by charitable organisations in a similar fashion: a blurb with information about the needy group, about the charity involved with them, and about the need for donations.

The aim of both studies presented in this chapter, Study 4 and Study 5, address the concerns put forward in the final of 3 sub-research questions:

3) Are the effects of reported empathy and responsibility on charitable giving systematically affected by the characteristics of the target group and what implications does this have for charitable giving more generally? More specifically, by
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priming normative aspects of a group’s identity as empathetic or as responsible, will this impact on giving when the target group is manipulated to present as blameworthy, as an outgroup, or as posing a threat to the ingroup donor?

As Study 3 investigated the effects of empathy and responsibility as salient elements of an ingroup identity on intentions to help an ingroup presented as to blame for their situation, these studies follow suit and further examine the consequences of such priming. Study 4 aims to demonstrate the consequences of priming empathy or responsibility on helping a target that is perceptibly innocent of their fate. However, the target group is manipulated to be perceived as either part of the participant’s ingroup or outgroup. In a similar fashion, Study 5 aims to demonstrate the consequences of same on helping a target group that is manipulated to be perceived as an outgroup. However the target here either presents as threatening to the participant’s ingroup or non-threatening. The choice of design for both experiments as 2 x 2 was again chosen as best placed to suit the needs of the specific research question under investigation, and constitutes the third and final type of method adopted in this thesis’ examination of the impact of empathy and responsibility on helping behaviours.

7.2 Similarity and group membership

“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 behaviour will emerge” (Levine, Prosser, Evans, & Reicher, 2005). From a Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) perspective, identification with a particular group leads to increased helping among group members. From the earliest Minimal Group Studies (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy & Flament, 1971) in which participants preferentially allocate reward to other nominal ingroup members even at the expense of an overall reduction in reward, identification was seen to be linked to helping ingroup members. Furthermore, a self-categorisation perspective would predict that once re-categorisation occurs at a higher level of abstraction, an outgroup member could be included within the extended ingroup boundaries.
Levine and colleagues (Levine et al., 2005) examined how this could be applied to emergency helping in a bystander study that made salient different social identities. This real-life study of helping in emergency situations has shown that while priming an identity different from the person in need of aid (Manchester or Liverpool football supporter) will decrease helping behaviour, priming a common identity (general football fan) will increase assistance. In essence, the perception of similarity of characteristics, expectations and purpose of group members is seen to be central to the impact of identification upon ingroup helping.

A similar approach was adopted by Levine and Thompson (2004) to investigate emergency helping behaviours. Participants' identity as either British or European was seen to impact on the amount of help they were willing to give after a disaster in either a European country or a country in South America. Those participants who were primed to view themselves as Europeans were willing to give more in the European disaster, suggesting that identifying at a higher level of abstraction enables ingroup boundaries to be extended and result in greater amounts of helping. Those primed with a British identity were not seen to discriminate significantly between both emergency situations. Notably, a measure of empathic concern was included in this study by Levine and Thompson, but did not appear to impact upon intentions to help in either condition.

This finding (or lack thereof) resonates with what Batson has claimed at an individual level of analysis, namely that the results of individual-level studies of the impact of empathy may not generalise to a social-psychological group-level framing; “empathy is typically felt for individuals as individuals, not for groups or abstract classes of people” (Batson, Early, & Salvarani, 1997, p. 106).

### 7.2.1 Similarity, group membership and long-term helping

Long-term helping such as volunteering has been examined in an intergroup setting. Empathic concern was predicted to mediate ingroup helping while attraction was predicted to mediate outgroup helping (Sturmer, Snyder, & Omoto, 2005). This longitudinal study on volunteering, whose participants were homosexual or heterosexual volunteers with an AIDS organisation, showed support for their
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predictions. The authors demonstrate how empathy can be a precursor to helping when the recipient is perceived as similar, but that in the absence of this perception of similarity and subsequent empathy, helping may still be given, but due to other processes of social judgement. This contributes to understandings of intragroup helping from an SIT perspective, but also suggests there is another set of considerations involved in outgroup helping.

While a social identity perspective on helping behaviours is useful at an intra and intergroup level of analysis, other approaches to the content of an identity can also prove valuable. Piliavin and colleagues have begun to examine volunteering as a long-term helping behaviour (Grube & Piliavin, 2000; Penner, 2002). In particular they have looked at the aspects of volunteering as a prosocial act that become embedded in the identity of the volunteer over time. Volunteer role identity is thus conceptualised as sustained long-term helping due to incorporating that role and the attributes associated with it into a person’s own identity. This has implications for helping both within and between groups.

7.2.2 Dissimilarity and helping

Tajfel (Tajfel et al., 1971), Levine (Levine et al., 2005) and Sturmer (Sturmer et al., 2005) among others have thus illustrated in intra- and intergroup settings how ingroup bias and favouritism can result in helping the ingroup, or how perceived similarity and ingroup membership can invoke empathy that will result in ingroup helping. Conversely, for those outside of the group, increased dis-similarity appears to be linked to a decrease in helping behaviour.

Research into the phenomenon of infrahumanisation in the helping literature indicate that the attribution of fewer uniquely human emotions to the outgroup reduces perceptions of similarity and hence of helping behaviour (Cuddy, Rock & Norton, 2007). This type of phenomenon is closely related to dehumanisation, which involves the devaluing of outgroup members as less human than ingroup members, and has previously been presented as an explanation for some of the atrocities of the Holocaust (Haslam, 2006). From this perspective then, lower similarity on valued axes of comparison and outgroup membership may be related to more negative intergroup attitudes and lower levels of intergroup helping.
7.2.3 Similarity, Blame and Responsibility

Evidence for the impact of the attribution of blame on intergroup helping is provided by Zagefka et al., (Zagefka, Noor, Brown, De Moura, & Hopthrow, 2011) who focused on how these attributions can influence decisions to donate to charitable organisations specifically. The authors investigated whether the perceived cause of a disaster (either natural or manmade) would have an effect on willingness to donate to a charitable organization that would help in the affected area, and whether or not this would be mediated by victim blaming and perceptions of self-help (if the victims were seen to be trying to help themselves out of their situation). Their results demonstrated a causal link between perception of blameworthiness and self-help among groups and donation behaviour such that groups received more donations if they were less responsible for their own fate and more able to help themselves.

Previous literature in social psychology has already been shown to favour a conceptualisation of responsibility as based on blame-attribution (Zagefka et al., 2011; Weiner, 1995). Where self-ascribed responsibility has been a factor it has been examined largely through its absence in the many Bystander studies on emergency helping (Latané & Darley, 1970; Latané & Dabbs, 1975; Schwartz & Clausen, 1970). However, Brickman and colleagues (Brickman et al., 1982) developed within a clinical setting a model of responsibility that focuses on its dual-layered nature. This model presents helping as based on judgements of responsibility for cause independent of judgements of responsibility for solution. This is suggestive of the potentially important role of such latter judgements of responsibility in a helping situation.

7.3 Study 4

A social identity approach to helping would predict ingroup bias and favouritism. Study 3 in the previous chapter found that priming empathy as a normative aspect of participants’ social (national) identity would result in greater willingness to help an innocent ingroup target than a potentially blameworthy target, and that responsibility when primed would result in no difference in willingness to donate
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to either group. One interpretation of these findings was that while empathy as an emotional response is contingent on certain criteria to evoke such an emotion, for example perceptions of similarity and absence of blame, responsibility was not contingent on such criteria and gave regardless of the target in question.

Building on these results and this interpretation Study 4 investigates the impact empathy and responsibility will have in a context where attributions of blame are controlled for. Furthermore it aims to examine the impact of both empathy and responsibility in an intergroup context whereby the target groups presented are either members of the participants ingroup or members of an outgroup.

Following from Study 3 it is suggested that as a primed identity as responsible can overcome issues of blame-attribution it will also overcome an in-group/ out-group divide. Moreover, priming empathy as a normative aspect of a participants’ identity is expected to result in out-group derogation as seen in the original minimal group experiments (Tajfel et al., 1987; Sturmer et al., 1995) and will give less to the outgroup target:

Hypothesis 1: Priming empathy as a normative aspect of the participant’s national identity will lead to a difference in levels of willingness to help the ingroup target group and the outgroup target group.

Hypothesis 2: Priming responsibility as a normative aspect of the participant’s national identity will lead to no difference in levels of willingness to help the ingroup target group or the outgroup target group.

7.3.1 Design

This was a 2 (Condition: Empathic Vs Responsible) x 2 (Target Group; Ingroup ‘Irish’ Vs Outgroup ‘Croatian’) between subjects factorial design. Dependent measures included donation proclivity, and perceptions of similarity with the ingroup was included as a covariate.

7.3.2 Participants

Participants were 80 undergraduate students at the University of Limerick (29 males, 51 females, mean age 18.63yrs) who took part in the experiment in return for course credits.
7.3.3 Measures

Donation Proclivity Levels of willingness to donate to the charitable organisation in question was assessed using the same 5-item measure as used in Study 3. This scale was derived from measures used by Zagefka and colleagues (2011), and from Levine and Thompson (2004).

Ingroup identification Identification with the ingroup of Irish was measured using a 3-item scale ‘I identify with my national group (i.e. Irish)’, ‘I am glad to belong to my national group’ and ‘I feel strong ties to my national group’ (Haslam, 2003).

Similarity A single similarity item was chosen for use in this experimental study, which simply asked the participants to rate on a scale of 1 to 7 how similar they felt the group receiving aid were to them (where ‘1’ was ‘absolutely different’ and ‘7’ was ‘absolutely similar’) (Haslam, 2003).

7.3.4 Procedure

Participants were randomly allocated to one of the 4 experimental conditions. They were instructed to first read a short article on giving in Ireland, and were then asked to fill out an ingroup identification measure and manipulation check to see how much they agreed with the article (which either primed a normative aspect of the Irish as empathic or responsible).

Those in the empathy condition were asked to read the following:

Ireland has a long history of being perceived across the world as a charitable nation. Recent statistics show that even over the past few years, when Ireland’s economy was in crisis and the Celtic Tiger days were definitively over, giving and donations have remained quite stable. A recent survey of the Irish donor population found that people tend to feel a certain solidarity with those who are suffering. Feelings that unify people with the larger community that is the Irish Nation means that donors are still extremely generous towards Irish charities and non-profit organisations - and this survey showed that continued giving was due to this shared sense of community here in Ireland.
Those in the responsibility condition were asked to read the following:

Ireland has a long history of being perceived across the world as a charitable nation. Recent statistics show that even over the past few years, when Ireland’s economy was generally acknowledged to be in crisis and the Celtic Tiger days were definitively over, giving and donations have remained quite stable. A recent survey of the Irish donor population found that people tend to feel a certain obligation to those who are suffering. Feelings that exert a sense of duty and moral responsibility for the Irish nation means that donors are still extremely generous towards Irish charities and non-profit organisations - and this survey showed that continued giving was due to this sense of obligation and responsibility amongst the Irish people.

Participants on completion were thanked for their participation in this first study, and instructed to turn the page and continue to the second short study (implying that both were unrelated). Participants were instructed to read a vignette comprising of a charitable appeal, and were then asked to rate the subsequent statements as they agreed or disagreed with them on a Likert-style scale (where similar to Study 3 1 = completely disagree and 7 = completely agree ). Those in the Ingroup Condition (Irish Child Appeal) were asked to read this vignette:

‘Leanbh’ is an Irish charity that helps a large number of at-risk children each year in Ireland. A safe home is something many of us take for granted, however the children who are helped by this organisation are usually those who come from an underprivileged background, who currently live with some form of emotional or mental mistreatment in the home or who suffer from serious neglect - even finding it difficult to remain fed and watered on a daily basis. This organisation aims to help these children through service provision (support and guidance, removal from the home, buddy-systems) but also to advocate for the rights of neglected children. As funding is tight, and with the increasing number of children falling into this at-risk category, Leanbh is appealing for donations.
Those in the Outgroup Condition (Croatian Child Appeal) were asked to read this vignette:

‘Djeca’ is a Croatian charity that helps a large number of at-risk Croat children each year. A safe home is something many of us take for granted, however the children who are helped by this organisation are usually those who come from an underprivileged background, who currently live with some form of emotional or mental mistreatment in the home or who suffer from serious neglect - even finding it difficult to remain fed and watered on a daily basis. This organisation aims to help these children through service provision (support and guidance, removal from the home, buddy-systems) but also to advocate for the rights of neglected children in Croatia. As funding is tight, and with the increasing number of children falling into this at-risk category, Djeca is appealing for donations.

This was followed by the measures of donation proclivity. Participants were then thanked for their time, and allocated their course-credits.

7.3.5 Results

Manipulation check A manipulation check was conducted by generating a mean score from 3 items that required participants to rate their level of agreement with the theme of the vignette they read. The empathy condition had items such as ‘I feel Irish people can easily empathise with others’, ‘I don’t think Irish people share a general sense of community’ (reverse scored), and ‘I am glad that Irish people are seen as generous to those they feel similar to’. The responsibility condition had items such as ‘I feel Irish people are dependable’, ‘I think Irish people shy away from their responsibilities’ (reverse scored) and ‘I am glad that Irish people are seen as willing to take responsibility for others’.

Participants who scored mean score of below 3 in their self-reports over all three items were excluded from the analysis (8 participants were removed).
Interactions A two-way ANOVA on donation proclivity was conducted with condition of group norm (responsible or empathic) and target group (Irish children or Croatian children) as independent variables. A borderline significant interaction between primed group norm (condition) and target groups was found, F (72) = 3.057, p = .08. Although there was no main effect of primed condition, F (72) = .017, p = .89, there was a main effect of target group (F (72) = 14.798, p < 0.000) with Irish children receiving more overall (M: 4.56, S.D.: 1.16) than Croatian children (M: 3.58, S.D.: 0.99). There was no effect of identification as Irish.

Similarity A One-way ANOVA on perceptions of similarity across both target groups between the two conditions did not show a significant difference between perceptions of similarity, with those assigned to the responsibility condition rating only slightly higher levels of similarity (M = 2.56, S.D. = 2.21) than those assigned to the empathy condition (M=1.86, S.D. = 1.95), F (71) = 1.991, p = .163. There was also no significant difference in perceptions of similarity across conditions between Croatian children and Irish children reported, F (71) = .152, p = 0.698.

A priori hypotheses Tests of the a priori hypotheses (that there would be a difference between the means of donation proclivity towards the two target groups in the empathy condition, but no difference in the responsibility condition) were conducted. Results indicated that the mean level of donations to the Croatian group were significantly lower in the empathy condition (M = 3.37, S.D = 1.02) than were the levels of donations to the Irish group in the empathy condition (M = 4.80, S.D = 0.76), t (68) = 3.956, p < 0.001. However the difference between levels of donations to the Croatian group in the responsibility condition (M = 3.78, S.D = 0.95) did not significantly differ from donations to the Irish group (M = 4.32, S.D = 1.44) in the responsibility condition, t(68) = 1.484, p = .143.

Table 7.1: Inter-group Study: Means, standard deviation for empathy and responsibility for Study 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irish Group</td>
<td>4.8(0.78)</td>
<td>4.32(1.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croat Outgroup</td>
<td>3.38(1.02)</td>
<td>3.79(0.95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.1: Results per condition - Study 4 - Interaction of means of donation proclivity in empathy and responsibility condition, for Irish and Croatian children (including table with means).
7. EMPATHY, RESPONSIBILITY AND INTERGROUP HELPING

7.4 Discussion

This experimental study was built upon the results of the previous chapter’s studies that first identified responsibility as a route to helping independent of empathic concern, and that also demonstrated the predictive ability of responsibility to give to a blameworthy ingroup while empathy would not predict same. Moving from such an intragroup context where blame-attribute was a consideration, this study looked instead at the impact empathy or responsibility as primed aspects of the participants identity would have in helping ‘innocent’ ingroup or outgroup members.

Empathy or responsibility was primed in Irish participants as a normative part of participants’ social identity (national identity as Irish). They were subsequently seen to display differing donation behaviours (in terms of self-reported intentions to help) depending on the nature of the target group with whom they were presented through the format of a charitable appeal. Results suggest that when subjects were primed to think about the Irish (and themselves as Irish nationals) as generally empathetic they were more likely to discriminate between which needy group they were willing to give more help to than when subjects were primed to think of the Irish as responsible. These findings demonstrate the independent predictions from an empathic concern versus a responsibility perspective.

The target groups were specifically chosen to represent a group that could not be construed as at fault for their situation, to avoid confounding issues of blame attribution (Zagefka et al., 2011). Therefore the innocent perception of children was expected to instigate relatively high levels of intentions to help in both conditions. As was predicted, however, those in the empathy condition were more likely to display ingroup bias and give to ingroup children as opposed to the outgroup targets, in comparison to those in the responsibility condition who gave a similar amount to both. This would suggest that there are in fact different processes through which these constructs as ingroup norms work, which subsequently lead to differences in terms of who will receive help: ‘us’ or ‘them’.

From a social identity theory perspective (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), empathy as
the emotional motivator could be interpreted as more susceptible to ingroup bias than would responsibility.

Thus the aim of Study 4 was to further examine the impact of priming empathic concern and responsibility upon helping intentions when various characteristics of the target group are manipulated. In this case, the manipulation lay in the presentation of the needy group as an ingroup or an outgroup target in the appeal. Issues of blameworthiness were controlled for, building on the conclusions drawn from Study 3, by presenting both target groups as children. The results contribute to this systematic examination of the different consequences of feeling empathic or responsible for eventual intentions to help groups in different circumstances. It also contributes to the broader social psychological literature on prosocial behaviour in the following ways.

7.4.1 Helping ‘us’ or helping ‘them’

Helping ‘us’, as empathy is shown to predict, suggests the contingent nature of empathic concern as a motivator once again: as in the previous study it wasn’t outgroup members that fared poorly, but those who could be construed as blameworthy. One interpretation of Study 3’s findings was the *Black Sheep Effect* (Pinto, Marques, Levine & Abrams, 2010), whereby an ingroup member who deviated from the prototypical role would receive fewer intentions to help. However, in this context, where blame has been removed as a consideration, a straightforward SIT explanation is more applicable. While the similarity-empathy link encourages ingroup giving, this is at the expense of ‘innocent-of-their-fate’ outgroup members. Conversely these outgroup members receive a similar amount of help as their ingroup counterparts when responsibility as an aspect of the ingroup’s identity is being primed.

This suggests that empathic concern instigates giving on the basis of who the recipient group is, whereas self-ascribed responsibility appears to give based on who the donor is, regardless of recipient group: whether blameworthy or innocent, in- or out-group member.

Sturmer, Snyder and Omoto (2005) have already demonstrated the competing pathways and processes involved in intergroup helping settings, showing that
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empathy mediates ingroup giving with attraction mediating outgroup helping. Social Identity studies (Tajfel et al., 1971) have also demonstrated how ingroup bias can lead to increased intragroup helping, and while this approach to helping does not overtly claim that empathy is the key process involved in such ingroup favouritism and intragroup helping, similarity and perceived interchangeability of fellow ingroup members has been suggested to facilitate empathy-based-helping (Batson et al., 1991; Sturmer et al., 2005). However, one interpretation of the current results would imply that empathy would answer the question of ‘us’ or ‘them’ by helping their own, whereas responsibility would lead to helping both.

7.4.2 Limitations

There are a number of potential limitations to this study that could restrict the ability to draw further inferences from the results. The materials used were careful to present both Irish and Croatian target groups as similar apart from their nationality, so as to control for other possible confounding variables. However, as an examination of empathy and responsibility shifts from simply an intragroup setting as seen in Study 3 to this intergroup context, this shift often begets factors for which you cannot control. Helping at an intergroup level becomes a complex dynamic of power relations, status hierarchies and political considerations (Nadler, 2002). While there is not at present any evident politically-charged or specifically power-driven relationship between Ireland and Croatia at this time, it is possible that some participants may have construed the outgroup as something other than a blameless group in need of help and attributed some political considerations to the appeals when making their decisions to donate, for which these findings cannot account.

Other processes seen to influence ingroup helping over outgroup helping outside of empathic concern involve situations of competition (as in the original minimal group studies) or situations that result in identity threat (Nadler & Halabi, 2006). As these could have potentially affected the findings of Study 4 as a political consideration, these contexts will be further investigated in the following study, whereby the impact of empathy and responsibility as normative aspects
of the ingroup’s identity on intentions to help are examined in the context of a threatening or non-threatening situation.

7.4.3 Conclusion

The results of Study 4 therefore contribute to the helping behaviour literature by illustrating the differing impact empathy as a normative aspect of a group’s identity can exert on helping behaviours over responsibility. The target groups in this particular study were children, specifically chosen for their perceptibly innocent-of-their-fate inferences. This was designed so as to avoid any issues of blame attribution that could confound the solitary influence of empathy or responsibility.

The conclusions drawn from this study further our understanding of the impact of empathy and responsibility on helping different types of target groups. However it also suggests a further element in taken into consideration in the investigation. The two experimental studies thus far have looked at the impact of blameworthiness of a target group, and impact of their group membership, as important aspects of the helping relationship. A final dimension worthy of examination involves a situation in which both target groups are presented as an outgroup. It is the various concerns at an intergroup level, when those seeking help are consistently members of the outgroup, that can shed a final bit of light of how empathy and responsibility differ in their predictions of who will receive help and who will not.

Regarding outgroup helping specifically, factors than can be seen to impact upon helping in intergroup settings are perceived competition (Jackson & Esses, 2010), power relations (Nadler, 2002) and identity threat (Livingstone, Spears, Manstead & Bruder, 2009). In such circumstances ingroup bias or ingroup favouritism is not concerned with empathic motivations, but often stems from the desire for the ingroup to prosper over the outgroup in some identity-relevant dimension. In order to see the impact ingroup empathy or responsibility could have in such a situation, the following study will present an intergroup experiment that examines helping within a context of ‘threat’, whereby it is necessary to take the political, status and power relationship dynamics of many intergroup
settings into account. Thus this hopes to further the claims and builds support for the suggestion that empathy and responsibility (as normative aspects of an ingroup’s identity) predict helping different types of target groups in different contexts.

7.5 Study 5: Introduction

The following study aims to examine the outcomes for intentions to donate when participants are primed with either empathy or responsibility and presented with a recipient outgroup that poses as threatening or non-threatening. Study 5 predicts that empathic concern will inhibit intentions to give to what can be viewed as a needy group in a costly situation (one of threat) whereas the same will not be seen when responsibility is made salient.

While empathic concern has been shown to predict helping via perceptions of similarity in individual and intragroup levels of analysis, empathy does not feature prominently as a factor in studies on helping in an intergroup context. Much of the literature on intergroup helping has other more complex sets of considerations to be taken into account when examining helping behaviours. Intergroup contexts involve factors such as the helper’s understanding of the relationship between helper and recipient, a shift from focusing on whether help will be given to also looking at what type of help will be given, and ultimately at what cost to the ingroup help will be given. To forefront this study a review of some of the intergroup literature and the helping literature that looks at these considerations will be presented.

7.5.1 Social identity and intergroup helping

Brewer’s Optimal Distinctiveness theory of group identification claims that there is a constant tension in attempts to maintain an optimal balance of assimilation and distinction both between and within social groups and situations (Brewer, 1991). From a social identity perspective, one strives to maintain a positive social identity and seek to at once belong to the ingroup and sustain the ingroup’s unique identity. Previous literature, and Study 4, indicate that ingroup helping can be
facilitated by perceptions of similarity. However, from an intergroup perspective perceived similarity can become quite problematic. An event (vanLeeuwan, 2007), a negative stereotype (Hopkins et al., 2007) or even a group that begins to overlap one’s own ingroup’s boundaries can impact on the members’ ability to maintain a positive social identity. This latter concern, overlapping of group boundaries, can occur when a group presents as overly-similar. It also can occur if a group who is becoming similar and beginning to share certain aspects of a group’s identity also begins to share their resources. All of these occasions can result in what is termed Identity Threat (Sherrif, 1966; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Blanz, Mummendey, Mielke & Klink, 1998).

7.5.2 Identity Threat and helping
If a group experiences identity threat, there are several predictions for how this group will act in a helping situation. If it is a third party in need of help, the ingroup who is experiencing a threat to their positive social identity via a negative ingroup stereotype (for example, as not very generous) could offer more help to an outgroup than would a group not experiencing such a threat (Hopkins et al., 2007). In such a case, helping is seen as a mechanism to restore a positive social identity. Similar results are also seen when the threat comes in the form of a threat to the uniqueness of a group identity, as in vanLeeuwan’s study whereby the Dutch identity was fictitiously presented as in threat of being overly incorporated into a larger more abstract European identity (vanLeeuwan, 2007). In such a case, those experiencing a threat would not only help a third party in need, but would offer help in a domain that was relevant to their identity (for example, water management). Thus helping in this way enabled the participants to overcome the threat by enhancing their sense of a positive social (national) identity.

The literature on identity threat outside of its impact on helping behaviours has examined its effects on personal and collective self-esteem (Long & Spears, 1998) and how these can interact and subsequently affect intergroup differentiation and intergroup relations, viewing self-esteem as a “motivator, predictor or instigator
of intergroup behaviour” (p. 914). Investigations have also taken social comparisons into consideration, as Brown and Haeger (1999) found that intergroup similarity was more often a criterion for comparisons than intergroup disparity or differences, in a study that looked at members of an EC (European Community) country and other EC countries. They also found there was prevalence for upward comparisons in situations of perceived threat to the participants’ national identity.

Blanz and colleagues (1998) present a taxonomy of strategies for identity management in the face of threat that build upon those first posed by Tajfel and Turner (1979): individual mobility, social creativity and social competition. They also included assimilation, realistic competition, individualisation and other forms of comparison. They provide evidence for a two-axis model of strategies: individual versus collective responses to identity threat and behavioural versus cognitive responses. The individual and collective nature of responses to threat could potentially have a bearing on how an ingroup member who has a particular aspect of their identity made salient would respond to a charitable appeal that invokes a sense of threat, for example. Furthermore, the impact of different aspects of identity could also be impacted by another set of considerations prominent at an intergroup level of analysis, namely power relations.

### 7.5.3 Helping as based on status relations

Helping to maintain, restore or create intergroup hierarchies has been put forward as an explanation of the political undertones to intergroup helping (Nadler, 2002). The consequences of this for intergroup helping are outlined by the work of Nadler (2002; Nadler & Halabi, 2006) who argues that outgroup helping can create, regain, or maintain the specific status quo of an intergroup relationship. Specifically, helping behaviour can be autonomy-oriented (help that encourages the out-group to be independent) or dependency-oriented help (help that keeps the out-group dependent on the in-groups support). In instances of identity-threat, it is the latter type of help which maintains their differences in power - such that in so far as the nature of help can affect the power relations of groups, it can also reflect it (Worchel, 1984).
Nadler’s model of helping predicts that helping will depend on several factors: level of identification with the ingroup, and (in)stability and (il)legitimacy of the higher group’s status. Nadler also predicts that if an ingroup is experiencing a threat to their identity, in the form of over similarity for example, it will offer help to maintain the distinction between helper and recipient, but importantly that this help will be dependency-oriented in nature, not necessarily required, and not specifically related to the recipient’s actual need. This form of helping is termed *defensive helping* (Nadler, 2009).

Jackson and Esses (2000) also looked at support for different types of helping in an intergroup threat context, examining support for empowering versus non-empowering forms of help for immigrant groups in Canada. They propose that “motivations to maintain ingroup status could, at least under some circumstances, lead to higher levels of dependency-oriented helping to reinforce group status differences” (p. 843). They found, similar to Nadler’s predictions, that groups perceived to be posing a threat would receive less support for empowering forms of helping, whereby participants favoured direct assistance.

### 7.6 Study 5

“Social arrangements that threaten social identity produce defensive reactions that result in conflict” (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000, p. 143). Such a social arrangement will form the basis of the threat condition in the following study (Study 5). From the perspective of the “optimal distinctiveness” of identities (Brewer, 1991), increased similarity of an outgroup would also appear to be linked to decreased helping behaviour. Brewer’s *Optimal Distinctiveness Theory* posits that in general individuals’ motivation to belong competes with their desire to be unique. In terms of group membership this translates into a desire to maintain a sense of the positive distinctiveness of one’s own group in relation to others. This can offer a sense of belonging, but by its very nature it forces the creation of an ‘outgroup’ to your ‘ingroup’ in order to maintain this sense of uniqueness and distinctiveness.

Therefore the threat of over-similarity can engender negative feelings or cognitions due to the infringement of group boundaries (Brown & Lopez, 2001). Also
insofar as the group boundaries are permeable or unstable and allow for the entry of stigmatised group members or challenges to the status relations between groups, these unstable boundaries can also be perceived as a threat to the status quo (Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Brown & Lopez, 2001), and subsequently a threat to the resources available to the ingroup.

The current study builds on the results from the previous three quantitative investigations. Responsibility and empathy are viewed as two separate routes to helping. Helping is framed as intentions to, or willingness to, donate. Previously responsibility and empathic concern have been operationalized by priming them as aspects of the participants’ identity and in the two previous studies the ingroup was chosen as the national group (Irish as the ingroup identity). In the following study, the ingroup being made salient was that of student - with empathy or responsibility as a normative aspect of a student identity. In order to present a threatening situation to the extent that it could be construed at a less abstract level than a threat to national identity, student was deemed best placed an identity to make salient for such a purpose (following much of Nadler’s work) due to the prominent common identity amongst participants and the location in which the study was taking place (University campus).

The threatening situation was chosen on the basis of this student identity and also was in line with the current economic climate at the time of year in which the study was conducted (the study was run several weeks before the much publicised national budget). The work of Jackson and Esses (2000) also looked at helping in the context of perceived economic competition. Similar to Study 5, they used competition to resources in an unstable economic climate as their context; “Whether a group is deemed responsible for negative economic events - that is, whether direct competition between groups is perceived to exist - seems to be critical to the relation between economic factors and intergroup hostility” (p. 420). They found that perceptions of competition posed by an immigrant outgroup would lead to a reduction in willingness to help and to provide empowering help.

As such, owing to the nature of empathic concern as withholding aid from seemingly costly recipient groups, as was demonstrated in the previous studies
of this thesis, and self-ascribed responsibility’s apparent ability to overcome such costly obstacles, the hypothesis was as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Participants primed with responsibility as a normative aspect of their social identity will report more intentions to donate to help a threatening outgroup than those participants primed with empathy as a normative aspect of their identity.

7.6.1 Design

This was a 2 (Condition: empathic Vs responsible) x 2 (Target Group; Threat Vs Non-threat) between subjects factorial design. The dependent measure was donation proclivity, and identification with the ingroup as student was included as a covariate (where the outgroup were retired members of the work-force).

7.6.2 Participants

100 undergraduate psychology students took part in the experimental session for course credits (32 males, 68 females; mean age 18.94yrs).

7.6.3 Measures

Donation Proclivity Levels of willingness to donate to the charitable organisation in question was assessed using a 10-item measure. This scale was derived from measures used by Zagefka and colleagues (Zagefka et al., 2011), from Levine and Thompson (Levine & Thompson, 2004), drew on several words, phrases and concepts that were identified within the first discursive study of this thesis and had been used as a 10-item scale in the first survey study (Study 2).

In order to look at types of helping within this measure of donations and charitable giving, this 10 items of the Donation Proclivity Scale was subjected to principal components analysis (PCA), where a 2 component solution was seen to explain a total of 63% of the variance. The scale had two dimensions, one with 4 items relating to short-term helping behaviours, and the other had 6 items relating to long-term helping behaviours. The analysis therefore looked at overall
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donation proclivity (DP) as a dependent variable, and subsequently analysed short-term (ST) and long-term (LT) levels of donation proclivity. ($\alpha = .908$)

*Ingroup identification* Identification with the ingroup of student was measured using a 3-item scale, the same as was used in Study 3 and 4; but replacing the national group identity with student identity. ($\alpha = .510$)

*Similarity* A single similarity item was again chosen for use in this experimental study, which simply asked the participants to rate on a scale of 1 to 7 how similar they felt the group receiving aid were to them (where ‘1’ was ‘absolutely different’ and ‘7’ was ‘absolutely similar’) (Haslam, 2003).

### 7.6.4 Procedure

Participants were randomly allocated to one of the 4 experimental conditions. They were instructed to first read a short article on giving in the University such that the article presented a review of student’s charitable behaviour, and were then asked to fill out an ingroup identification measure (measure below) and manipulation check to see how much they agreed with the article (which either primed an ingroup norm of students as empathic or responsible; their agreement was thus how empathic or how responsible they felt students were in general).

Those in the empathy condition were asked to read the following:

The University of Limerick’s recent President’s Volunteer Award has demonstrated how compassionate and caring university students are at taking care of their own community. The empathy shown by many students towards disadvantaged and vulnerable groups, such as the elderly and the disabled, indicates that they can really place themselves in the position of those suffering and use this experience to encourage them to help people with whom they can see certain similarities. The warm and caring nature of the student body in terms of their ability to take the perspective of others has ensured that they are a wonderful example of empathic concern in their communities.

Those in the responsibility condition were asked to read the following:
The recent University of Limerick President’s Volunteers awards highlighted how dedicated university students are towards the betterment of their community. Responsibility, as one of the new key Graduate Attributes being promoted at UL, appears to already have a strong grounding within the student cohort, as students are dependable in the help they give to other members of their community. The sense of duty and responsibility students show towards some of the most disadvantaged and vulnerable groups, such as the elderly or the disabled, has ensured that they are a wonderful example of a capability to accept and act on their social responsibilities.

Participants were then asked to turn the page and proceed to ‘the next part of the experiment’. They were instructed to read through one of the two charitable appeals and to then rate their level of agreement to a number of items. Each item had a response format that ranged from 1 strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree. Participants allocated to the threat condition were presented with the following appeal:

Due to the recent economic climate many people have had to take early retirement. Some charitable organisations are trying to create a scheme that helps the elderly and those receiving a pension to come back to work in a part-time capacity, where they can work flexibly and maintain a positive sense of self. Where this will no doubt be of great benefit to the wellbeing of a vulnerable group in society, certain concerns lie around the amount of jobs that would then be available for new graduates seeking employment (who would have otherwise simply taken up the roles left vacant due to these early retirements).

Participants allocated to the non-threat condition were presented with the following appeal:

Due to the recent economic climate many people have had to take early retirement. Some charitable organisations are trying to create a scheme that helps the elderly and those receiving a pension to come
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back to work in a part-time capacity, where they can work flexibly and maintain a positive sense of self. This will no doubt be of great benefit to the wellbeing of a vulnerable group in society, and jobs for new graduate should also be unaffected due to the part-time nature of this scheme (graduates could still be hired into these new positions but would be able to benefit from the experience of an older, fully trained employee).

This vignette was then followed by the 10 donation proclivity items (short and long-term helping) and the perceived similarity item.

7.6.5 Results

Manipulation check A manipulation check was conducted by generating a mean score from 3 items that required participants to rate their level of agreement with the theme of the vignette they read. The empathy condition had items such as ‘I feel that students can easily empathise with other students’, ‘I don’t think students share a general sense of community’ (reverse scored), and ‘I am glad that students are seen as generous to those they feel similar to’. The responsibility condition had items such as ‘I feel students are dependable’, ‘I think students shy away from their responsibilities’ (reverse scored) and ‘I am glad that students are seen as willing to take responsibility for others’.

Participants who scored a mean score of below 3 in their self-reports over all three items were excluded from the analysis. (4 participants were removed).

Interactions A Two-way ANOVA on overall donation proclivity showed a significant interaction between primed condition and target groups, $F (96) = 8.53, p = .004$. There was no main effect of primed condition, $F (96) = 1.45, p = .231$. There was also no main effect of target group, $F (96) = 1.37, p = .244$.

A priori hypotheses There was no difference in overall donations between empathy ($M = 4.22, S.D. = 1.22$) and responsibility ($M= 3.80, S.D. = 1.13$) conditions, $t (46) = 1.239, p = 0.222$, in the Non-Threat condition. However in the Threat condition, participants in the responsibility condition were seen to give significantly more overall donations ($M = 4.81, S.D.= 1.22$) than those in the empathy condition ($M = 3.75, S.D = 1.23$), $t (46) = -2.860, p < 0.01$, both
Figure 7.2: Results per condition - Study 5 - Means for Donation Proclivity in Empathy and Responsibility condition.

Table 7.2: Inter-group Threat Study: Means, standard deviation for all 4 conditions for Study 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Donation</td>
<td>3.75(1.23)</td>
<td>4.81(1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>4.72(1.32)</td>
<td>5.58(1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>3.18(1.31)</td>
<td>4.29(1.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-threat</td>
<td>4.22(1.22)</td>
<td>3.80(1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Donation</td>
<td>4.08(1.31)</td>
<td>3.05(1.16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in terms of short-term helping, $t(46) = -2.539, p < 0.05$ and long-term helping, $t(46) = -2.722, p < 0.01$.

The was no difference in the empathy condition in levels of willingness to donate in general to the threatening group ($M = 3.79$, S.D. = 1.23) than the non-threatening group ($M = 4.22$, S.D. = 1.22), $t(46) = -1.213, p = .231$. Nor was there a difference in levels of willingness to give specifically long-term help or short-term help to either threatening or non-threatening group.

In the responsibility condition the group that posed a threat received significantly more overall donations ($M=4.80$, S.D.=1.22) than the non-threatening group, ($M=3.80$, S.D.=1.13), $t(46) = 2.954, p < 0.01$; and the threatening group also received more long-term donations ($M= 4.29$, S.D. 1.50) than the non-threatening group ($M= 3.04$, S.D.= 1.16), $t(46) = -2.722, p < 0.01$.

7.7 Discussion

Study 5 constitutes the final study in this mixed methods investigation of the role of empathy and responsibility in helping behaviours. The inductive exploratory nature of the first qualitative study, Study 1, allowed for the identification of two important ways in which people talk about helping: via empathy and responsibility. Study 2 was the first of 4 quantitative studies. It aimed to develop a measure of responsibility as based on the understandings gained from Study 1, but also it aimed to address the 2nd of three sub-questions presented in Chapter 2: whether empathic concern and responsibility have a unique impact on helping and whether they present as independent pathways towards eventual intentions to help.

Building on the results of both Study 1 and 2, three experimental studies were conducted. Study 3 examined the impact of priming empathy and responsibility as integral parts of the participant’s ingroup identity on willingness to help a needy group presented as to blame for their situation. Study 4 examined the same priming effect, however here the targets were presented as either ingroup or outgroup members (and innocent of their fate). The final study, Study 5, shifted to a fully intergroup focus, and investigated the effect of priming empathy and responsibility on intentions to help an outgroup that poses as threatening. The
overarching research question of this thesis was to understand the roles empathy and responsibility play in helping behaviours, and these 5 studies have attempted to untangle both concepts and examine their influence on intentions to help in comparison to each other.

The findings of this final study suggest that priming responsibility as a normative aspect of a participant’s group identity leads to giving in a costly situation, whereby priming empathy does not result in same. In the threatening condition those primed with responsibility gave significantly more than those primed with empathy. One possible interpretation of this result is that responsibility leads to ‘stepping up to the mark’ when a vulnerable group requires help (even at one’s own group’s expense) and in particular leads to a commitment to help that is other-oriented. This is akin to a concept of doing one’s duty, and also resonates with the elements of non-judgemental and non-biased nature of the responsibility prime in Study 3 and 4. Here however it is possible that responsibility is also self-sacrificing, to the extent that it will result in helping a group that poses as a threat and therefore could be framed as costly helping. These results will now be discussed more fully in relation to the intergroup literature.

7.7.1 SIT, Identity threat and helping

When individuals’ membership in a group becomes salient, “a positive social identity becomes the ultimate goal of the group” (Marques & Paez, 1994). From a social identity theory perspective, issues of stability and legitimacy have to be taken into consideration when acting out of your identity in an intergroup context. Traditional SIT studies that examine intergroup helping promote ingroup bias and favouritism (Levine et al., 2005) and outgroup derogation (Cuddy, Rock & Norton, 2007). However, the identity threat literature has suggested that when a social identity is threatened groups may in fact offer help in order to maintain, regain or enhance their sense of a positive social identity (Hopkins et al., 2007; van Leeuwan, 2007).

Social identity contingencies can be viewed as “vulnerabilities or opportunities” that a group member may expect to face in a situation based on their particular social identity (Purdie-Vaughans, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, & Crosby,
One interpretation of the results from Study 5 is that such “contingencies” as they relate to one’s social identity are viewed as vulnerabilities in the empathy condition, but as opportunities in the responsibility condition. Put more simply, when primed with an empathic group identity a threat is seen as a negative event and does not result in help being offered to the threatening group as it too costly. In contrast, when responsibility is primed as an important and normative aspect of the group’s identity, a threat is viewed as an opportunity to act out of that identity (as responsible) regardless of the cost.

### 7.7.2 Volunteer role identity

In van Leeuwen’s study (2007) the phenomenon under investigation was how identity threat impacted helping on a dimension that was relevant to the content of that identity (the Dutch identity and water management expertise). Piliavin and colleagues work on the volunteer role identity, as an aspect of a social identity that over times become integral to the sense of self (Grube & Piliavin, 2000), would also suggest that help such as volunteering occurs because helping becomes an identity-relevant aspect for the volunteers, regarding specifically the content of a volunteer identity. It is then possible perhaps that in the responsibility condition, as students with a primed identity content of self-ascribed responsibility, they are also helping on an identity-relevant dimension by giving donations, and donations that are long-term in nature (as opposed to the previously claimed “superficiality” of empathy-based helping in Neuber et al., 1997).

This interpretation would suggest responsibility as an aspect of identity requires that participants help, whereas empathy as an aspect of identity can function on the basis of certain criteria - criteria necessary to invoke such an emotion, such as similarity, shared experience or absence of blame and threat. The meaning of the identity primed in individuals as responsible may have made salient the underlying attributes of such an identity: duty-bound, obliged to help the vulnerable to the point of self-sacrifice. In the empathy condition, the meaning associated with this as an important aspect of the ingroup’s identity may not necessarily require self-sacrifice or helping when the emotion is not invoked.
7.7.3 Nadler’s model of helping

Regarding the strategic side of helping put forward by Nadler’s model of help as based on status relations (Nadler, 2002) these results would suggest that responsibility-motivated helping in this intergroup threat situation is not led by strategic defensive helping as Nadler’s work would suggest, but by the norm of responsibility and obligation to help. Helping can be seen here to be due to compliance with normative aspects of an identity (e.g. Warburton & Terry, 2000) as discussed in the previous section. Of course within the concept of responsibility lies an element of control, as agency, duty and ability endow a certain level of control on he who is responsible. However it would require further investigation to find support for this element of responsibility (power or control) above and beyond speculation. In so far as these results can be interpreted, responsibility as an aspect of the ingroup’s identity lead to helping a threatening group in the form of both long- and short-term donations.

7.8 Limitations

There are some limitations to this study. Firstly, willingness to give long- or short-term donations did not appear to differ much across the conditions either primed with empathy or responsibility, and when the target group presented as threatening or non-threatening. This could be a sample-size issue, or more likely it is due to the nature of the long- and short-term helping items. Each item, while they implied the duration and extent of helping required by a participant, were not extremely overt in evidencing the differences between both forms of helping (i.e. they implicitly indicated long or short term duration, but did not explicitly state that this is what the helping would entail). Perhaps future research could develop further these two facets of the measure of donation proclivity and determine their relationship with empathy, responsibility and a threatening target group more fully.

A further limitation of this and the previous studies is that, while it makes predictions and has found support for those predictions as based on differences between empathy and responsibility and their impact on helping behaviours, the
behaviour itself is not actually measured. The dependent variable in these studies is a self-report measure of willingness to donate. Thus in so far as these studies may predict intentions to help, a further study would be necessary to consolidate these findings in a real-world setting or in a controlled setting that includes a behavioural measure such as a donation box of some description.

However these limitations, while restricting their predictive power to intentions to donate as opposed to actual observed behaviours, do not detract from the consistency with which differences between the primed identity of empathic or responsible could be seen in relation to their responses to helping situations that presented target groups as blameworthy (Study 3), outgroup members (Study 4), or those who pose as threatening (Study 5).
Chapter 8

Discussion & Conclusions

This final chapter presents some conclusions that can be drawn from the results of the empirical investigations of this thesis and discusses several ways in which these findings may be interpreted. It will first review the initial rationale for the overarching research question of this mixed-methods investigation. A brief summary of the findings will then be presented. Theoretical contributions will be discussed in terms of how the findings relate to discursive and qualitative investigations, but also to the previous literature initially reviewed at three discrete levels of analysis; individual, intergroup and intergroup. Interpretations of the findings of the empirical studies in this thesis identified several ways in which this research on the role of understandings of responsibility in shaping charitable giving contributes to previous research. Understanding charitable giving in terms of responsibility brings a separate set of considerations into play. Negotiation of these considerations to enable successful collective giving suggests that this type of giving (motivated by responsibility) could potentially differ from that based on empathy in the following ways. It appears in some cases as self-sacrificing, as non-discriminatory, and could potentially prime a collective identity more so than empathic concern.

These contributions work towards a final consideration that will subsequently be discussed: whether helping is about who the helper is, or who the recipient is. These findings will then be applied and discussed in terms of their practical implications for charitable organisations. The limitations of these studies will be noted, which highlight the need for further investigation of this topic. Therefore
the final section of this chapter will provide some tentative suggestions as to what might prove fruitful and socially consequential avenues for future investigations.

8.1 Overview of initial research question

The review of the literature on helping behaviour as put forward in chapter 2 looked at this phenomenon at three discrete levels; individual, intragroup and intergroup. Several key theoretical assertions and prominent studies were presented at each level as they related to helping. At an individual level it was found that empathic concern was an important factor in any helping relationship. The debate around its egoistic or altruistic basis has dominated the area and other suggested factors have been largely overlooked (Batson, Lishner, Cook, & Sawyer, 2005; Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010). At this individual level, Wilhelm and Bekker’s principle of care was considered a matured, logically-driven moral duty after a more youthful tendency toward empathic concern is outgrown. Also Batson’s (Batson et al., 2005) later position on the role of protection and nurturing tendencies as motivations to help was presented as another form of empathic concern. Thus, at this individual level, empathic concern could be seen as holding a monopoly in terms of factors affecting helping decisions, to the exclusion of other potentially more complex but no less important considerations.

Concerning empathy, and what extends in its importance to the intragroup level, is the route or process through which empathic-helping motivations are facilitated - perceptions of similarity. At an intragroup level, social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categroisation theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherell, 1987) posit that ingroup bias and favouritism would lead to ingroup members, being perceived as similar and interchangeable with the self, as recipients of a greater amount of help. This phenomenon was also evident when groups were re-categorised into higher levels of abstraction, as Levine and Thompson’s study found when participants’ identity as British or European was made salient, and they were subsequently asked to report intentions to help after a crisis in Europe or South America (Levine & Thompson, 2004). This study also indicated the potentially important role of other elements outside of empathy, as the authors suggest that extending the boundaries of group membership also
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increases the amount of obligation felt for this group; such that “when such an identity is salient (extended group boundaries and more inclusive identity) they still feel some kind of obligation or responsibility for events” (p. 241).

Thus while perceptions of similarity appear to be closely linked to empathic concern, and empathy is put forward as an integral route toward helping from both individual and intragroup perspectives, the concept of self-ascribed responsibility has started to come to the forefront, albeit often under a different name. Nurturance, principle of care, and extended group boundaries leading to a “sense of responsibility” (Levine & Thompson, 2004, p. 233) as prominent factors in the social psychological study of helping behaviours necessitated further investigation, such that responsibility be investigated in a systematic and direct way.

These considerations, the problem of perceived similarity, the impact of empathy and the potentially important role of responsibility are also a concern when intergroup helping behaviour is examined. Nadler’s (2002) model of intergroup helping as status relations suggests that while a dominant group will offer help to a subordinate group through strategic means, via defensive helping (Nadler, Harpaz-Gorodeisky, & Ben-David, 2009) or dependency-oriented helping (Nadler & Halabi, 2006), it also suggests that the ability to help is acknowledged and the long-term dependency in many intergroup situations could lead to helping outside of a view of helping as a mechanism of control. Moreover, although perceptions of similarity remain a concern for individual and intragroup level analyses of helping behaviours, be that through empathic concern or shared group membership and interchangeability, it becomes problematic at an intergroup level when matters of identity threat (a threat to positive distinctiveness, positive social identity, or status hierarchy) arise.

Although some authors clearly see the value of considering aspects of long-term, other-oriented, duty-bound helping, this has not been systematically explored. As such, this thesis set about addressing some of these concerns, by first gaining a better understanding of how responsibility is understood and negotiated in talk and subsequently attempting to explore the relationships between these factors and helping behaviour (charitable donations in particular) in order to determine the nature of the relationships between donor and recipient in situations of increased helping, and how such increases can be brought about: via an
increase in empathic concern through perceived similarity, or through the novel and previously unexplored but multifaceted and complex route of responsibility.

Ultimately this thesis has hoped to address some of the concerns regarding how the helper’s understanding of the relationship between themselves and their recipient can impact upon the decision to help, and the roles empathy and responsibility can play in this understanding.

**8.2 Research Questions**

The main questions asked of this thesis were thus:

1. Given the lack of a comprehensive or systematic understanding of responsibility in the literature: How do people themselves understand and use the concept of responsibility as it applies to charitable behaviour, what consequences does it have for their thought, talk and charitable behaviour and how are these different from other ways of understanding the reasons to give to charity such as empathy?

2. From Study 1 how do perceptions of responsibility for a charitable target affect charitable giving independently of feelings of empathy?

3. Are the effects of reported empathy and responsibility on charitable giving systematically affected by the characteristics of the outgroup and what implications does this have for charitable giving more generally? More specifically, by priming normative aspects of a group’s identity as empathetic or as responsible, will this impact on giving when the target group is manipulated to present as blameworthy, as an outgroup, or as posing a threat to the ingroup donor?

**8.3 Contribution to discursive approaches**

In adopting a pragmatic mixed methods approach (Morgan, 2007) to this investigation, the nature by which people understand these concepts in their everyday
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talk and negotiate them as concerns when choosing to help or donate was first ex-
amined. This approach was chosen as best placed to explore how people in their
talk display their understandings of such complex concerns as similarity, empathy
and ultimately responsibility, to see what considerations are involved for speak-
ers when deciding to donate. Similar to Stevenson and Manning’s (2010) study
the speakers here oriented to charitable giving as a highly accountable matter
and worked hard in the interviews to present themselves in a positive light and
maintain an identity as a moral agent. In addition, in this study the repertoires
of empathy and responsibility were identified as rhetorical resources drawn upon
by speakers at specific points in the interactions to help accomplish an account
of giving or withholding aid.

In the empathy repertoire, inference-laden categories that implied similarity
or dissimilarity (or even over-similarity in some cases) were deployed to serve
whatever function was necessary in that particular context. And what was strik-
ing was, in contrast to the responsibility repertoire, the categories deployed were
all associated with the recipient group, and the discursive business being done
was to construct specific versions of the recipient group as worthy of empathy
and giving or not. Conversely, in the responsibility repertoire speakers did not
focus exclusively on the characteristics of the recipient but on the characteristics
of both giver and receiver and on the relationship of obligation between them.
The consequentiality of talk and deployment of different resources is the main
benefit of such an analytic method, as in the responsibility repertoire giving was
depicted as independent of one’s own feelings whereas in the empathy repertoire
donations could be withheld on the basis of a lack of similarity or inability on the
part of the recipient to instigate such feelings.

As previous discursive and qualitative work has shown, responsibility can form
part of an ideological dilemma to be negotiated in the talk of giving. Responsi-
bility is an important consideration, as evidenced in talk, and while these studies
have suggested its importance until now there has not been a specific focus on
responsibility as a discrete repertoire.

Nor has there been a subsequent examination therefore of how it is used and
to what ends. In an investigation of online discourse, Gibson demonstrated how
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Responsibility-talk could be invoked when posters were arguing that the government should be responsible for monitoring and protecting against fraudulent claims. This resonates with the construction by participants in Study 1 of this thesis of those who were not in receipt of help: as overly similar and to blame for their circumstances. Gibson’s (2009) speakers make relevant similar opportunities, and this aspect of a lack of warranted empathy overlaps with concepts of responsibility in terms of blame-attribution. Gibson (2011) also produced further work on how responsibility can be negotiated in talk, but, as opposed to the blame dimension this work focused on self-ascribed responsibility as an accountable citizen.

The first study of this thesis therefore builds on Gibson’s work on responsibility. It demonstrates how responsibility is a discrete resource to be used in the talk of charitable giving and helping behaviour. Moreover, it illustrates how it differs to other helping-related resources, such as empathic concern, by identifying instances in which it is used and for what purpose. While empathy was invoked in reference to talk of feeling-related decisions to give and personal experience, responsibility was invoked comparatively in rational and non-emotive ways. In addition to the blame-attribution element of responsibility acknowledged and discussed in the work of Gibson (2009), a further dimension was evidenced in this thesis’ participants’ talk - attributing responsibility to themselves to help and also to a third party to help (in ways that did not centre on blame).

The types of helping that speakers can orient towards in talk can further signify their use of a responsibility-driven repertoire. In this study (Study 1), as in the work of Stevenson and Manning (2010), autonomy-oriented helping was made relevant. Also, while the role of national norms was highlighted in the talk of Stevenson and Manning’s participants, in this thesis the norm of responsibility was also oriented to when charity workers claimed responsibility in their accounts of giving as their professional norm of duty.

This idea of displaying or working up the norms of a group to account for helping is further illustrated in the work of Reicher and colleagues (Reicher, Cassidy, Hopkins, & Levine, 2006) whereby the moral norm of duty to help and protect the Bulgarian Jews was used to successfully encourage responsibility throughout the nation. This paper was focused largely on ingroup inclusion and helping.
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It also suggested that defining the group as responsible would help the Jewish population. Here we look at how this works when the identity of the group is defined in terms of responsibility and how this operates under conditions where the relationship with the target is different.

To review, responsibility has been a feature of previous discursive work on helping behaviours. However, this literature has not systematically looked at it as a stand-alone and interesting way in which people accomplish being helpful or charitable. Moreover, the very fact that it features in several of these previous works albeit in the guise of some other name indicates that people do use it in their talk. Therefore the first study of this thesis attempted to look more directly at its use, as well as how empathy and similarity were invoked in talk. The findings suggest that it is an important factor in helping over and above the way in which it is used in discursive interactions.

In such a semi-public forum (De Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 1999) as the multiple participant interviews offer members of the general public drew on responsibility in the justifications and negotiations as charitable giving is essentially an accountable matter. While responsibility in terms of the elements of blame-attribution were evidenced in Gibson’s work, the participants were online posters, which affords an anonymity that can overcome many considerations or concerns for the consequences of their talk. However here we can see responsibility being used in an accountable manner and used reflexively as a resource to justify blame and accountability. Gibson has noted this in his work, but with Study 1 it is evident now that responsibility is seen to be a discrete repertoire with distinct implications for its use in talk.

8.4 Theoretical contributions

From previous literature and the first qualitative study of this thesis it was found that people use responsibility in their everyday accounting. These findings allowed for the generation of several hypotheses at three different levels of analysis. Thus that empathy and responsibility would predict intentions to help through separate and independent pathways; As a measured construct, empathy may predict giving behaviour under some conditions and not others, namely a situation
whereby the target ingroup could be perceived as to blame for their fate, where
the target is an outgroup, or where the target poses a threat to the ingroup’s
identity via a threat to resources. Responsibility was predicted to be more con-
sistent and to not take the same considerations as empathic concern would into
account in a giving situation.

Finding support for these predictions via survey and experimental data in-
dicates that under some circumstances, responsibility can be a better predictor
of charitable giving than empathy. From an individual level of analysis, a bet-
ter understanding of responsibility can contribute to the debate around altruistic
or egoistic forms of helping as it could potentially be seen as an altruistic or
self-sacrificing motivation under certain conditions. From an intragroup level
of analysis, this understanding can contribute to a social identity perspective on
helping when comparing the conditions under which responsibility will give to the
criteria necessary for empathic concern to result in giving, which appears to show
more of an ingroup bias. Finally these findings would suggest that responsibility
diffs from empathy by way of its ability or even tendency to prime a collective
identity. At an intergroup level of analysis, the individualistic nature of empathy
as a potential predictor of helping can be compared to the collective nature of
responsibility as a potential predictor, and the individualistic side of empathic
concern can be used to illustrate how responsibility can prime identification at a
higher level of abstraction.

These three criteria as the key dimensions of responsibility that demonstrate
its impact on helping and also how it differs from the concept of empathy will be
discussed in light of and in relation to the three discrete levels of analysis to which
they are most relevant: individual, intragroup and intergroup levels respectively.

8.5 Individual level of analysis

Much of the evolutionary and bio-psychological perspectives on helping rested
on empathic concern outside of survival mechanism (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, &
Schroeder, 2005). A developmental psychological approach has also promoted em-
pathy as a precursor to helping (Barnett, 1994). Batson’s studies (1991; Batson
et al., 1991) demonstrated the many ways in which empathy could be invoked,
perspective taking and perceived similarity among them. However, this led to questions around the altruistic or egoistic basis of empathy-motivated helping, oftentimes to the exclusion of investigating other potential considerations outside of an emotionally driven motivation to help. These studies spanned distress, sadness, guilt, and oneness, but the crux remained their relationship to empathy and subsequently how this might impact on decisions to help.

Thus a gap or a limitation was identified at this individual level of analysis that required further investigation: namely, how other potential considerations could be useful to understanding what influences helping behaviours. Batson (Batson et al., 2005) began to examine other precursors to helping, such as nurturant tendencies, and Wilhelm and Bekkers (2010) also examined what they termed principle of care. However while nurturance, protection and principles of helping could potentially be associated with a broad and popular understanding of the concept of responsibility, they were investigated in relation to their association with empathic concern. Batson suggested that nurturant tendencies were simply another form of empathic concern, another facet of a complex concept. Wilhelm and Bekkers suggested that empathic concern mediated the relationship between principle of care and helping. Thus other possible explanations were not explored.

The findings of this thesis, having explored responsibility and empathy as independent routes to helping, would suggest that both differ in terms of their motivations. The following section will provide one interpretation of these results as they relate to the concerns at an individual level of analysis.

8.5.1 Responsibility as potentially altruistic?

Much of the individual and interpersonal literature on precursors to helping centre on whether or not these constitute altruistic or egoistic motivations. One way of looking at the constructs under investigation throughout this thesis, and interpreting the results is to discuss where responsibility would sit on the egoism-altruism spectrum.

Batson (Batson et al., 1991) has promoted empathy-driven helping as altruistic in nature. Altruism is “a motivated state with the ultimate goal of increasing
another’s welfare” (p. 6), and it is acknowledged that motivation to help is altruistic “to the degree that it is evoked by an empathic emotional response to the victim’s distress” (Batson et al., 1991, p. 6). While empathy may not be egoistic, not all empathy-based talk (giving and not giving as accounted for by drawing on the empathy repertoire in Study 1) could be construed as altruistic, and furthermore the experimental findings would suggest that the context-dependent nature of empathy-motivated helping (where empathy was primed as the ingroup norm) imply that such empathic concern is quite closely tied to self-concern. Indeed in his early work Batson did present an understanding of empathy as a fragile flower “easily crushed by self-concern” (Batson, O’Quin, Fultz, Vanderplas, & Isen, 1983, p. 718) and Neuberg and colleagues have hinted at its superficial nature (Neuberg et al., 1997).

Within this egoism-altruism debate, where might responsibility fit? Based on the exploratory findings of this thesis, one suggestion would be that responsibility has an altruistic basis. The self-sacrificing element of altruism is often evident in experimental settings that demonstrate a costly helping situation. While Batson’s (Batson et al., 1983) study found empathic concern lead to increased help in costly situations, this was when a high level of empathy primed in participants was compared to a lower level.

This thesis systematically compared the impact of empathic concern as a normative aspect of the ingroup’s identity to responsibility as part of the ingroup’s identity, and when this is the comparative context (as opposed to high or low levels of empathy) responsibility might be construed as an altruistic influence. This was seen across the experimental studies whereby responsibility consistently demonstrated self-sacrificing tendencies in willingness to help groups that traditionally could be viewed as unworthy at best (blame-worthy for example, study 3) or even harmful at worst (posing a threat to the ingroup for example, Study 5). The priming of responsibility resulted in a lack of self-concern and willingness to give despite a lack of deservingness on the part of the recipient group (Study 3). It also resulted in a lack of ingroup bias and a willingness to give despite outgroup member status (Study 4). Finally priming responsibility led to self-sacrificing acts of helping a group that could either be harmful to the ingroup in terms of maintaining a positive social identity (e.g. black sheep effect, Marques.
8.6 The intragroup level

Studies have shown that people display an ingroup bias and favouritism to those who identify as ingroup members (Tajfel, Turner, Billig & Flament, 1971) and subsequently will be more likely to help those ingroup members (Levine, Prosser, Evans, & Reicher, 2005). Studies also demonstrate how outgroup derogation and dehumanisation of outgroup members can lead to less reported intentions to help (Cuddy, Rock & Norton, 2007). While this presents as a straightforward argument, complications arise when group distinctiveness (Brewer, 1991) and the ability to maintain a positive social identity (Marques et al., 1998) are under threat. This can cause perceptions of similarity to result in less willingness to help.

Similarity can be viewed therefore as somewhat contradictory, especially building on individual-level studies that promote empathy based on similarity as an integral predictor of helping behaviours (Batson et al., 1991) and that empathic concern can also overcome issues of blame (Batson, Early, & Salvarani, 1997).
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From the intragroup perspective, empathic concern was not seen to impact on helping when the ingroup boundaries were extended (Levine & Thompson, 2004).

Thus this thesis attempted to re-address these issues by priming empathy and responsibility in an intragroup context (Study 3) and examining how both would influence decisions to donate when the target presented as a member of the ingroup but either to blame for their situation or not (as blame is often confounded with perceptions of over-similarity, which was also noted in Study 1 in participants’ talk). Responsibility was found to overcome issues of blame, and resulted in greater intentions to donate than empathic concern.

In Study 4, responsibility was seen to result in greater giving to the outgroup than empathic concern.

8.6.1 Responsibility and ingroup bias

One way of interpreting the results of these studies is from an SIT perspective. Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and its later reformulation in SCT (Turner et al., 1987) would suggest perceptions of similarity and subsequent ingroup bias leads to helping (Levine et al., 2005). However, while empathy is seen to mediate helping an ingroup member (Sturmer et al., 2005), the ingroup member must first be noted as worthy of help and not liable to damage the ingroup’s sense of positive social identity (Pinto, Marques, Levine & Abrams, 2010). Therefore, in an intragroup helping context the ability to feel empathic concern for the target group is contingent on several criteria; unproblematic ingroup membership, lack of blame-attribution, and a level of similarity that does not impinge on the positive social identity of the helper.

Regarding the suggestion that the contingent nature of empathic concern implies that it cannot predict helping in costly situations, Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner and Clark (1981) present helping as based on judgements of costliness, “the decision to help is influenced systematically by an assessment of the relative costs and rewards associated with various courses of action”. Where it appears empathic concern is susceptible to such assessments, and will report less willingness to donate in circumstances that could be construed as costly, responsibility
appears to have a different set of considerations, and when primed suggests participants continue to give regardless of the cost associated with a recipient group or helping situation. Empathy is a feelings-based motivator, and as such requires specific circumstances to invoke such an emotion. However responsibility is less inclined toward emotional considerations and thus does not rely on such specific circumstances as necessary to result in helping.

From such an SIT perspective, ingroup bias and ingroup favouritism can therefore facilitate empathic concern and giving. However outgroup derogation is often framed as the reverse of or the consequence of ingroup favouritism. An approach that emphasises the positive role of responsibility in helping situations would appear to be predictive of sentiments of responsibility for one’s own ingroup but also the possibility that such a moral and non-emotive motivation could overcome group boundaries and also overcome blame attribution of fellow members within their own group boundaries, to result in helping. This would suggest that responsibility is not susceptible to in-group bias.

Self-categorisation studies support this argument, and indicate that responsibility could in fact be a better predictor of helping when ingroup boundaries are extended (Levine & Thompson, 2004), whereas empathic concern is not seen to have an effect on helping intentions in such contexts. Perhaps this is because over-similarity can often lead to perceptions of identity threat (Brown & Lopez, 2001) and empathic concern does not appear strong enough to overcome this threat and will still discriminate. Threat might eliminate the potential for compassionate and empathic emotions.

To sum, empathy is therefore contingent on ingroup membership and perceptions of similarity. However, this similarity can oftentimes present as problematic, in terms of Brewer’s optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991) and also in terms of the black sheep effect (Pinto et al., 2010). Conversely, responsibility is seen to predict helping members of the ingroup, but importantly ingroup membership can be granted unproblematically due to an extension of the ingroup boundaries (Levine & Thompson, 2004). Moreover, responsibility could therefore be construed as a rational and dutiful approach to helping, as opposed to ingroup bias, as ingroup membership (unlike with empathic concern) is not a necessary criterion for helping. Therefore, another important dimension of responsibility
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that differentiates it from the features of empathic concern and therefore predicts different process of decisions to donate is that from an SIT perspective it has another set of considerations outside of ingroup bias and favouritism.

8.7 The Intergroup Perspective

At an intergroup level of analysis, perceived similarity is not seen to be a positive precursor to helping behaviours as issues of power dynamics and status relations come to the fore (Brown & Lopez, 2001). When similarity does lead to helping, it is often in the form of dependency-oriented help (Nadler et al., 2009). Moreover, at an intergroup level of analysis people are seen to give on the basis of strategic concerns about their identity - identity enhancement (Hopkins et al., 2007) or restoration following an identity threat (vanLeeuwan, 2007). Empathic concern is not considered at this level of analysis, with the exception of studies such as Sturmer and colleagues (Sturmer, Snyder & Omoto, 2005) whereby they look at the impact empathy can have on ingroup helping in comparison to the impact of attraction on outgroup helping. Furthermore, investigations that focus on power relations, strategy and control as motivations for helping neglect the potentially important role of responsibility as a consideration.

Study 4 primed empathy and responsibility and resulted in responsible participants reporting greater intentions to help an outgroup member, and Study 5 resulted in responsible participant reporting greater willingness to help a member of a group that posed as threatening. This was in contrast to empathy, which did not appear to predict helping in these two particular intergroup contexts. One suggested interpretation for this, beyond the potentially altruistic nature of responsibility or perhaps the non-biased nature of responsibility, is that empathy may instigate relating with a recipient at individual level, but priming responsibility as an aspect of an identity promotes relating at a collective or group level. Empathy could be interpreted as an aspect of identity that primes individuality, whereas the opposite might be said for responsibility.
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8.7.1 Empathy as individualistic, responsibility as collective

This way of interpreting the results, however, involves pitting individual against intergroup levels of analysis to examine when each concept (empathy and responsibility) as forming part of a participant’s identity can and will lead to greater intentions to donate. Regarding the emergency helping paradigm involving diffusion of responsibility (Latané & Darley, 1968), this thesis’s findings could suggest that when self-ascribed responsibility is a factor and diffusion is overcome through an acknowledgment of this self-ascribed responsibility, it can successfully predict helping intentions across a range of contexts. A divergent finding counters the traditional bystander effect by demonstrating the willingness of participants to intervene more in the presence of others when the situation involved a perpetrator violating social norms such as littering or antisocial behaviour (Chekroun & Brauer, 2002). Such a reversal of the bystander effect could in theory be attributed to a reversal in the phenomenon of diffusion of responsibility, suggesting that perhaps social identity content is important. Moreover it also suggests that antisocial behaviour affect groups of people as a collective and as citizens, not just as individuals. This can be viewed in contrast to a mugging incident, or a victim falling over for example. Subsequently their responses to intervene could stem from their salient identities as a responsible group or responsible citizens, and thus a collective duty to act.

In fact, previous research that focuses specifically on ecological behaviour has found that such self-ascribed responsibility can be divided into two main forms: moral responsibility (which was found to involve guilt, and was a better predictor of positive behaviour towards the environment) and conventional responsibility (which involved social expectations and the acknowledgement that social actors must fulfil these expectations) (Kaiser & Shimoda, 1999). This line of investigation was explored in the experimental studies presented throughout this thesis by looking at the impact of responsibility as a normative aspect of a group’s social identity (as a manipulated variable that could also prime participants to view themselves as responsible member of their group) on donation behaviours in different contexts (and in comparison to empathy as part of a group identity).
Responsibility as an aspect of a group’s identity appears to invoke a stronger need to rise above group differences or concerns of threat and help, more so than when empathy is an aspect of a group’s identity. Halabi and colleagues suggest that identity content is relevant in helping situations; “Under different circumstances, alternative meanings may become salient. For instance, helping opportunities may be viewed differently as a function of stereotypic expectations of outgroup and ingroup members” (Halabi, Dovidio & Nadler, 2008, p. 856). These stereotypic expectations relate to the group’s norms, characteristics and identity-related behaviours.

This thesis’s investigations would thus lead to the proposition that responsibility as forming part of or an aspect of one’s identity is collective in nature. It promotes a rational sense of duty, highlights the group’s sense of responsibility, and makes salient the collective ability and agency of the group member in terms of helping. In contrast, empathy as a group norm appears to prime a more localised and individualistic approach to the helping situation, whereby even as a group norm members are required to engage with and feel at a personal level for the recipient.

The issue of the nature of empathic concern as an aspect of a social identity is its tendency as a concept to be more useful in helping situations that are interpersonal or inter-individual (Batson et al., 1997). On the other hand, self-ascribed responsibility appears to lend itself to an intergroup context more readily, and promotes a sense of collective group action, possibly in order to maintain this sense of ingroup responsibility (as is the case with a volunteer role identity, Grube & Piliavin, 2000). This way of framing responsibility, as a collective ingroup identity resonates with Kaiser and Shimoda’s (Kaiser & Shimoda, 1999) aforementioned term of conventional responsibility: where “feelings depend on the social expectations a person is aware of and his or her readiness to fulfil these expectations” (p. 243).

Batson and colleagues have also expressed the same concern: that the results of individual-level studies of the impact of empathy would not generalise to a social-psychological group-level framing. “Empathy is typically felt for individuals as individuals, not for groups or abstract classes of people” (Batson et al., 1997, p. 106). As Weiner had posited (1985) from an individual perspective, it
is apparently easier to empathise with someone who is not responsible for their plight or their situation of need, someone who could be construed (as those in Study 4) to be innocent of their fate. This theorising about the impact of empathy would imply that empathic concern can predict helping in a wide range of circumstances, provided the helping is framed as inter-personal or inter-individual. However, once the level of analysis shifts to an intra- or intergroup context, empathic concern is as Batson (Batson et al., 1983) referred to it, a “fragile flower” that loses its predictive power in costly circumstances.

However, the findings from this thesis and previous literature in the area of intergroup helping would suggest that responsibility could operate at a group level and predict helping in many circumstances, including those perceived to be costly at such a group level: blameworthy recipients, outgroup recipients, recipients that pose as threatening.

This is further supported by Brown and Lopez’s (2001) theoretical argument that identity threat is an issue at an intergroup level as opposed to an inter-personal level. They suggest that this is because interpersonal similarity can be seen to promote helping via empathic concern, whereas there are more complex concerns at an intergroup level that can instigate a threat to the identity of the group and similarity exacerbates this threat (unlike at an interpersonal level where empathy via similarity proves more influential). Thus increased perceptions of similarity and empathy may predict helping in interpersonal settings, but does not transfer to group level settings, where responsibility has more of a positive impact. This illustrates once again the broader point that responsibility has the tendency to be understood by participants as priming a collective identity and thus acting out of this identity at a group level.

8.8 Is helping about who you are, or who I am?

A final overarching question has therefore been raised by the investigations presented in this thesis. If the three aspects of responsibility as a predictor of helping behaviours that make it different from empathy are that it could be construed as
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a more consistent predictor in costly situations, that it does not appear to discriminate in relation to SIT-based ingroup bias, and that it primes participants to act out of a collective identity, then a final point for discussion is thus: Is helping about who you are, or who I am?

Instability is a fundamental dimension in the social identity-based model of helping that Nadler presents (2002), and the economic climate as the background for Study 5 of this thesis could be construed as unstable in terms of group status. Yet, building on the defensive helping theoretical framework, Nadler has demonstrated the effect of priming a common ingroup identity in such threat situations (Nadler et al., 2009). Instances in which a common identity was primed resulted in higher instances of autonomy-oriented helping. This could be due to the desire to restore a positive social identity as opposed to simply positive group distinctiveness. Therefore priming responsibility as forming part of a social identity requires participants to think about themselves as duty-bound regardless of who the recipient is.

Wohl and Branscombe (2005) examined negative group values as a form of threat, in that when group values were perceived as less moral this engendered feelings of unworthiness in ingroup members. This highlights the importance of values and attributes of the helper in certain contexts. This has implications for the content of a primed identity in potential helpers, and whether or not this content or aspect of identity relates to how they view themselves, or has more instructive value for how they view others.

The findings of the empirical investigations in Chapters 6 and 7 would indicate that maintaining the values and attributes associated with a group identity as responsible is more important than a group identity as empathetic. Moreover, as discussed in the previous section, the normative aspects of identity as empathic or as responsible may also prime participants to view the helping relationship through different lenses. This may result in a framing of the helping situation from either an individual perspective or an intergroup perspective.

Responsibility is more inclusive in terms of who participants will help (Levine et al., 2005). Ingroup norms were shown as an important factor in mobilising collective action in saving the Jewish population of Bulgaria (Reicher et al., 2006), an ingroup norm of helpfulness that was seen to be opposed to the large-scale
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oppression of any group. This concept of the impact an ingroup norm can have on a helping intervention, regardless of the recipient groups’ characteristics, is relevant for self-ascribed responsibility but is not the case with empathic concern: once again highlighting the issue of contingency, as “providing for others may reflect concerns over ones own collective interest” (Levine et al., 2005, p. 787).

If helping can accomplish strategic goals for the ingroup, such as working against a negative ingroup stereotype (Hopkins et al., 2007) it can also work to preserve or maintain a positive group stereotype or positive social identity. Strategic concerns can indeed result in helping, but in the case of responsibility it could be construed as helping to maintain and uphold aspects of the ingroup identity as they relate to duty and obligation.

Bystander intervention occurs due to physical or psychological groups that have a norm that supports a helping intervention (Horowitz, 1971; Rutkowski, Gruder, & Romer, 1983; Levine et al., 2007). As such, the way responsibility is conceptualised in this thesis is a norm that embodies duty, obligation and accountability and ability to help.

These studies, and the findings of this thesis’s mixed methods investigation, suggest that where responsibility is concerned the decision to help is primarily based on ‘my’ identity, or ‘our’ identity. This aspect of identity is presented as one of duty, obligation, ability and one that could be more consistent in relation to giving in costly situations and therefore altruistic, non-biased, and suggestive of collective action. All of these attributes relate to the character of the helper. This is in contrast to an empathetic identity and its role in the decision to help. Empathy is based on feeling similar to the recipient, feeling ‘one’ with the recipient, based on the recipient as falling within the boundaries of the ingroup, as being worthy of compassion and as not presenting as threatening in terms of their own attributes (black sheep effect, Marques et al., 1998). In comparison to responsibility, empathy appears to very much centre on the recipient of help, on who the recipient of help is, as opposed to who the help-giver is.

This contrast has implications for who will be subsequently offered help, in what context this help may be given and in what context these two norms ‘work’ best. Moreover, from a practical perspective, these contrasting aspects of identity and their opposing emphasis on the importance of the recipient and the helper or
donor, have implications for what approach to fundraising and helping should be taken to ensure increased willingness to help. This is especially important when long-term and sustained helping is under discussion, as a norm that promotes giving based on who the donor is would presumably predict a more consistent approach to giving over time as opposed to a perhaps fickle, superficial (Neuberg et al., 1997) approach to helping that centres on the recipient’s status and characteristics.

8.9 Practical implications: Can these findings be applied to charity work?

As was reviewed in the introduction chapter, charitable organisations are at present experiencing several serious problems in terms of attracting donors, raising funds, and most importantly sustaining these donations over the long-term. Donor fatigue, defined as “a state of mind in which donors have exhausted their resources, or in which they grow complacent about appeals from charities leading to diminished public response” (Brown & Minty, 2008, p. 16) is just one of the many issues facing these organisations, as mistrust in charities and lack of belief in the agency and ability of charities to make a difference come to the fore.

Therefore those working in the third sector must become increasingly innovative, creative and imaginative in terms of how they can sustain donations. However, this is not always straightforward, and many charity campaigns remain loyal and reliant on an approach that attempts to invoke compassion and empathy in their donors and target the emotions of their audience. This, however, does not provide sustained giving reliably as compassion fatigue is also a consequence of such an onslaught of emotionally-charged appeals (Kinnick, Krugman, & Cameron, 1996).

This thesis has systematically examined the effect priming an emotion, empathy, on willingness to donate to a range of target groups or fictitious charitable organisations in comparison to the effect of priming responsibility. The findings when taken together, and as have been reviewed in the previous sections, could
address some of the concerns of charities today. Responsibility can be interpreted from these results as being more altruistic, less biased and more rational in the decision to give that it results in. A suggested interpretation is also that when responsibility is invoked in individuals, it is this content of their identity that they take into consideration and act based on being responsible. Empathy, in contrast, appears to instigate a character-sketch of the recipient, in order to weigh up if the recipient is similar enough or innocent enough or non-threatening enough to invoke such an emotion before deciding to give. Therefore, these results would suggest to charitable organisation that responsibility, as promoting giving as based on who the donor is and therefore as a more reliable approach, could lead to more sustained and long-term giving that does not judge the target group and gives in a rationale manner based on duty and obligation.

Such an approach to designing appeals has begun to be noted, as with the recent UNICEF advertisement as quoted in the introductory chapter. However, this thesis provides some empirical grounding for why such appeals might work and under what conditions they are likely to be successful. On this basis such campaigns can be supported by evidence that responsibility is an important consideration in how both members of the public and charity workers talk about giving, but also that it differs from empathic concern and emotional giving, and so requires that other considerations are taken into account when developing and targeting charitable appeals.

One way in which the differing aspects of concepts of empathy and responsibility have been teased apart by charitable organisations is from a grassroots-level approach by raising awareness of issues of empathy and responsibility in young people through a school-based curriculum change. Oxfam has recently promoted an approach to raising awareness among young people of the issues this charity or NGO attempts to address through the development of a classroom-based education programme. It is called Education for Global Citizenship. As well as building on the core mission statements of Oxfam as a charity, it takes the concept of citizenship and works towards a thorough understanding of the idea of responsible citizenship across age groups of 4 and 5yrs all the way through to 18 and 19yrs. The end result is young people who can appreciate their role as a responsible citizen in an interdependent world, one in which they “exercise their
own rights and their responsibilities to others” (Oxfam, EGC guidelines, 2006, pg 2).

Along with emphasising the need for a sustainable world which would imply a long-term approach to interdependence, this programme also promotes diversity and a respect for such diversity. What is notable is the timeline through which this programme is geared to achieve its goals. The first element for “responsible Global Citizenship” (GC) involves aspects such as diversity, social justice, interdependence and sustainability. The second involves respect, co-operation, conflict resolution, and so forth. The third, however, is highly relevant to the concepts under discussion through the previous chapters of this thesis: the values and attitudes as key elements of GC include a sense of identity, empathy, and valuing diversity.

This thesis has argued for the different routes to helping that empathic concern and self-ascribed responsibility can lead through, and also the different target groups that would benefit from either motivation. Results of the latter quantitative studies would suggest that empathic concern can oftentimes lead to helping that is contingent on similarity or ingroup membership, or a non-costly situation. Responsibility, however, can oftentimes lead to helping that appears to stem from a collective and non-discriminatory motivation.

Responsibility could therefore be a key element of citizenship, an aspect that was investigated in a qualitative study by Gibson (2009). Empathic concern is also a key element of Oxfam’s approach to responsible GC. However, a closer look at the curriculum as it is presented to the different age groups indicates an understanding of the relationship between empathy and responsibility as highly similar to that put forward by Wilhelm and Bekkers (2010).

Wilhelm and Bekkers (2010) suggested, albeit from a developmental and individual-level of analysis, that empathic concern was simply a motivation to help in young children, a motivation that eventually gave way through maturation to a more rational moral duty to help, termed principal of care. The Oxfam curriculum would suggest something similar. In the ‘Values and Attitudes’ area of development, the key element called ‘Empathy and a sense of common humanity’ progresses in the following way: In the foundation stages, children under 5 are encouraged to be concerned for ‘others in the immediate circle’ (ingroup favouritism
so-to-speak). At Stage 2 children are taught ‘empathy towards others, locally and globally’; By Stages 4 and 5, ages 14-16 and 16-19, the key learning outcomes are ‘sense of common humanity’ (similar to a SCT approach to identifying at a higher level of abstraction perhaps) and ‘sense of individual and collective responsibility’ (akin to the collective norm primed by self-ascribed responsibility in this thesis). This progression mirrors the explanation put forward by Wilhelm and Bekkers that implies empathic concern is a feeling that is present in a less-cognitively developed population (young children) but that helping (in Oxfam’s case awareness of citizenship and interdependence) is better predicted by the rational and moral principle of care presented by Oxfam’s education programme and this thesis as responsibility.

This is also directly relevant to the studies presented in Chapters 6 and 7 of this thesis. The primed identity of empathetic and responsible led to helping different target groups; however, it was responsibility that was most predictive of helping across all situations - the type of helping one might see if the identity of global citizen was salient. Indeed, one of the suggestions within this discussion chapter is that, while empathic concern may work as an individual norm, self-ascribed responsibility could be the result of a collective norm. Oxfam appear to be engaging with this concept, and the UNICEF advertisement quotes in Chapter 1 would also indicate that there is a recent shift within certain charitable organisations towards an understanding of the potentially powerful route to fundraising and helping that responsibility presents.

These new approaches could subsequently be explored in terms of their efficacy. Now such intuitions can be supported by theoretically and empirically grounded evidence that demonstrates the complexity of such concepts of empathy and responsibility as they relate to giving, but also the factors necessary to be manipulated in order to achieve long term sustained contributions.

8.10 Limitations

As this was a mixed methods investigation, a qualitative approach using discourse analysis was initially chosen to examine responsibility, empathy and helping in people’s own terms, to allow for an examination of the links and association
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they make and furthermore to see the importance and relevance of responsibility, empathy, and helping in people’s talk by focusing on the consequences of their use in interactions. It was also chosen in order to understand this area better, mainly due to several inconsistencies, contradictions and omissions evident in the literature on helping from an individual, intra- and intergroup level of analysis. However, there are several inherent limitations to this qualitative methodology and general epistemological approach which mean that the findings need to be considered in their local context and in relation to the subsequent quantitative studies.

Within this qualitative study (Study 1) participants’ talk about giving was rich and multifaceted. Given the theoretical focus of the research, the elements of the talk focusing on reasons for giving had to be examined at the exclusion of the many other elements of people’s talk. The focus was on ways in which participants, charity workers and members of the general public, demonstrated in their talk the diversity of ways of negotiating responsibility and empathy as resources. Therefore concerns such as religiosity, generational differences and such were not included in the analysis.

Moreover, it was subsequently necessary to examine the experimental findings on a more homogenous sample. Therefore it remains an empirical question as to what the findings might be if the quantitative studies, and also the qualitative study, were to be conducted on different samples that take such generational differences and issues of religiosity into account.

These experimental studies were conducted on a homogenous student sample as it was necessary to systematically study responsibility as a concept, in relation to empathic concern, and thus this required a somewhat controlled environment. Insofar as people make private donations to paper-based appeals, this may be realistic but as compared to real life encounters or collective discussions about charity, laboratory experiments are unlikely to have much ecological validity. Real-world contexts would need to be investigated subsequent to these controlled laboratory studies in order to fully investigate this new area of research and to further consolidate our understandings of how responsibility impacts on helping in the field. The experimental designs afforded precision to allow causal inferences to be made about the basis of behaviour and to elucidate the variables that can
or must be manipulated to result in helping behaviour. However these would need to be considered in a real-world context to fully see their effects.

This issue of a controlled environment and the limitations of not examining behaviours in the real world also signify another potential limitation to this thesis’ investigations. This limitation lies in the way in which it has investigated people’s helping behaviours in the experimental studies. While looking holistically at the way in which people do being charitable in their talk in Study 1, the subsequent studies relied on self-report measures of willingness to help in the form of Likert-scale response on intentions to donate money, old clothes, to organise fundraisers and so on (also used in Zagefka et al., 2011 for example). While several studies have found strong positive correlations between self-report and actual behaviours (e.g. Clunies-Ross, Little & Kienhuis, 2008) Baumeister has highlighted the prominence but also the limits of this method of looking at behaviours in his reproach of psychological studies today. (It appears then that) “human behaviour is almost always performed in a seated position, usually seated in front of a computer. Finger movements, as in keystrokes and pencil marks, constitute the vast majority of human action” (Baumeister, Vohs, & Funder, 2007 p. 397). Therefore this limitation of self-report measures must be acknowledged as restricting the strength with which the arguments are made in terms of responsibility and empathy leading to different levels of donating behaviour, and must be confined to predicting levels of intentions to or willingness to donate. A behavioural measure of helping such as a donation box forming part of the experimental procedure would be necessary to further consolidate the arguments as they relate to behaviour.

A final factor for consideration is that the experimental studies, while controlling for blame and measuring similarity, did not use a measure of more dispositional traits such as dispositional empathy, or dispositional responsibility. The findings therefore can only be based on situational factors of empathy and responsibly, and thus cannot take into account the impact of one’s natural disposition or tendency towards one or other of these as traits on eventual decisions to help.
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8.11 Future Directions

These limitations however do not undermine necessarily the key findings of this thesis, but do suggest that further investigation and novel ways of continuing these lines of research would be appropriate. Therefore the final section of this chapter will provide some suggestions for ways in which this research could be developed and perhaps gain further support for and deeper understandings of the important role of responsibility in charitable giving and to understand its impact in a variety of prosocial behaviours.

8.11.1 Responsibility as discourse

One domain that requires further examination is the use of responsibility in discourse. Study 1 demonstrated how empathy as a repertoire could be used strategically to account for giving or justify withholding aid, but so too was responsibility identified as a discrete resource carefully deployed to manage issues of identity and the relationship between giver and receiver. The nuances of responsibility in talk need to be looked at further. This mixed methods approach was successful in so far as it provided a grounded understanding of responsibility to be further operationalized. However, the discursive features of responsibility could be further examined in more detail.

Looking at the linguistic interactions of charity workers, charity street-collectors (‘chuggers’) and cold callers could prove useful. These encounters are often reported by people as stressful and embarrassing, but are used by charitable organisations as they are more effective than phone or email appeals. These discursive interactions could be examined to identify why that might be the case, and also to identify which lead to successful donations and which interactions do not. As we have seen, verbal appeals of empathy may be defused on the basis of similarity and personal experience, whereas appeals to responsibility may in fact depend on the speaker or donor’s ability to attribute responsibility to a third party successfully, for example.

Furthermore, an ethnographic study would be appropriate to understand how appeals are designed using lay models of charitable giving that the organisations
themselves rely on and appear to understand. In terms of linguistics, one approach could be to examine the concrete effects of programmes such as Oxfam’s development work in a school setting.

Outside of the domain of charitable giving, responsibility as a discrete resource could also be looked at more systematically regarding the role of community groups as taking more ‘responsibility’ for the provision of services to vulnerable groups. A systematic examination of how responsibility is used in the talk about care for the elderly, the disabled and other groups that used to rely on government funding (before budget cuts began to harm them) and the categories deployed in such talk would prove fruitful in understanding the consequences of its use and how it can be invoked to accomplish a wide variety of goals in public discourse.

8.11.2 Strategic side of responsibility

Much of Nadler’s work promotes the strategic and perceptibly darker side to intergroup helping: ultimately that “helping is both an expression of caring and a demonstration of superiority makes it an especially effective instrument of dominance in the hands of a more advantaged group” (Halabi et al., 2008, p. 857). Responsibility, as it has been represented throughout this thesis does not engage directly with this darker side of helping (although Study 5 has somewhat superficially investigated the different types of helping).

As Halabi and colleagues presented, autonomy and dependency forms of helping are a key aspect of Nadler’s model of Intergroup Helping Relations as Status Relations (2002). However, they also note that these forms of helping ‘parallel’ the types of helping examined by Jackson and Esses (2000) in an investigation of support for empowerment for immigrant groups in Canada (Halabi et al., 2008, p. 843). The forms of helping adopted by Jackson and Esses, namely direct assistance or empowerment, are therefore also reflected in Nadler’s initial theorising of what constitutes autonomy- or dependency-oriented help.

As Jackson and Esses generated these forms of helping based on Brickman and colleagues (Brickman et al., 1982) original model of helping based on the dual-role of responsibility attributions, it is therefore fair to suggest that Nadler’s model of helping as strategic and purposeful, presented as ‘the darker side’, has
its roots in a conceptualisation of helping as based on responsibility. Therefore a more systematic investigation into the prospect of responsibility as somewhat strategic and how it fits within a darker Nadler framework could be useful in understanding when it is most beneficial in a helping situation and what the long-term consequences of this type of motivation might be.

8.11.3 Citizenship and civic duty

There is an emerging literature in psychology concerned with the concept of citizenship, which could be usefully merged with work on responsibility: in terms of how responsibility can contribute to a broader understanding of citizenship in a unique way (Cemalcilar, 2009; Crocetti, Jahromi, & Meeus, 2012).

Models of active and engaged citizenship include a description of and often-times a measure of social responsibility such that “an active and engaged citizen is someone who has a sense of civic duty” (Bobek, Zaff, Li, Lerner, 2009, p. 736). There is also some overlap with these concepts within the volunteer role identity literature as looked at by Piliavin and colleagues (Grube & Piliavin, 2000; Penner, 2002) in terms of the aspects of volunteering as a prosocial act that becomes embedded in the identity of the volunteer over time. Volunteer role identity is sustained long-term helping due to incorporating that role and the attributes associated with it into a person’s own identity.

However, both literatures (civic engagement and volunteer role identity) approach these behaviours and actions from a developmental and dispositional perspective. An interesting avenue of research would therefore be to adopt this civic engagement approach to behaviours through the lens of self-ascribed responsibility. This dimension has been briefly investigated in the literature on environmental behaviours, whereby recycling and other environmentally friendly acts can be viewed as prosocial in nature (Kaiser & Shimoda, 1999). This approach has further differentiated between moral responsibility (which was found to involve guilt) and conventional responsibility (which involved social expectations) and used this dichotomy to investigate which would be more influential in predicting responsible environmental behaviours. It was found that moral responsibility was a better predictor of positive behaviour towards the environment.
This would suggest that responsibility could be further investigated in terms of its impact on civic duty, the aspects of citizenship that involve engagement and participation above and beyond the developmental aspects, and essentially move away from simply promoting a view of responsibility in social psychology that takes self-ascribed responsibility into account over blame-attribution and accountability, and moves towards further developing the dimensions and complex interplay of factors that exist within this conceptualisation of responsibility as self-ascribed, dutiful and centred on obligation. This could also have implications for looking at responsibility as a social identity that could influence sustained helping more so than empathy due to these dimensions inherent within the concept. Thus this newly emerging literature on citizenship and aspects of citizenship could benefit from the contribution responsibility and its many dimensions could bring to bear on understandings of and workings of it.

8.12 Conclusion

The overall aim of this thesis was to reconceptualise responsibility in terms of its self-ascribed nature in the social psychological literature on helping behaviours. A mixed methods approach allowed for the development of a grounded understanding of responsibility as it relates to charitable giving. This enabled further examination of this multifaceted concept in terms of its predictive ability in the context of intragroup and intergroup helping (in the form of intentions to donate). Responsibility was also investigated as it relates to empathic concern as a motivation to give help. The findings contribute to our overall understanding of how these two concepts, self-ascribed responsibility and empathic concern, influence decisions to donate. When they are both primed, people appear to take a different set of considerations into account and this has implications for who will get help: ingroup victims or outgroup victims, those who could be attributed blame for their situation or those who are perceptibly more innocent, or those who present as threatening or non-threatening. This also has implications for when they will receive help, as similarity can positively affect giving when the context is an individual level of analysis, yet becomes more complicated when the context is an intergroup level of analysis.
8. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS
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Participants Details
Table 1

Members of the general public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Participant Interview Groups</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) JD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julianne</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhán</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Lisa</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Simon</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) David</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Jim</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Enda</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisling</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Employees/ Founders of charitable organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single Interviews</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mary</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sarah</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Denise</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gerry</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Neil</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Frank</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Brenda</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tasks presented to multiple participant interviewees
YOU HAVE 5000 EURO BETWEEN YOU TO SPEND IN A CHARITABLE MANNER

Try to make your decision within 10 minutes.
All participants should have a say in how the money is spent.

Please refer to the green cards for ideas or help.

1. Quotations presented to some MPI participants as useful prompts
   - “It’s much easier to show compassion to animals. They are never wicked”.
   - “Charity begins at home”
   - “The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated”
   - “Service to others is the rent you pay for your room here on earth”
   - “The difference between a helping hand and an outstretched palm is a twist of the wrist”
Appendix 3

Semi-structured Interview schedule/ Topic Guide
For multiple participant interviews

• What do you understand by the term “charity”?
• What kind of charities are you familiar with?
• What different types of charities are there?
• Would you give to any particular charity over another?
• (What do you think of the expression “charity begins at home”?)

For both single and multiple participant interviews

• Do you think people have started to give less to charity since the economic downturn/recession?
• Are people still giving as much to some charities as before the recession?

For single interviews

• Can you tell me a little bit about your charity?
Appendix 4

Measures used in Study 2
Donation proclivity measure

To be rated on a 7 point scale: where 1= strongly disagree and 7= strongly agree

1. I would select a product in the supermarket where a percentage of the price would go to help this group.
2. I would give a donation to this cause if I was approached in the street.
3. I would be willing to send regular donations to this appeal.
4. I would be willing to sponsor an individual being helped by this organisation.
5. I would be willing to give old clothes or house-hold items to this appeal.
6. I would be willing to organise an event to raise funds for this group.
7. If I had some spare change I would give it to this organisation.
8. I would host an event with friends to encourage awareness of the suffering of this group of people receiving aid.
9. I would sign up for the duration of one year or more to help this organisation.
10. I would donate some money if I was presented with a collection box in a shop.

Empathy Scale

To be rated on a 7 point scale: where 1= strongly disagree and 7= strongly agree

1. I feel compassion for the group receiving help from these organisations.
2. I feel warmth for the group receiving aid from these organisations.
3. I feel distressed thinking about the group receiving aid from these organisations.
4. I feel troubled when I think about the group receiving aid from these organisations.
5. I feel upset by the situation the group receiving aid from these organisations are in.
6. I feel concerned about the group receiving aid from these organisations.
7. I feel soft-hearted thinking about the group receiving aid from these organisations.

8. I feel for the group receiving aid from these organisations.

9. I care about the group receiving aid from these organisations.

10. My understanding of the group receiving aid from these organisations leaves me feeling sad for them.

Responsibility measurement

To be rated on a 7 point scale: where 1= strongly disagree and 7= strongly agree

1. I feel obliged to help the group receiving aid from these organisations.

2. I feel accountable for helping the group receiving aid from these organisations.

3. I feel pressure to help the group receiving aid from these organisations.

4. I feel it is my duty to help the group receiving aid from these organisations.

5. I feel I have the authority to help the group receiving aid from these organisations.

6. I feel the group receiving aid from these organisations are dependent on me.

7. I feel I should help the group receiving aid from these organisations.

8. I feel the group receiving aid from these organisations are reliant on my help.

9. I feel anxious when I think about helping the group that receives aid from these organisations.

10. I feel resentful being asked for help from groups that receive aid from these organisations.
Appendix
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Measures used in Study 3, 4 & 5
**Strength of identification measures**

I identify with my national group (i.e. Irish) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am glad to belong to my national group 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I feel strong ties to my national group 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**Blame measures**

I believe the group receiving aid did not do anything wrong themselves 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I think the group receiving aid might have been responsible for their plight themselves, at least to some extent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**Adjusted Responsibility Measures**

1. I feel obliged to help the group receiving aid from these organisations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I feel accountable for helping the group receiving aid from these organisations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I feel it is my duty to help the group receiving aid from these organisations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I feel the group receiving aid from these organisations are dependent on me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I feel the group receiving aid from these organisations are reliant on my help. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**Adjusted Empathy Measures**

6. I feel warmth for the group receiving aid from these organisations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I feel distressed thinking about the group receiving aid from these organisations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. I feel troubled when I think about the group receiving aid from these organisations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. I feel concerned about the group receiving aid from these organisations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
organisations.

10. I feel for the group receiving aid from these organisations.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

*Adjusted Donation Proclivity Measures*

11. I would give a donation to this cause if I was approached in the street.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I would be willing to sponsor an individual being helped by this organisation.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I would be willing to organise an event to raise funds for this group.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I would host an event with friends to encourage awareness of the suffering of this group of people receiving aid.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I would donate some money if I was presented with a collection box in a shop.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

*Perceptions of Similarity/ Difference*

In your opinion the group receiving aid from the organisation that issued this appeal are

Absolutely Different:  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Absolutely Similar:  6 7

to your own group (please circle one number between 1-7 which best represents your opinion).
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Transcription convention
Glossary of abridged version of Jeffersonian (Jefferson, 1984)

(0.2) Numbers in brackets measure pauses in seconds (in this particular case, 2 seconds).

(.) A micropause, hearable but too short to measure

{huhhhuhh} Laughter

[ ] Square brackets marks the start and end of overlapping speech. They are aligned to mark the precise position of the overlap.

↑↓ Vertical arrows precede marker pitch movement, over and above normal rhythms of speech.

Underlining Indicates emphasis; the extent of the underlining within individual words locates emphasis and also indicates how heavy it is.
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