Personality and Social Psychology Review
2005, Vol. 9, No. 1, 2–16

Copyright © 2005 by
Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Differences in Helping Whites and Blacks: A Meta-Analysis

Donald A. Saucier
Department of Psychology
University of Kentucky

Carol T. Miller and Nicole Doucet
Department of Psychology
University of Vermont

The amount of help given to Blacks versus Whites is often assumed to reflect underlying levels of racism (or lack thereof). This meta-analysis assessed discrimination against Blacks in helping studies. The overall effect size for the 48 hypothesis tests did not show universal discrimination against Blacks ($d = .03$, $p = .103$). However, consistent with the predictions of aversive racism, discrimination against Blacks was more likely when participants could rationalize decisions not to help with reasons having nothing to do with race. Specifically, when helping was lengthier, riskier, more difficult, more effortful, and when potential helpers were further away from targets, less help was given to Blacks than to Whites. Interestingly, discrimination against Blacks was shown when there were higher levels of emergency. This suggests that discrimination may occur when the ability to control prejudicial responding is inhibited, or when the arousal of the emergency is misattributed to intergroup anxiety.

Is racism still a problem in our society? If so, how and when may racism be expressed? Definitive answers to these questions require extensive investigations into the social psychological literature. By providing a quantitative synthesis of the studies that have examined discrimination in helping paradigms, we intend to provide insight into these questions by using the situational characteristics contained in those paradigms to predict the rates to which Blacks are discriminated against relative to Whites.

In a previous attempt to answer the questions posed previously, Crosby, Bromley, and Saxe (1980) published a narrative literature review exploring the use of unobtrusive studies of behavior to measure racism. Crosby et al. (1980) noted that surveys were no longer clearly answering the question of how prevalent racism is in society because many studies found evidence of racism in the self-reports of participants, and many others did not. More recent studies have also given contradictory answers to the question of how prevalent racism is. Dovidio and Gaertner (1991) reported data showing that participants did not report racism on surveys to a large extent; other studies (e.g. Devine, 1989; Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995) show that racism still may be widespread despite the nonracist self-reports of the participants. To better gauge how large the problem of racism is in society, Crosby et al. (1980) reviewed studies of behavior, looking for the presence of discrimination against Blacks, compared to Whites, in helping behavior, aggression, and nonverbal behavior.

Their review of helping behavior examined studies that compared the degree of help offered to Whites and to Blacks in a variety of helping situations. In these studies, if Blacks who needed help were helped significantly less than Whites who needed help in the same situation, then it could be argued that this is evidence of racism against Blacks. Crosby et al. (1980) did conclude that racism was evidenced in these studies because Blacks who needed help were not offered the same degree of help as Whites in several cases. However, they also concluded that the level of racism was not universal across the studies. In the majority of studies (56%), Blacks were not discriminated against in the terms of the help they received. However, given that 44% of the studies did show evidence of discrimination against Blacks, closer examination of the characteristics of the studies may reveal situations in which discrimination is and is not reliably observed.

Crosby et al. (1980) attempted to identify helping situations that reliably showed evidence of discrimination against Blacks. They categorized studies depending on whether or not the participants (potential helpers) were in face-to-face contact with the confederates (targets).

We thank Katherine Bolton, Mary Cain, Amanda Cornett, Renzia Geertsema, Marc Genzler, Aileen Hitt, Stirling Sampson, and Wes Sheeley for their assistance in coding studies for various drafts of this article.

Donald A. Saucier is now at Kansas State University.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Donald A. Saucier, Department of Psychology, Kansas State University, 468 Bluemont Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506–5302. E-mail: saucier@ksu.edu

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

Using the box-count method of tabular results in which studies with significant effects count in favor of the discrimination hypotheses and those with nonsignificant effects count as no discrimination, Crosby et al. found that participants discriminated against Blacks more frequently when there was no face-to-face contact.

Unfortunately, the review by Crosby et al. (1980) did not examine additional characteristics of the helping situation that could potentially moderate the likelihood that participants would discriminate against Blacks. In addition, the report of the percentages of studies that did and did not show evidence of racism ignores sample sizes and effect sizes that are important in describing the trend across studies (Hall, Rosenthal, Tickle-Degnen, & Mosteller, 1994) to discriminate against Blacks. The purpose of this study was to systematically and quantitatively synthesize results across studies of subtle bias against Blacks in helping, and to explore several theoretically relevant moderators. Specifically, this study used three theoretical perspectives to explore the literature that used helping studies to measure discrimination against Blacks relative to Whites: the aversive racism theory (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986), the justification–suppression model of the expression of prejudice (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003), and the arousal: cost–reward model of helping (Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Clark, 1981).

Overt Versus Aversive Racism

Racism has become more subtle in today's society, and distinctions are made between old-fashioned overt bigotry and more hidden forms of racism (e.g., Katz & Hass, 1988; McConahay, 1986; McConahay, Hardee, & Batts, 1981). This distinction is necessary given that much empirical work has shown that individuals may be hesitant to express racism even when they are consciously racist (e.g., Crandall, Eshleman, & O'Brien, 2002; Dunton & Fazio, 1997; Plant & Devine, 1998). Often, individuals control their levels of racist responding to avoid guilt (e.g., Fazio & Hilden, 2001; Monteith, 1993) or to conform to social pressure (Crandall et al., 2002; Monteith, Deneen, & Tooman, 1996). Accordingly, instances of overt racism have become less frequent, but racism may still be expressed when doing so does not arouse guilt in the individual and when the individual's behavior is not interpreted as being racist. That is, the racist behavior must be ambiguous enough for the individual to justify the behavior with plausible nonracist rarionalizations.

Several theoretical models of contemporary prejudice have been offered, such as modern racism by which prejudice is expressed through support of social and political issues (McConahay, 1986; McConahay et al., 1981) and ambivalent racism which occurs through the simultaneous possession of moral beliefs that lead to both positive and negative attributions about traditionally disadvantaged groups (Katz & Hass, 1988). However, aversive racism theory (Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hodson, 2002; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Hodson, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2002) may be the best model to explain the behavioral instances of prejudice that were addressed in the literature review by Crosby et al. (1980). Aversive racism refers to the discomfort, disgust, fear, or uneasiness that may be experienced by Whites in the presence of Blacks despite the beliefs that Whites espouse egalitarianism. While consciously endorsing equality and believing that they are not racist, Whites may still feel uncomfortable in situations with Blacks. This discomfort will not produce hostility or overt discrimination against Blacks, because this behavior would conflict with the Whites' beliefs that they are not racist, but the discomfort may result in avoidance or other behaviors that are not obviously racist. Therefore, situations in which a response's potentially racist motivation is ambiguous and easily explained by other situational factors may reveal more discrimination toward Blacks even by Whites who believe that they are not racist (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986).

Justification–Suppression Model of the Expression of Prejudice

Crandall and Eshleman (2003) contend that individuals do not express their genuine levels of prejudice but instead disinhibit their suppressed prejudice when justifications for doing so are available. That is, individuals will not express any negativity that they have toward Blacks because this expression would bring about negative consequences at both the interpersonal (e.g., confrontation) and intrapersonal (e.g., guilt) levels. Therefore, individuals will be both externally and internally motivated (Plant & Devine, 1998) to behave in nonprejudiced ways (Dunton & Fazio, 1997). This process is motivated and controlled so that individuals can consciously maintain both a nonprejudiced appearance and a nonprejudiced self-concept (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). The justification–suppression model predicts that when a behavior such as withholding help can be perceived by oneself or by others as prejudiced, then the prejudice will be suppressed and the individual will help in that situation. When withholding help can be justified by rationalizations other than one being prejudiced, then the prejudice may not be suppressed and the individual may not help in that situation while avoiding both social and intrapersonal consequences. Accordingly, discrimination against Blacks compared to Whites in helping situations is predicted to occur when the situations allow for justification of discrimination by nonprejudiced rationales and when the individual is not aware that their behavior may be perceived as prejudiced.

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

Arousal: Cost–Reward Model of Helping

According to the arousal: cost–reward model of helping, when individuals notice that someone else needs help, they often experience arousal that motivates them to take some action to alleviate that arousal. The action that is taken depends on the individuals' assessment of the relative cost of helping (e.g., assumed risk, effort, time) and cost of not helping (e.g., guilt, level of target's suffering or emergency). The probability that the individuals will chose to help, rather than leave the situation or cognitively restructure the situation into a less emergent situation that does not require help, increases as the costs of helping decrease and the costs of not helping increase (Piliavin et al., 1981). Accordingly, the costs of helping and not helping can influence potential helpers' actions in any situation in which a target needs help. We thought it informative to explore the role of the costs of helping and not helping in contexts in which the target's race varied to better understand the relationship of these costs to discrimination in helping situations.

Characteristics of the Helping Situation

Consistent with the aversive racism perspective (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986), we predicted that the situational context of a helping situation (e.g., the risk, effort, or time involved in helping) would predict when discrimination against Blacks relative to Whites would occur. When individuals have ample opportunity to justify withholding help, the individuals may do so at a higher frequency when the person needing help is Black than when the person needing help is White. For example, if a Black person is standing beside a stranded car on the highway, then individuals can choose not to help for a variety of reasons. Perhaps they thought that it was too risky to pick up a stranger, or that it would take a large amount of time to help, or that they would not be able to help because they have little knowledge about cars. When the individuals drive by the Black person, they can easily justify not helping without feeling guilty or feeling as if they violated social norms that would rebuke discriminatory behavior.

We hypothesized that the characteristics of the helping situations would influence the amount of discrimination expressed, if any, against Blacks compared to Whites. We predicted that discrimination against Blacks would increase as these characteristics increased the ability of potential helpers to rationalize not helping with nonracist explanations. Accordingly, the characteristics of each helping situation were coded and used as predictors of discrimination. These characteristics included the time it would take to help, the ambiguity of the helping situation, the risk one would take by helping, the emergency level of the situation, the financial cost involved, how difficult it would be to help successfully, the effort one would need to expend, and the distance between the helper and the target. Individuals may be more able to rationalize withholding help when it would take a large amount of time because time is risky, costly, difficult, and/or effortful. When there is more ambiguity about whether the target actually needs help and/or when one is further away from the person needing help, it may be more justifiable to choose not to help. Finally, it may be more justifiable to withhold help in situations where the emergency level is lower because it can be argued that the need for help is not as great. Our predictions were that when individuals have greater opportunity to justify withholding help from a target, higher levels of discrimination against Blacks would be observed.

These hypotheses based on aversive racism theory overlap somewhat with those based on the justification–suppression model of prejudice which also predicts that individuals will show more discrimination against Blacks when they believe that they can justify the expression of prejudice with a nonprejudiced rationalization. To provide additional tests of the justification–suppression model we also coded the helping situations for how likely it was that potential helpers would recognize that their decisions to withhold help from a Black target were somehow related to their own prejudices. Specifically, we coded each helping situation for how aware potential helpers would be to recognize possible prejudice in a decision not to help, how motivated potential helpers would be to suppress any prejudice they might feel in that situation, and how much withholding help from a Black target would pose a threat to the potential helpers' unprejudiced self-concept. The specific hypotheses offered by the justification–suppression model of prejudice state that as the awareness of possible prejudice, the motivation to suppress prejudice, and the threat of not helping to unprejudiced self-concept each increase, then the levels of discrimination expressed against Blacks compared to Whites should decrease.

In addition, to explore the arousal: cost–reward model of helping we created codings for the helping situations for the overall amount of costs that would be incurred by potential helpers who choose to provide help (e.g., time, effort, overall investment) and the overall amount of costs that would be incurred if the helpers did not provide help (e.g., the level of emergency, potential helpers' feelings of regret for not helping). We did not create specific hypotheses for the relationships of the costs of helping and not helping with the levels of discrimination against Blacks compared to Whites, but included these variables to explore these relationships.

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

Method

Collection of Studies and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were collected using the reference list from the literature review on unobtrusive studies of discrimination by Crosby et al. (1980). Additional studies were found using the database PsycINFO. Subject words were entered into the database covering the publication period from 1887 through July 2002. Because the meta-analysis sought to synthesize the research on the expression of prejudice in helping paradigms, the search employed terms related to two categories of subjects: prejudice and helping. Prejudice search terms were Blacks, Whites, race and ethnic differences, racial and ethnic attitudes, racism, prejudice, and discrimination. Helping search terms were altruism, help, helping, assistance, prosocial, and social behavior. All Boolian combinations of prejudice and helping search terms (e.g., "prejudice" and "helping," "racism" and "altruism") were used to locate relevant studies. Abstracts from all studies found by PsycINFO were examined to determine if the studies observed the rates of helping given to Blacks and to Whites. All studies satisfying the initial criteria were retrieved, and the reference lists of these studies were used to locate more prospective studies. In addition, these studies were entered into three citation indices (Science Citation Index Expanded, Social Sciences Citation Index, Arts and Humanities Citation Index) to locate other potentially relevant studies.

To be included in the meta-analysis, studies needed to report statistics that allowed an effect size to be calculated comparing the amount of help given by White participants[1] to Blacks and the amount of help given to Whites.[2] In all, 48 hypothesis tests in 31 journal articles[3] were retrieved that satisfied the criteria.[4]

[1]Whenever possible, only data from White potential helpers given the opportunities to help both White and Black targets were used. It is only in the field studies in which demographic information of the participants is speculative that samples may have included both White and Black participants.

[2]Only one study was excluded from the meta-analysis because the effect size could not be calculated from the statistics reported in the study (Scott, 1987).

[3]When a study contained a manipulation that we believed may have altered the characteristics of the helping situation (e.g., conditions in which there were and were not bystanders), hypothesis tests were retrieved for each condition individually to compare the rates of helping given to Black and White targets. In addition, some research articles contributed more than one hypothesis test from different studies using different samples. For our analyses, each hypothesis test retrieved was treated as an independent observation. Although this procedure violates the assumption of independence of the hypothesis tests, it is necessary because it provides the most sensitive method for testing our theoretical predictions.

[4]Only one study using a sample of children was found. This prompted our decision to confine this meta-analysis to studies using adult samples.

Predictors Yielded by the Studies

Aversive racism predictors. Three independent judges read the method sections of each study and made ratings about the helping situation, defined as the context in which participants had the opportunity to help the targets. The judges rated the level to which each helping situation offered some justifiable rationale for the participants not to help through each of several specific contextual characteristics. For instance, it may be justifiable for participants to refrain from helping a target (White or Black) when helping would require participants to invest greater amounts of time, money, or effort, or when they would have to put themselves at great risk. Accordingly, if racism was absent in these situations, then we would expect participants to provide help to all targets infrequently. If participants provide help to Black targets less often than to White targets, then racism may be expressed. However, participants can justify this withholding of help from the Black targets by claiming they did not help because it would have taken a long time, been risky, and so on. Thus, these types of situations may provide a socially acceptable outlet for the expression of racism.

Continuous ratings of study characteristics by judges were used rather than categorical assignments to provide the most sensitive test of the theoretical predictions and to avoid the problems involved with categorizing continuous data (Cohen, 1990; Mullen, 1989). The judges used a Likert-type rating scale from 1 (*very little*) to 10 (*very much*) to rate each study's method on the following characteristics of the helping situation: time, ambiguity, risk, emergency, cost[5], difficulty, effort, and distance. Reliabilities (discussed later) were good for judges' ratings of each study characteristic. Time (mean r = .72, R = .88)[6] was defined as the amount of time that participants would need to invest to help the targets. Ambiguity (mean r = .74, R = .89) was defined as how unclear it was to the participants that the targets needed help. Risk (mean r = .64, R = .84) was defined as the amount of potential harm (physical or otherwise) to themselves that the participants may have feared as a result of helping the targets. Emergency (mean r = .72, R = .88) was defined as the amount of potential harm (physical or otherwise) that the targets faced in the helping situation. Cost (mean r = .78, R = .92) referred to the amount of financial investment that helping would have required. Difficulty (mean r = .73, R = .89) referred to the difficulty that participants would have in providing help to targets successfully. Effort (mean r = .70, R = .87) referred to the amount of effort that participants would have to in-

[5]Cost was rated from 0 (*no anticipated financial cost*) to 10 (*high anticipated financial cost*).

[6]Mean r is the mean correlation among the three judges' ratings. R is the effective reliability calculated using the Spearman-Brown formula (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991).

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

vest to help the targets. Distance (mean $r = .85$, $R = .94$) referred to the physical distance between the participants and the targets at the moment when targets needed help. Judges rated each characteristic of the helping situation so that higher ratings indicated a greater level of justifiable unwillingness to help (with the exception of emergency).

A composite predictor was calculated by taking the average of the three judges' ratings for each characteristic, standardizing the values, and summing the ratings. Emergency ratings were reverse coded prior to data reduction. This composite score provided an index of the degree to which each helping situation provided nonracist justification for withholding help from a Black target.

This composite index treated each characteristic of the helping situation as equivalent in providing nonracist justification for failing to help a Black target. However, there may be differences between these characteristics in how much nonracist justification they offer for failing to help. For example, participants' failure to help when they would be put at great risk may be more justifiable than their failure to help when they would have to invest a greater amount of time. Accordingly, the judges independently rated each helping situation for how justifiable it would be for participants to withhold help from any target from 1 (*not at all justifiable*) to 10 (*extremely justifiable*). These ratings were also reliable (mean $r = .67$, $R = .86$). Both the composite index and the judges' ratings of justification for withholding help were used in later analyses. All judges were unaware of the results of the studies when they rated the study characteristics. Averages of all judges' ratings and the composite justification scores[7] for each study are listed in Table 1.

Additional predictors for the justification–suppression model of prejudice. In addition to the justification ratings made and described previously, three independent raters rated each helping scenario for characteristics related to the potential helpers' motivation to suppress prejudicial responding. Raters read each helping situation and rated how much they would be aware that withholding help from a Black person who needed help would be an expression of prejudice, how motivated they would be to suppress any prejudice that they may feel toward Blacks in that situation, and how much choosing not to help a Black person in that situation would pose a threat to their unprejudiced self-concept. The raters rated the helping situations for these characteristics from 1 (*not at all*) to 10 (*very much*). The raters were reliable in their ratings for the awareness (mean $r = .51$, $R = .76$), suppression (mean $r = .50$, $R = .75$), and threat (mean $r = .48$, $R = .74$) characteristics. Averages of the judges' ratings are provided in Table 2.

Additional predictors for the arousal: Cost–reward model of helping. We sought to create ratings that would reflect the overall amounts of costs for helping and for not helping in each helping situation. The ratings made and described previously regarding the amount of time, risk, effort, and difficulty are relevant in determining the costs incurred by potential helpers who choose to help in a given situation. In addition three independent raters created an additional rating of how much helpers would have to invest of themselves in the situation overall in providing help as a subjective measure of the overall costs of helping from 1 (*very little*) to 10 (*very much*). These ratings were reliable (mean $r = .59$, $R = .81$). We also created a composite rating of the costs of helping by summing the judges' average ratings of time, risk, effort, difficulty, and investment. The judges' average investment ratings for each helping situation and the composite scores for the costs of helping are provided in Table 2.

In determining the costs of not helping, three independent raters rated each helping situation for how bad they would feel if they did not provide help to the target and how much they would regret not helping from 1 (*not at all*) to 10 (*very much*). The feeling bad and regret ratings were reliable (mean $r = .67$, $R = .86$ mean $r = .62$, $R = .83$, respectively). Further, we created a composite rating of the costs of not helping by summing the judges' average ratings of feeling bad, regretting not helping, and the target's level of emergency (described previously). The judges' average feeling bad and regretting not helping, and the composite scores for the costs of not helping are provided in Table 2.

Calculation of Effect Sizes

Effect sizes were expressed as Cohen's d statistic. Effect sizes were computed so that negative effect sizes indicated that more help was given to White confederates than to Black confederates and positive effect sizes indicated that more help was given to Black confederates than to White confederates. The effect size for each study was calculated by the computer statistical program DSTAT (Johnson, 1993), a program specifically designed for analysis of meta-analytic databases. Effect sizes were calculated from statistics provided in each study that compared the overall degree of help given to Black confederates to the overall degree of help given to White confederates, and included t values, F values, frequencies, χ^2 values, and p values. If a study reported that no significant differences were found for this comparison but gave no statistics that allowed for precise calculation of that effect size, then the effect size for the study was determined

[7]We thank Brian Mullen for suggesting the use of judges' justification ratings and composite scores based on judges' ratings of individual situational characteristics in testing our predictions.

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

Table 1. *Characteristics of Studies Included in Meta-Analysis to Test Aversive Racism Theory*

Study, Conditions (if appropriate)	Time	Ambig.	Risk	Emerg.	Cost	Diff.	Effort	Dist.	Composite[a]	Justified[b]
Benson, Karobenick, and Lerner (1976)	5.00	6.67	2.33	4.33	0.00	1.33	4.00	10.00	0.76	4.33
Bickman and Kamzan (1973)										
Low need	2.67	1.33	3.00	2.67	2.00	1.67	1.67	1.33	–3.43	6.00
High need	2.67	1.33	3.00	3.67	2.00	1.67	1.67	1.33	–3.78	4.67
Brigham and Richardson (1979)	1.33	1.33	3.33	3.67	3.67	1.67	1.67	1.33	–3.13	5.67
Brown (1984)	6.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.67	5.00	8.33	0.03	7.00
Brown and Reed (1982)										
Low cost	5.33	8.67	3.00	4.33	0.33	1.33	4.00	10.00	2.14	4.67
High cost	6.33	8.67	3.00	4.33	3.33	2.00	6.33	10.00	5.63	6.67
Bryan and Test (1967)	1.67	3.67	1.00	1.67	4.33	1.00	1.33	3.00	–1.99	7.33
Clark (1974)	4.00	1.00	1.00	7.67	1.33	2.33	3.33	9.00	–2.74	2.33
Dovidio and Gaertner (1981)	2.67	7.33	2.67	4.67	0.00	2.67	4.00	2.00	–1.72	4.33
Dutton (1971)										
White first	1.33	8.67	4.00	1.33	0.00	1.67	1.33	2.00	–1.51	8.33
Black first	1.33	8.67	4.00	1.33	0.00	1.67	1.33	2.00	–1.51	8.33
Dutton (1973)										
Public	2.67	1.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	1.00	1.33	1.00	–2.45	7.00
Private	2.67	1.00	2.67	2.00	5.00	1.00	1.33	1.00	–2.15	8.00
Dutton and Lake (1973)										
High threat	2.67	1.00	4.67	4.67	4.33	1.00	1.33	1.00	–2.62	6.33
Low threat	2.67	1.00	4.67	4.67	4.33	1.00	1.33	1.00	–2.62	6.33
Farra, Zinser, & Bailey (1978)										
Internal cause	8.67	2.00	4.33	2.00	0.00	9.00	8.33	9.67	7.49	8.33
External cause	8.67	2.00	4.33	2.00	0.00	9.00	8.33	.67	7.49	6.33
Franklin (1974)	4.00	1.00	1.00	7.67	1.33	2.33	3.33	9.00	–2.74	2.33
Frey and Gaertner (1986)										
External locus of control	4.00	1.00	1.67	3.00	0.00	2.67	4.33	2.67	–3.06	3.33
Internal locus of control	4.00	1.00	1.67	3.00	0.00	2.67	4.33	2.67	–3.06	4.33
Gaertner (1973) Study 1	4.00	1.00	1.00	7.67	1.33	2.33	3.33	9.00	–2.74	2.33
Gaertner (1975)										
Alone	8.00	3.33	4.33	9.67	0.00	5.33	7.67	5.67	1.75	2.00
Together	8.00	4.00	4.33	9.67	0.00	5.33	7.67	5.67	2.00	3.67

(continued)

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

Table 1. *(Continued)*

Study, Conditions (if appropriate)	Time	Ambig.	Risk	Emerg.	Cost	Diff.	Effort	Dist.	Composite[a]	Justified[b]
Gaertner and Bickman (1971)	4.00	1.00	1.00	7.67	1.33	2.33	3.33	9.00	–2.74	2.33
Gaertner and Dovidio (1977) Study 1										
Alone	8.00	3.33	4.33	9.67	0.00	5.33	7.67	5.67	1.75	2.00
Together	8.00	4.00	4.33	9.67	0.00	5.33	7.67	5.67	2.00	3.67
Gaertner and Dovidio (1977) Study 2										
High ambiguity	8.00	5.33	4.33	7.00	0.00	5.33	7.67	5.67	3.43	3.33
Low ambiguity	8.00	4.33	4.33	9.00	0.00	5.33	7.67	5.67	2.36	2.67
Gaertner, Dovidio, and Johnson (1982)										
Alone	8.00	3.00	4.33	9.67	0.00	5.33	7.67	5.33	1.53	2.00
Together	8.00	4.00	4.33	9.67	0.00	5.33	7.67	5.33	1.90	3.67
Graf and Riddell (1972)	9.00	3.00	9.33	6.00	1.33	5.00	6.67	7.33	6.33	9.67
Katz, Cohen, and Glass (1975) Study 1	5.67	1.33	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.67	4.00	6.33	–1.35	7.33
Katz et al. (1975) Study 2	5.67	1.33	1.33	1.33	0.00	1.67	4.00	1.00	–2.97	6.67
Katz et al. (1975) Study 3	2.67	1.00	3.67	3.33	1.00	1.00	1.67	1.00	–4.55	5.67
Katz, Glass, Lucido, and Farber (1978) Study 1	7.33	1.00	1.67	2.33	0.00	2.00	8.33	8.00	1.35	7.33
Lerner and Frank (1974a)	1.33	4.00	1.00	4.67	2.33	3.33	2.67	6.33	–1.61	4.67
Lerner and Frank (1974b)	4.67	6.67	3.00	5.00	0.00	3.33	4.33	2.67	–0.48	4.33
Piliavin, Rodin, and Piliavin (1969)										
Drunk	6.67	6.00	7.67	9.00	0.00	5.00	7.33	3.67	3.01	6.33
Ill/cane	6.67	6.00	7.33	9.00	0.00	5.00	7.33	3.67	2.86	2.00
Rosenfield, Greenberg, Folger, and Borys (1982)										
Panhandler	2.67	1.00	4.67	4.67	4.33	1.00	1.33	1.00	–2.62	7.33
Petitioner	2.00	1.33	1.67	1.33	0.00	1.00	1.33	1.00	–5.63	4.67
Shaffer and Graziano (1980)	4.00	1.00	1.00	8.00	1.33	2.33	3.33	9.00	–2.85	2.33
Thayer (1973)	4.00	1.00	1.33	5.33	0.00	1.33	3.00	1.00	–5.70	2.33
Wegner and Crano (1975)	5.33	7.33	2.67	4.67	0.00	3.33	4.67	1.67	–0.18	4.33
West, Whitney, and Schnedler (1975) Study 1	9.00	7.33	9.67	6.00	1.33	5.33	9.00	7.33	9.13	9.67
West et al. (1975) Study 2	9.00	7.33	9.67	6.00	1.33	5.33	9.00	7.33	9.13	9.67
Wispe and Freshley (1971)	4.67	6.67	3.00	5.00	0.00	3.33	4.67	3.33	–0.15	4.33

Note: Ambig. = Ambiguity; Emerg = Emergency; Diff. = Difficulty; Dist. = Distance. All values (except Composite) represent the average rating among three independent judges.
[a]Composite refers to the sum of the standardized predictor values of the other predictors, excepting Justified, with Emergency reversed coded.
[b]Justified refers to the judges' ratings of the extent to which the situations contained characteristics that would allow participants to justify withholding help from targets with nonracist explanations.

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

Table 2. *Additional Characteristics of Studies Included to Test the Justification-Suppression and Arousal: Cost-Reward Models*

Study, Conditions (if appropriate)	Aware	Suppress	Threat	Invest	Cost Help[a]	Bad	Regret	Cost No Help[b]
Benson, Karabenick, and Lerner (1976)	3.33	4.67	4.00	5.00	17.67	7.33	6.67	18.33
Bickman and Kamzan (1973)								
Low need	2.33	3.33	2.67	3.67	12.67	3.33	3.33	9.33
High need	2.67	3.33	3.00	4.00	13.00	4.67	2.67	11.00
Brigham and Richardson (1979)	3.00	2.67	4.00	4.67	12.67	3.67	4.33	11.67
Brown (1984)	5.00	3.00	4.67	5.00	18.67	4.33	4.33	9.67
Brown and Reed (1982)								
Low cost	4.33	4.67	3.67	4.33	18.00	4.67	5.00	14.00
High cost	4.33	4.00	4.00	6.00	23.67	5.00	5.67	15.00
Bryan and Test (1967)	2.67	3.33	2.67	3.67	8.67	5.00	2.67	9.33
Clark (1974)	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.67	16.33	7.00	6.00	20.67
Dovidio and Gaertner (1981)	3.33	3.00	3.33	4.33	16.33	4.33	4.33	13.33
Dutton (1971)								
White first	3.33	3.33	2.67	3.33	11.67	4.33	3.67	9.33
Black first	3.00	3.67	4.00	3.33	11.67	4.33	4.00	9.67
Dutton (1973)								
Public	3.67	6.67	4.00	3.33	10.33	7.33	6.67	16.00
Private	2.67	3.33	3.00	5.00	12.67	4.33	4.33	10.67
Dutton and Lake (1973)								
High threat	8.33	8.00	8.33	3.67	13.33	7.67	7.33	19.67
Low threat	2.33	3.67	2.00	3.67	13.33	2.67	4.00	11.33
Farra, Zinser, and Bailey (1978)								
Internal cause	5.33	4.00	3.00	8.33	38.67	4.67	5.33	12.00
External cause	3.00	5.00	3.67	9.00	39.33	7.33	6.67	16.00
Franklin (1974)	3.00	3.00	3.67	5.67	16.33	6.67	5.67	20.00
Frey and Gaertner (1986)								
External locus of control	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.33	18.00	5.00	4.67	12.67
Internal locus of control	3.33	3.67	4.33	5.67	18.33	6.00	4.67	13.67
Gaertner (1973) Study 1	3.67	3.33	5.00	5.67	16.33	7.67	5.67	21.00
Gaertner (1975)								
Alone	2.67	3.00	4.00	7.00	32.33	8.33	8.33	26.33
Together	3.00	4.67	5.33	7.67	33.00	10.00	9.33	29.00
Gaertner and Bickman (1971)	3.00	3.33	2.67	4.33	15.00	6.33	5.33	19.33
Gaertner and Dovidio (1977) Study 1								
Alone	2.67	3.00	4.00	5.67	31.00	7.67	6.67	24.00
Together	3.33	4.67	4.67	7.33	32.67	9.33	8.67	27.67
Gaertner and Dovidio (1977) Study 2								
High ambiguity	3.33	3.67	4.33	6.00	31.33	5.67	6.00	18.67
Low ambiguity	3.00	3.00	4.33	5.67	31.00	7.67	6.67	23.33
Gaertner, Dovidio, and Johnson (1982)								
Alone	2.67	3.33	4.33	7.67	33.00	8.33	8.00	26.00
Together	3.33	4.67	5.33	7.67	33.00	9.00	8.33	27.00
Graf and Riddell (1972)	3.00	4.00	4.33	6.67	36.67	5.00	4.67	15.67
Katz, Cohen, and Glass (1975) Study 1	3.67	2.67	4.00	4.67	17.00	3.00	2.33	6.33
Katz, Cohen, et al. (1975) Study 2	3.00	2.67	3.00	4.67	17.33	2.67	2.67	6.67
Katz, Cohen, et al. (1975) Study 3	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.67	12.67	3.67	3.33	10.33
Katz, Glass, Lucido, and Farber (1978) Study 1	2.00	3.00	1.67	6.00	25.33	5.00	4.33	11.67
Lerner and Frank (1974a)	4.00	4.67	5.33	5.00	13.33	4.67	4.67	14.00
Lerner and Frank (1974b)	3.33	3.00	3.33	5.00	20.33	6.33	6.00	17.33
Piliavin, Rodin, and Piliavin (1969)								
Drunk	3.00	3.33	5.33	7.00	33.67	6.33	5.00	20.33
Ill/cane	3.33	3.33	4.00	6.33	32.67	7.33	7.00	23.33
Rosenfield, Greenberg, Folger, and Borgs (1982)								
Panhandler	2.67	3.00	4.00	4.33	14.00	4.00	4.00	12.67
Petitioner	3.00	3.33	2.67	2.67	8.67	5.33	3.67	10.33
Shaffer and Graziano (1980)	2.33	3.33	3.67	4.33	15.00	7.67	7.00	22.67
Thayer (1973)	2.67	3.33	3.67	5.00	14.67	9.00	7.33	21.67
Wegner and Crano (1975)	3.00	2.33	3.00	6.00	22.00	6.67	5.00	16.33
West, Whitney, and Schneider (1975) Study 1	3.00	4.33	4.67	7.00	40.00	5.67	4.33	16.00
West et al. (1975) Study 2	3.67	4.00	5.33	6.00	39.00	4.33	6.00	16.33
Wispe and Freshley (1971)	3.00	3.67	3.33	5.00	20.67	6.00	6.33	17.33

Note: All values (except Cost Help and Cost No Help) represent the average rating among three independent judges.

[a]Cost Help refers to the sum of the average of the judges' ratings for the time, effort, difficulty, risk, and overall investment incurred by the helper by providing help and higher values indicate that helping is more costly to the helper.

[b]Cost No Help refers to the sum of the average of the judges' ratings for how bad potential helpers feel and how much regret they feel when they do not help with the ratings for the level of emergency the target faces in the situation. Higher values indicate that the costs of not helping are higher.

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

by assigning the hypothesis test a p value of .50.[8] All effect sizes for the studies are listed in Table 3.

Results

Table 4 shows a stem and leaf display that illustrates the distribution of effect sizes. As Table 4 shows, the effect sizes for all studies approximated a normal distribution. The overall effect size for the 48 hypothesis tests derived from the 31 studies ($N = 14{,}368$) was $d = .03$. This overall effect size, which was not significantly greater than zero ($p = .103$), indicated that there is no overall evidence for discrimination against Blacks in the amount of help they receive compared to Whites in the same situations. The test for overall heterogeneity was significant, $Q(47) = 242.95$, $p < .00005$, indicating that moderators were influencing the amounts of help given to Blacks and Whites. Removal of 10 effect sizes (20.83% of the total) was required to reduce the heterogeneity to nonsignificant levels.

Relationships Between Predictors and Study Outcomes

We tested the relationships between the predictors and the effect sizes using the Z for focused comparisons. These results are shown in Table 5. Interestingly, the publication year of the study was not a significant predictor of discrimination, indicating that the levels of discrimination did not systematically vary over time. That is, the level of helping given to Blacks relative to Whites did not increase or decrease over the time period represented by the literature.

Aversive racism predictors. Many of the predictions offered by aversive racism theory were supported. Several predictors significantly predicted levels of discrimination against Blacks in helping situations relative to Whites. The results show that as the time it took to help increased, as the risk the helper would face increased, as the difficulty of helping increased, as the effort of helping increased, and as the distance between the target and helper increased, the help that Blacks received decreased relative to Whites in the same situations. Further, the composite index for justification for not helping also predicted discrimination against Blacks. This indicates that less help was offered to Blacks relative to Whites when the helpers had more attributional cues available to them for rationalizing the failure to help with reasons having nothing to do with race. This effect was found when the composite did and did not include the emergency ratings (reversed).

Not all of our predictions were supported. As ambiguity of the helping situation increased and as the financial cost that helping would require increased, the relative levels of help given to Blacks and Whites did not change. Further, the judges' subjective ratings of how justifiable it would be to withhold help from participants of any race in a given situation did not predict the relative levels of help given to Blacks and Whites. Notably inconsistent with our predictions, higher levels of situational emergency were associated with less, not more, help being given to Blacks relative to Whites.

Justification–suppression model predictors. As shown in the results for aversive racism theory previously discussed, the hypotheses offered by the justification–suppression model of prejudice expression received support regarding the ability of specific characteristics of the helping situation to allow potential helpers to justify not helping with nonracist rationale and thus show more discrimination against Black targets relative to White targets. It should again be noted that the subjective ratings of how much individuals could justify decisions not to help in specific helping situations did not predict discrimination. Further, the relationship between how much potential helpers would be aware that their prejudice may be influencing their decision to help or not to help and the relative amounts of help given to Blacks and to Whites only reached marginally significant levels, although the relationships with the motivation to suppress prejudice and the extent to which not helping would threaten one's unprejudiced self-concept were nonsignificant. These results are listed in Table 5.

Arousal: Cost–reward model. The arousal: cost–reward model of helping predicts that potential helpers, aroused by the situation in which someone needs help, will choose among their behavioral options to provide help more often when the costs of helping are relatively low and the costs of not helping are relatively high. We investigated the relationships of the costs of helping and not helping not to overall amounts of help given in helping situations but to the levels of discrimination shown in the amounts of help given to Blacks compared to Whites. The results, shown in Table 5, indicate that the costs of helping were associated with the levels of discrimination against Blacks in helping situations. As helping required more time, effort, difficulty, risk, and overall investment, then the amount of discrimination against Blacks increased. It appears in these situations individuals are more likely to choose to leave the situation, for instance, rather than to provide help when the target is Black versus when the target is White.

[8]The effect sizes for only two hypothesis tests (Lerner & Frank, 1974a; West, Whitney, & Schnedler, 1975) were determined by assigning the undescribed, nonsignificant effects p values of .50. All results subsequently reported are virtually identical whether these hypothesis tests are included or excluded.

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

Table 3. *Hypothesis Tests Included in Meta-Analysis*

Study, Condition (if appropriate)	N	Statistic	Direction (Helped More)	Effect Size d	Effect Size r	Significance p
Benson, Karabenick, and Lerner (1976)	604	$\chi^2(1) = 3.88$	Whites	–0.16	–.08	.049
Bickman and Kamzan (1973)						
Low need	50	Frequencies	Whites	–0.16	–.08	.561
High need	50	Frequencies	Whites	–0.12	–.12	.396
Brigham and Richardson (1979)	91	Frequencies	Whites	–0.42	–.21	.050
Brown (1984)	400	$\chi^2(1) = 4.31$	Whites	–0.21	–.10	.038
Brown and Reed (1982)						
Low cost	200	Frequencies	Whites	–0.02	–.01	.877
High cost	200	Frequencies	Whites	–0.17	–.08	.233
Bryan and Test (1967)	56	$F(1, 48) = 4.84$	Whites	–0.58	–.28	.034
Clark (1974)	665	Frequencies	Whites	–0.25	–.13	.001
Dovidio and Gaertner (1981)	96	Frequencies	Blacks	0.48	.23	.022
Dutton (1971)						
White first	40	Frequencies	Blacks	0.21	.10	.514
Black first	40	Frequencies	No difference	0.00	.00	1.000
Dutton (1973)						
Public	1,805	Frequencies	Blacks	0.23	.11	< .00005
Private	1,884	Frequencies	Blacks	0.16	.08	.0005
Dutton and Lake (1973)						
High threat	40	Frequencies	Blacks	0.79	.37	.016
Low threat	40	Frequencies	Whites	–0.40	–.20	.208
Farra, Zinser, and Bailey (1978)						
Internal cause	60	$p = .06$	Whites	–0.49	–.24	
External cause	60	$p = .05$	Whites	–0.52	–.25	
Franklin (1974)	89	$\chi^2(1) = 5.56$	Whites	–0.51	–.25	.018
Frey and Gaertner (1986)						
External locus of control	60	Frequencies	Blacks	0.31	.16	.231
Internal locus of control	60	Frequencies	Whites	–0.27	–.14	.269
Gaertner (1973) Study 1	468	Frequencies	Whites	–0.46	–.23	< .00005
Gaertner (1975)						
Alone	20	Frequencies	No difference	0.00	.00	1.000
Together	20	Frequencies	Whites	–1.48	–.61	.003
Gaertner and Bickman (1971)	569	$\chi^2(1) = 7.40$	Whites	–0.25	–.12	.006
Gaertner and Dovidio (1977) Study 1						
Alone	32	Frequencies	Blacks	0.38	.19	.292
Together	32	Frequencies	Whites	–0.80	–.38	.030
Gaertner and Dovidio (1977) Study 2						
High ambiguity	80	Frequencies	Whites	–0.21	–.10	.352
Low ambiguity	80	Frequencies	Whites	–0.31	–.15	.167
Gaertner, Dovidio, and Johnson (1982)						
Alone	22	$F(1, 35) = 1$	Whites	–0.41	–.21	.228
Together	21	$F(1, 35) = 10.09$	Whites	–1.33	–.57	.006
Graf and Riddell (1972)	1,600	Frequencies	Whites	–0.002	–.001	.965
Katz, Cohen, and Glass (1975) Study 1	2,340	$F(1, 2322) = 18.64$	Blacks	0.19	.09	< .00005
Katz, Cohen, et al. (1975) Study 2	960	$F(1, 944) = 37.24$	Blacks	0.39	.19	< .00005
Katz, Cohen, et al. (1975) Study 3	800	$F(1, 792) = 20.48$	Whites	–0.32	–.16	< .00005
Katz, Glass, Lucido, and Farber (1978) Study 1	99	$F(1, 91) = 3.86$	Blacks	0.39	.19	.054
Lerner and Frank (1974a)	80	$p = .50$[a]	Whites	–0.15	–.08	
Lerner and Frank (1974b)	102	Frequencies	Blacks	0.12	.06	.552
Piliavin, Rodin, and Piliavin (1969)						
Drunk	38	Frequencies	Whites	–0.42	–.21	.205
Ill/cane	65	Frequencies	No difference	0.00	.00	1.000
Rosenfield, Greenberg, Folger, and Borgs (1982)						
Panhandler	28	Frequencies	Whites	–0.97	–.45	.020
Petitioner	28	Frequencies	Blacks	0.40	.20	.293
Shaffer and Graziano (1980)	127	$\chi^2(1) = 0.07$	Blacks	0.05	.02	.793
Thayer (1973)	80	Frequencies	Blacks	0.57	.28	.012
Wegner and Crano (1975)	72	Frequencies	No difference	0.00	.00	1.000
West, Whitney, and Schnedler (1975) Study 1	64	$p = .05$	Whites	–0.50	–.25	
West et al. (1975) Study 2	64	$p = .50$[a]	Whites	–0.17	–.08	
Wispe and Freshley (1971)	88	Frequencies	Blacks	0.05	.02	.832

[a]Incomplete hypothesis test, however the direction of the nonsignificant effect could be discerned from the report.

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

Table 4. *Stem and Leaf Plot of Effect Sizes (d) for Differential Rates of Helping Given to Whites and Blacks*

Stem	Leaf
–1.4	8
–1.3	3
–1.2	
–1.1	
–1.0	
–0.9	7
–0.8	0
–0.7	
–0.6	
–0.5	0 1 2 8
–0.4	0 1 2 2 6 9
–0.3	1 2
–0.2	1 1 4 5 5 7
–0.1	5 6 6 7 7
0.0	0 2
0.0	0 0 0 0 4 5
0.1	2 6 9
0.2	1 3
0.3	1 8 9 9
0.4	0 8
0.5	7
0.6	
0.7	9

Note: Negative effect sizes indicate that more help was given to Whites than to Blacks and positive effect sizes indicate that more help was given to Blacks than to Whites.

Table 5. *Model Tests of Continuous Predictors of Effect Sizes*

Predictor	Z for Model	Significance
Year	–0.802	.423
Time	–2.781	.005
Ambiguity	–0.106	.916
Risk	–2.746	.006
Emergency	–3.601	.0003
Cost	–0.462	.644
Difficulty	–3.832	.0001
Effort	–2.720	.007
Distance	–3.591	.0003
Overall justification for not helping	0.461	.645
Justification composite	–3.423	.0006
Justification composite without emergency	–3.909	.00009
Aware of prejudice	1.877	.061
Motivation to suppress	0.019	.985
Threat to self concept	–1.454	.146
Overall investment	–4.403	.00001
Cost of helping composite	–3.543	.0004
Feel bad not helping	–2.227	.026
Feel regret not helping	–2.209	.027
Cost of not helping composite	–2.973	.003

Note: The sign of the *Z* test indicates the direction of the relationship between the predictor scores and the effect sizes such that a negative value indicates that higher scores on the predictor coincide with more negative effect sizes (i.e., greater discrimination against Blacks). Significance refers to the *p*-value (two-tailed) for the *Z* test of the predictor model.

The results for the costs of not helping, also shown in Table 5, were also associated with the amounts of discrimination shown against Blacks compared to Whites. As the costs of not helping increased in terms of the level of emergence and how much regret and how bad the potential helpers would feel if they did not help then the amounts of help given to Blacks were lower compared to the amount of help given to Whites. These results suggest that, although the situations are objectively equivalent, the costs of not helping a White target in those situations may be perceived by participants as more costly than the costs of not helping a Black target in the same situations.

To offer a cautious exploration of these results we categorized each helping situation as high or low for both its costs of helping and costs for not helping using a median split of the composite scores for each variable. This created four groups of studies with regards to the costs for helping and not helping (low/low, low/high, high/low, and high/high for costs of helping and not helping, respectively). We calculated effect sizes for each of these four groups and tested these for significance by inspecting the 95% confidence interval. The low/low group (k = 18) showed a significant effect size indicating that when the costs of helping and not helping are both low, then Black targets received help more often than Whites ($d = 0.09$, $CI = 0.03/0.14$). The low/high group (k = 8) showed a significant effect size indicating that when the costs of helping are low and the costs of not helping are high, then Black targets received help less often than Whites ($d = -0.25$, $CI = -0.36/-0.14$). The high/low group (k = 8) and the high/high (k = 14) groups did not show significant effect sizes indicating the help given to Blacks relative to Whites in these studies were not different ($d = 0.00$, $CI = -0.08/0.08$ and $d = 0.05$, $CI = -0.01/0.11$, respectively). Significant differences between the effect sizes of the groups did emerge (QB (3) = 29.97, p = .0000016), and contrasts between the four groups indicated that the amount of discrimination against Blacks compared to Whites in the low/high group was significantly greater than any of the other groups. Thus, it was when the costs of helping were low but the cost of not helping was high that the most discrimination was observed against Black targets who needed help compared to White targets who needed help.

Discussion

Many studies have employed varied and creative research designs to measure discrimination against Blacks in helping situations. In a prior review of the literature, Crosby et al. (1980) concluded that it was easier for helpers to discriminate from a distance. This effect was confirmed by this meta-analysis. This

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

conclusion supported the theory of aversive racism (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986) that states that Whites who firmly believe that they are nonprejudiced often still feel some discomfort in situations with Blacks. These Whites may display behavioral evidence of prejudice (which may be unconscious) in situations in which discriminatory behavior can be rationalized with an alternative nonprejudiced motivation. Discrimination will not occur overtly because that would conflict with the individuals' egalitarian beliefs and produce an aversive internal state due to the inconsistency between the individuals' thoughts and actions (Festinger & Carlsmith, 1959; Monteith, 1993). This effect is also consistent with the justification–suppression model of the expression of prejudice (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003) that asserts that individuals' expressions of prejudice will occur when they are able to justify this expression using a nonprejudiced motivation.

The literature review by Crosby et al. (1980) did not allow for further predictions made by aversive racism theory and the justification–suppression model to be evaluated. It also did not offer the sensitivity of comparisons that is possible with a more quantitative synthesis of the research. This meta-analysis provided this capability, using calculation and comparison of effect sizes across the literature that employed helping paradigms to measure discrimination against Blacks relative to Whites. Several moderators of the helping settings were tested to determine when discrimination was most likely to occur, and the predictions that aversive racism theory and the justification–suppression model would suggest were evaluated.

The results of this meta-analysis generally supported these predictions for aversive racism theory. It was expected that discrimination would occur against Blacks more frequently when the helping situation afforded individuals more opportunities to justify withholding help with nonracist explanations. The direct test of this prediction made feasible by this meta-analysis showed that the evidence contained in the literature supports this prediction. The composite justification score comprised of ratings of the specific characteristics that were expected to provide participants with the ability to rationalize discrimination successfully predicted levels of discrimination. That is, as helping scenarios contained higher levels of various attributional cues that would justify one's failure to help a target of any race, help was given less often to Black targets than to White targets. It appears that the ability to rationalize not helping with nonracist explanations allowed individuals to express prejudice without fear of either themselves or others attributing their behavior to any prejudicial attitudes that they may harbor toward Blacks. It should be noted, however, that the judges' overall ratings of the subjective level of justification present in each paradigm did not predict levels of discrimination.

These results provide partial support for the justification–suppression model of the expression of prejudice. That the attributional cues of the helping scenarios would (individually and summed into a composite) provide justification for and hence allow the expression of prejudice is consistent with the hypotheses of the justification–suppression model. However, the subjective ratings of how justifiable it would be to withhold helping using nonprejudiced rationalizations did not predict levels of discrimination, nor the ratings of how aware one would be that withholding help would be indicative of prejudice, the ratings of how motivated one would be to suppress prejudice, or how much a threat not helping would be to one's unprejudiced self-concept.

Examination of the specific situational characteristics that we expected would allow individuals to rationalize discrimination showed that several of these characteristics provided significant prediction of discrimination against Blacks in the expected direction, again consistent with aversive racism theory (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986) and the justification–suppression model (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). Help was given less often to Blacks than to Whites when potential helpers would need to invest more time and more effort, assume more risk, and engage in a more difficult helping task. In each of these cases, the potential helpers could attribute their decisions not to help to the characteristics of the situation. They could accordingly believe that their decisions have nothing to do with race, avoiding a state of dissonance (Monteith, 1993). However, the fact that more help was given to White targets in the same situations indicates that the targets' race was a factor in deciding whether or not to help.

Contrary to our predictions, emergency level of the situation was a significant predictor of discrimination against Blacks such that higher levels of emergency were associated with more (not less) discrimination against Blacks. These results suggest that, especially in emergency situations, the necessity for a plausible explanation to justify one's decision to withhold help from a Black target in need of help is not a key predictor of discrimination. According to aversive racism theory, not having this ability to rationalize one's behavior in nonracist ways should arouse guilt in individuals who believe that they are low in prejudice. Did participants in these studies feel guilty for not providing help to Black targets? We suspect not. Even in situations in which the ability to rationalize not helping was lower, the decision to help or not to help was made by participants immediately after discovering that the target needed help. This immediacy may have precluded the type of examination of the motivations for one's behavior that would have increased the probability of helping Blacks in situations with low justification for withholding help. This

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

prevention of cognition may have hindered participants' ability to consider what racist and nonracist responding would be, with participants instead acting on their initial inclinations.

This explanation is consistent with the literature that describes prejudice as a combination of automatic and controlled processes (Devine, 1989; Fazio et al., 1995; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Smith & DeCoster, 2000; Wilson, Lindsey, & Schooler, 2000). This perspective distinguishes between the negativity many Whites feel toward Blacks at an implicit level, such as that measured by response latencies to positive and negative stimuli paired with White and Black stimuli (e.g., Fazio et al., 1995; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998), and the behavior that emerges after conscious control is asserted. In many instances, individuals feel the need to inhibit the expression of any prejudice that they may harbor toward Blacks (Fazio & Dunton, 1997), and may attempt to suppress even thinking about that negativity (see Monteith, Sherman, & Devine, 1998, for a review). However, these attempts to inhibit prejudice are not always successful (Bargh, Chen, & Burrows, 1996). Especially when one's capacity for cognition is limited, prejudice may emerge in one's behavior due to the inability to suppress implicit negativity (Gilbert & Hixon, 1991) and to help conserve the cognitive resources that are available (Macrae, Milne, & Bodenhausen, 1994).

Our results indicated that more discrimination against Blacks was found in the studies in which levels of emergency in the helping situation were higher. Although they are inconsistent with the predictions of aversive racism, these results are consistent with the explanations offered by automatic and controlled processes of prejudice. The participants' dilemma in a helping situation in which there is a high level of emergency is that they must make an almost instantaneous choice to help or not help an individual who is in some jeopardy. That the choice must be made quickly does not necessarily distinguish situations of high emergency from situations of low emergency. However, the added stress and arousal created by the high emergency situation may increase the participants' cognitive load so that they negativity harbored toward Blacks at the implicit level is less likely to be controlled. As a result, that uninhibited negativity may cause participants to withhold helping from Blacks at higher frequencies relative to Whites in situations of higher emergency levels. In contrast, the greater ability to assert conscious control over one's automatically activated prejudice may have overridden the desire of many White participants to avoid contact with Black targets that would be predicted by aversive racism theory in most other situations of lower emergency levels.

An alternative explanation for why Black targets were helped less than White targets in situations of higher emergency levels may be offered by the theory of intergroup anxiety (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). This theory posits that individuals may experience feelings of threat during an intergroup interaction because they have some expectation that the interaction will not go well. The individuals may feel that they will be embarrassed or have other negative effects on themselves during or as a result of the interaction. This expectation may contribute to individuals' expressions of negativity toward other groups, such as by avoiding interactions with members of another group (Bizman & Yinon, 2001; Stephan et al., 2002). When potential helpers who were White were confronted with high emergency situations in which Black targets needed help, the potential helpers may have attributed the arousal produced by the situations to feelings of anxiety about interacting with an outgroup member. This may have caused the potential helpers to refuse to offer help so that they would not experience negative outcomes during or after the interaction. It is plausible that this anxiety-produced motivation to avoid negative interactions combined with the potential for the disruption of prejudice control processes to produce the systematic reduction in help received by Blacks relative to Whites in high emergency situations. Unfortunately, our data do not allow us to definitely identify the mediator of the relationship between discrimination against Blacks and higher levels of emergency.

Our results regarding the arousal: cost–reward model (Piliavin et al., 1981) may be telling in explaining this finding. When the costs of helping were higher, then less help was given to Blacks than to Whites. When the costs of not helping were higher, again less help was given to Blacks than to Whites. Further, the least help was given to Blacks relative to Whites when the situations had relatively low costs of helping and relatively high costs of not helping. It should be noted that these determinations regarding the costs of helping and not helping were made by independent raters retrospectively examining the helping situations while disregarding the race of the individual needing help. What may be happening is that individuals who harbor negativity toward Blacks may perceive the situations in which Blacks need help as less arousing than situations in which Whites need help, and may therefore be less motivated to take action. This explanation is speculative but plausibly consistent with our findings.

Returning to our original queries: Is racism still a problem in our society? If so, how and when may racism be expressed? These results offer insight into these questions despite the fact that much of the research synthesized by this meta-analysis was conducted many years ago. Racism and expressions of discrimination against Blacks can and will exist as long as individuals harbor negativity toward Blacks at the implicit level. Discrimination will be more frequently expressed when the ability to consciously control the expression of this negativity is inhibited.

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

Conclusion

This meta-analysis provided a quantitative synthesis of the literature that used helping behavior to measure discrimination against Blacks relative to Whites in the same situations, and allowed the predictions of aversive racism theory (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986), the justification–suppression model of the expression of prejudice (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003), and the arousal: cost–reward model (Piliavin et al., 1981) to be tested by coding the moderators of the helping situations. Overall, we found that discrimination against Blacks was more likely to occur when potential helpers had more opportunities to rationalize decisions not to help with justifiable explanations having nothing to do with race. These results were consistent with aversive racism theory and the justification–suppression model of the expression of prejudice. Further, we found that discrimination against Blacks was more likely to occur when the situations were higher in their level of emergency, possibly due to the inability to control implicit negativity toward Blacks or to the misattribution of arousal to interracial anxiety. Together these findings suggest that the automatically activated prejudice that exists in many individuals, even among those who are convinced that they are not prejudiced, may have dire consequences for the targets of that prejudice, especially in situations in which not helping is justifiable and in emergency situations.

References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis.

Bargh, J. A., Chen, M., & Burrows, L. (1996). Automaticity of social behavior: Direct effects of trait construct and stereotype activation on action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71,* 230–244.

*Benson, P. L., Karabenick, S. A., & Lerner, R. M. (1976). Pretty pleases: The effects of physical attractiveness, race, and sex on receiving help. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 12,* 409–415.

*Bickman, L., & Kamzan, M. (1973). The effect of race and need on helping behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology, 89,* 73–77.

Bizman, A., & Yinon, Y. (2001). Intergroup and interpersonal threats as determinants of prejudice: The moderating role of in-group identification. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 23,* 191–196.

*Brigham, J. C., & Richardson, C. B. (1979). Race, sex, and helping in the marketplace. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 9,* 314–322.

*Brown, C. E. (1984). Own-group bias in survey return rate: An unobtrusive attitude measure. *Psychological Reports, 54,* 157–158.

*Brown, C. E., & Reed, M. D. (1982). Race, cost, and car-status: Interacting variables using the lost-letter technique. *Psychological Reports, 51,* 303–308.

*Bryan, J. H., & Test, M. A. (1967). Models and helping: Naturalistic studies in aiding behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6,* 400–407.

*Clark, R. D.(1974). Effects of sex and race on helping behavior in a nonreactive setting. *Representative Research in Social Psychology, 5,* 1–6.

Cohen, J. (1990). Things I have learned (so far). *American Psychologist, 45,* 1304–1312.

Crandall, C. S., & Eshelman, A. (2003). A justification-suppression model of the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin, 129,* 414–446.

Crandall, C. S., Eshleman, A., & O'Brien, L. (2002). Social norms and the expression and suppression of prejudice: The struggle for internalization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* 359–378.

Crosby, F., Bromley, S., & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of Black and White discriminatin and prejudice: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin, 87,* 546–563.

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56,* 5–18.

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

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1991). Changes in the expression of racial prejudice. In H. J. Knopke, R. J. Norrell, & R. W. Rogers (Eds.), *Opening doors: Perspectives on race relations in contemporary America* (pp. 119–148). Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. E., Kawakami, K., & Hodson, G. (2002). Why can't we just get along? Interpersonal biases and interracial distrust. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 8,* 88–102.

Dunton, B. C., & Fazio, R. H. (1997). An individual difference measure of motivation to control prejudiced reactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23,* 316–326.

*Dutton, D. G. (1971). Reactions of restauranteurs to Blacks and Whites violating restaurant dress requirements. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 3,* 298–302.

*Dutton, D. G. (1973). Reverse discrimination: The relationship of amount of perceived discrimination toward a minority group on the behavior of majority group members. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 5,* 34–45.

*Dutton, D. G., & Lake, R. A. (1973). Threat of prejudice and reverse discrimination in interracial situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 28,* 94–100.

*Farra, J. D., Zinser, O., & Bailey, R. C. (1978). Effects of I-E of donor and race and locus of cause of failure of recipient on helping behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology, 106,* 73–81.

Fazio, R. H., & Dunton, B. C. (1997). Categorization by race: The impact of automatic and controlled components of racial prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33,* 451–470.

Fazio, R. H., & Hilden, L. E. (2001). Emotional reactions to a seemingly prejudiced response: The role of automatically activated racial attitudes and motivation to control prejudiced reactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 538–549.

Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., & Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 1013–1027.

Festinger, L., & Carlsmith, J. M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58,* 203–210.

*Franklin, B. J. (1974). Victim characteristics and helping behavior in a rural Southern setting. *Journal of Social Psychology, 93,* 93–100.

*Frey, D. L., & Gaertner, S. L. (1986). Helping and the avoidance of inappropriate interracial behavior: A strategy that perpetuates a nonprejudiced self-image. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 1083–1090.

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016

*Gaertner, S. L. (1973). Helping behavior and racial discrimination among liberals and conservatives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25,* 335–341.

*Gaertner, S. L. (1975). The role of racial attitudes in helping behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology, 97,* 95–101.

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

*Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1977). The subtlety of white racism, arousal, and helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35,* 691–707.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61–89). San Diego: Academic Press

*Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., & Johnson, G. (1982). Race of victim, nonresponsive bystanders, and helping behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology, 117,* 69–77.

Gilbert, D., & Hixon, J. G. (1991). The trouble with thinking: Activation and application of stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 509–517.

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

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review, 102,* 4–27.

Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 1464–1480.

Hall, J. A., Rosenthal, R., Tickle-Degnen, L., & Mosteller, F. (1994). Hypotheses and problems in research synthesis. In H. Cooper, & L. V. Hedges (Eds.), *The handbook of research synthesis* (pp. 17–28). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hodson, G., Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Processes in racial discrimination: Differential weighting of conflicting information. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28,* 460–471.

Johnson, B. T. (1993). *DSTAT: Software for the meta-analytic review of research literatures* (version 1.11) [computer program]. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

*Katz, I., Cohen, S., & Glass, D. (1975). Some determinants of cross-racial helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32,* 964–970.

*Katz, I., Glass, D. C., Lucido, D., & Farber, J. (1978). Harm-doing and victim's racial or orthopedic stigma as determinants of helping behavior. *Journal of Personality, 47,* 340–364.

Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55,* 893–905.

*Lerner, R. M., & Frank, P. (1974a). Laboratory analogue of field helping behavior. *Psychological Reports, 35,* 557–558.

*Lerner, R. M., & Frank, P. (1974b). Relation of race and sex to supermarket helping behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology, 94,* 201–203.

Macrae, C. N., Milne, A. B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (1994). Stereotypes as energy-saving devices: A peek inside the cognitive toolbox. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66,* 37–47.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–125). San Diego: Academic Press.

McConahay, J. B., Hardee, B. B., & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in America? It depends on who is asking and what is being asked. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 25,* 563–579.

Monteith, M. J. (1993). Self-regulation of prejudiced responses: Implications for progress in prejudice-reduction efforts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65,* 469–485.

Monteith, M. J., Deneen, N. E., & Tooman, G. D. (1996). The effect of social norm activation on the expression of opinions concerning gay men and Blacks. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 18,* 267–288.

Monteith, M. J., Sherman, J. W., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Suppression as a stereotype control strategy. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2,* 63–82.

Mullen, B. (1989). *Advanced BASIC meta-analysis.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

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

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

Plant, A. E., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75,* 811–832.

*Rosenfield, D., Greenberg, J., Folger, R., & Borys, R. (1982). Effect of an encounter with a black panhandler on subsequent helping for blacks: Tokenism or confirming a negative stereotype? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8,* 664–671.

Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1991). *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Scott, R. R. (1987). Interracial couples: Situational factors in white male reactions. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 8,* 125–137.

*Shaffer, D. R., & Graziano, W. G. (1980). Effects of victims' race and organizational affiliation on receiving help from Blacks and Whites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 6,* 366–372.

Smith, E. R., & DeCoster, J. (2000). Dual-process models in social and cognitive psychology: Conceptual integration and links to underlying memory systems. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4,* 108–131.

Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K. A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K. S., Jackson, L. A., et al. (2002). The role of threats in the racial attitudes of Blacks and Whites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28,* 1242–1254.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues, 41,* 157–175.

*Thayer, S. (1973). Lend me your ears: Racial and sexual factors in helping the deaf. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 28,* 8–11.

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

*West, S. G., Whitney, G., & Schnedler, R. (1975). Helping of a motorist in distress: The effects of sex, race, and neighborhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31,* 691–698.

Wilson, T. D., Lindsey, S., & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological Review, 107,* 101–126.

*Wispe, L. G., & Freshley, H. B. (1971). Race, sex, and sympathetic helping behavior: The broken bag caper. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17,* 59–65.

Downloaded from psr.sagepub.com at University of Wales Lampeter on January 9, 2016