



Universiteit Leiden

Faculteit der Sociale Wetenschappen

# Third Party Judgements of Strategic Helping in Public and in Private Settings

---

Carmen Massaar

In collaboration with Jessica Horlings

---

Master thesis Psychology, specialization SOP  
Institute of Psychology  
Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences – Leiden University

Date: 15-05-2020

Student number: s1511580

First examiner of the university: Esther van Leeuwen

Second examiner of the university: Emma ter Mors

### **Abstract**

Prior research demonstrated that the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth is seen as less negative than the strategic motive to demonstrate competence, while this was not expected. Both these motives are strategic and used to boost one's image. Because these motives are better served in a public setting, we investigated third parties' perceptions of help providers and help offers that are given with a strategic motive to demonstrate either competence or warmth in a public versus a private setting. We expected that help and help providers with a strategic motive to demonstrate warmth would be judged more negatively by participants when an audience was present compared to when no audience was present, whereas the presence or absence of an audience would not affect judgements of help or help providers with a strategic motive to demonstrate competence. We used a scenario to test 188 participants, resulting in the unexpected absence of an interaction effect, but explorative analyses showed that the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth was seen more as genuine warmth by participants than the strategic motive to demonstrate competence. These results indicated that people seem to be incapable of recognizing the strategic nature of warmth. Other than that, we found that both the attitudes towards help and helpers with a strategic motive to demonstrate warmth as well as competence were more negative in a public situation compared to a private situation. Showing that the strategic nature of the help was recognized more in a public context.

*Keywords:* Strategic help, Competence and warmth, Presence of an Audience, Absence of an audience, Genuine warmth, Perceptions of help giver, Perceptions of help offer

### **Third Party Judgements of Strategic Helping in Public and in Private Settings**

Imagine that while scrolling through your social media feed you see that a company publicly announces that they are committed to helping a certain charity. You hear from an insider friend that the main motive behind this announcement is to boost its public reputation. What would be your perception of this company? Would you see the company as caring and generous, or as hypocritical?

When a group helps another group, it is possible to differentiate between strategic and non-strategic motives. Non-strategic motives are often motivated by empathy or prosocial attitudes, whereas strategic motives are motivated by the interests or needs of the helper (Van Leeuwen, 2017). Prior research has shown that people judge help that is given with a strategic motive more negatively than help given without a strategic motive (Ames et al., 2004; Van Leeuwen, 2019). A strategic motive could be used to boost a public image (Van Leeuwen, 2017), as illustrated by the scenario described in the previous paragraph. However, strategic help with a motive to boost a public image may be seen as hypocritical (Van Leeuwen, 2019). Although a lot of research has been done to identify the various strategic motives behind offered help, this was not focused on the perception third parties have of help with a strategic motive. This perception, however, is very relevant, because companies or other groups of people often use the fact that they are helping others to boost their public image via (social) media channels. Does this publicity affect outsiders' perception of these groups? To answer this question, it is important to look at the difference between judgements of strategic motives of groups helping other groups in private and public settings. To this end, we conducted a study in which we investigated perceptions of helpers and help offers made with a strategic motive, in public and in private conditions.

#### **Motives for Giving Help**

Helping is seen as a way of taking care of others who cannot help themselves in fulfilling their needs (Van Leeuwen & Zagefka, 2017). Helping is often seen as a prosocial act, and a genuine act of help is one in which the helper does not expect anything in return (Van Leeuwen, 2017). We know, however, that there are strategic and non-strategic motives for offering help (Van Leeuwen & Zagefka, 2017). “Helping”, as defined in the introduction of the book ‘Intergroup Helping’ by Van Leeuwen and Zagefka (2017), “is the provision of aid through acts that may or may not be motivated by the intention to benefit the recipient” (p. vi).

When there is a non-strategic motive for help, help is motivated by prosocial attitudes towards other groups or individuals, often rooted in feelings of empathy (Van Leeuwen, 2017). When there is a strategic motive for help, help is motivated by a concern for the own group (Van Leeuwen, 2017). This means that the helping group actually has something to gain by helping others, such as boosting their own image. Multiple forms of strategic helping were defined in the strategic outgroup helping model (SOUTH model), among which the strategic motive to demonstrate competence and the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth. Both are specifically used to boost the helper’s image (Van Leeuwen, 2017). The strategic motive to demonstrate warmth refers to the desire to appear kind, helpful and warm, whereas the strategic motive to demonstrate competence refers to the desire to appear competent, smart, skilled or proficient. As stated in the previous paragraph, help is generally seen as a prosocial act (Van Leeuwen, 2017), offering help to another group may thus make you seem prosocial and friendly. Other than that, research shows that helping groups are seen as competent, prosocial and attractive (Täuber & Van Leeuwen, 2017; Van Leeuwen & Täuber, 2011, 2012), showing that the act of helping will impact your image in a positive manner.

The stereotype content model explains that there is a difference in the way people perceive competence and warmth in others (Fiske et al., 2002). According to Fiske et al.

(2002), competence perceptions are derived from perceptions of power and status of groups, relative to other groups. In contrast, warmth is associated with the extent to which an outgroup competes with other groups. The less a group competes, the more warmth is attributed to that group, and vice versa. Therefore, high warmth is perceived as less competitive than competence, and is associated with more benign intentions towards the other group than low warmth and competence (Van Leeuwen, 2017).

### **Responses to Strategically Offered Help**

In two recent studies by Van Leeuwen (2019) and Sillevs Smitt (2019), judgements of helpers with strategic motives were investigated, and compared to those of helpers with non-strategic motives. Both studies specifically looked at warmth and competence as strategic motives, and empathy as non-strategic motive. Sillevs Smitt (2019) reminded people of help that was given in the past; no significant effect was found. In a follow-up study, Van Leeuwen (2019) found that help given with a strategic motive was judged more negatively than help given with a non-strategic motive (i.e., empathy). She also found that help given with a motive to demonstrate competence was judged more negatively than help given with a motive to demonstrate warmth. While Sillevs Smitt (2019) did not find evidence to support a difference in the judgements of strategically versus non-strategically motivated help, Van Leeuwen (2019) found that groups that helped with a strategic motive were judged more negatively than groups with a non-strategic motive (i.e., empathy), and that the strategic motive to demonstrate competence was judged most negatively.

Both Van Leeuwen (2019) and Sillevs Smitt (2019) expected that help given with a motive to demonstrate warmth or competence would affect the attitude of the help recipient more negatively compared to help that had been given with an empathy motive. Other than that, they expected that a motive to demonstrate warmth would be judged more negatively than a motive to demonstrate competence, both authors specifically mention moral hypocrisy

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

as reason for this expectation. Moral hypocrisy is generally described as a situation in which someone explicitly supports a certain moral standard but does not behave according to that moral standard (Tong & Yang, 2011). In the case of strategically motivated help, the act of helping may appear moral, but the self-serving nature of strategic help is anything but moral. Moral hypocrisy is described as people pursuing their own interests, while they try to appear as if they are fair (Caviola & Faulmüller, 2014). Research has shown that people do not like people who are hypocritical, because they dishonestly signal that they behave in a moral way (Jordan et al., 2017). When an act of helping, which is commonly seen as prosocial, is done purely out of the desire to appear a certain way and with that improve one's image, it is not a prosocial act anymore, and this can be seen as morally hypocritical.

The results of Van Leeuwen (2019) and Sillevs Smitt (2019) were not congruent with moral hypocrisy literature. Sillevs Smitt did not find differences between the attitudes towards either help offered with the motive to appear competent or the motive to appear warm. Van Leeuwen found the opposite of what she expected, participants had more negative attitudes towards helpers with a motive to appear competent than with a motive to appear warm. The stereotype content model (Fiske et al., 2002) provides an explanation for these unexpected findings. Perceptions of warmth are generally based on the nature of the relationship between the helper and help recipient, whereas perceptions of competence are based on relative group status (Fiske et al., 2002). Relative group status is something you can have a competition over. High warmth implies that a group has no to very little competition, whereas low warmth or a lack of warmth is associated with competition. Therefore, it could be that people find it especially difficult to perceive a group that is high in warmth as competitive, since warmth is associated with benign intentions. Thus, according to the stereotype content model (Fiske et al., 2002), groups high in warmth are generally perceived as less competitive than groups high in competence. This might also mean that people often

do not see warmth as something they can strategically use in order to make themselves come across in a more positive way. This could be the reason why Van Leeuwen (2019) did not find the expected results; people might just find it harder to imagine warmth being used in a strategic way.

### **The Effect of an Audience**

The expected results based on the theory of moral hypocrisy were not found in the research by Van Leeuwen (2019) and Sillevs Smitt (2019). This raises questions as to what is happening here, do people not recognize the strategic nature of warmth as can be expected when taking the stereotype content model in consideration, is the moral hypocrisy effect not applicable here, or is there something else? In our research we expected that strategic helpers with the motive to demonstrate warmth would be judged most negatively in a public situation as compared to a private situation and to either a public or a private situation in which the helper offered help with a strategic motive to demonstrate competence. To meet these expectations people would need to recognize the strategic nature of an audience. We would thus need to create a circumstance in which third parties would see warmth as something over which people could have a competition.

The strategic motives to demonstrate both competence and warmth are specifically used to boost one's image (Van Leeuwen 2017). Boosting your groups image is better served when an audience is present to witness the act of helping, considering you want to reach more people. So, when a help provider purposefully seeks out attention after having helped another group, this should give an extra indication of a self-serving, strategic motive for providing the help.

Different studies demonstrate that people tend to be more prosocial and willing to help when there is an audience present (Riordan et al., 2001; Satow, 1975). Castillo et al. (2015) showed that people more often donate to a charity when they are asked to do so in

front of their friends. Furthermore, people were more willing to ask friends to donate if their name was written in the request, so that it was visible for others that they had already donated. That people are more willing to help or donate money just by having an audience witness their help showed that others' opinions about ourselves, and thus our image, is a big motivator for people to help. This increase in more strategic motives behind helping in a public setting, especially in wanting to appear as warm, leads us to expect that spectators will be more likely to see warmth in a public situation as something in which groups could have a competition. This would consecutively lead people to see the group that provides this help as hypocritical, because they give a misleading signal that they act moral whilst actually fulfilling their own needs (Jordan et al., 2017). To summarize, we hypothesized that when help is offered with an audience present, people would be more able to see this as a strategic move to improve the image of the helper and therefore would be able to see warmth more as a competitive trait. This would in turn lead to a perception of the helper as hypocritical and thereby to a more negative perception of help and a helper who offers help with a strategic motive to appear as warm compared to a strategic motive to appear as competent.

### **Overview of Study and Hypotheses**

We used a two (competence versus warmth) by two (public versus private) between-subjects experimental design in this research, and we observed third parties' perceptions of (providers of) help that was offered with a strategic motive to demonstrate either competence or warmth, and the help was offered in either a public or a private situation. Based on the research on moral hypocrisy (Jordan et al., 2017; Tong & Yang, 2011) and prosocial behavior (Castillo et al., 2015; Kraus & Callaghan, 2016; Riordan et al., 2001; Satow, 1975), two hypotheses were formulated.

*Hypothesis 1:* Help providers with a strategic motive to demonstrate warmth would be judged more negatively by a third party when an audience is present compared to when no



## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

audience is present, whereas the presence or absence of an audience would not affect judgements of help providers with a strategic motive to demonstrate competence (interaction effect).

*Hypothesis 2:* Help given with a strategic motive to demonstrate warmth would be judged more strategically by a third party when an audience is present compared to when no audience is present, whereas the presence or absence of an audience would not affect judgements of help given with a strategic motive to demonstrate competence (interaction effect).

## Method

### Participants and Design

One hundred eighty-eight male, female, and non-binary participants ( $M_{\text{age}} = 39.90$ ,  $SD_{\text{age}} = 17.11$ , range from 17 to 76 years; 99 female, 1 non-binary) were recruited in various public areas (e.g., at train stations, markets, and shopping areas). They were randomly assigned to the conditions of a between-subjects design with the variables Motive (warmth vs competence) and Audience (private vs public). Cell sizes ranged from  $n = 44$  to  $n = 50$ .

Our research was approved by the Psychology Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences of the University of Leiden on March 2 of 2020.

### Procedure

Participants participated in this study voluntarily. The questionnaire took approximately ten minutes to complete. After reading and signing an informed consent, participants were asked to read the following scenario about two fictitious groups: “On a faraway planet, there is a civilization just like we have on earth. Somewhere in a valley there are two villages, which we will call A and B. Imagine that you are traveling on this planet. One day, a resident of A tells you about a problem that the villages were struggling with. Due to extreme drought, there was a lack of water for the crops in A and B. Therefore, residents of

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

A made an invention in the field of water supply. Because of this invention, A is now more resistant against drought spells.” The full text of the scenario is included in Appendix A.

After this introduction, the scenario differed across the conditions.

In the *private and warmth condition*, participants read: “The resident of A also told you that they offered B their new invention. In doing so, they could show how friendly and helpful they are. A only discussed the offer with the mayor of B, and did not share it in the media.” In the *private and competence condition*, participants read: “The resident of A also told you that they offered B their new invention. In doing so, they could show how competent and knowledgeable they are. A only discussed the offer with the mayor of B, and did not share it in the media.” In the *public and warmth condition*, participants read: “The resident of A also told you that they offered B their new invention. In doing so, they could show how friendly and helpful they are. Moreover, A chose to draw attention to their offer in the local media. Spokespersons of A reported on their offer to B widely in newspapers, on the radio, and on tv, and explained that this is a good example of how friendly A is.” In the *public and competence condition*, participants read: “The resident of A also told you that they offered B their new invention. In doing so, they could show how competent and knowledgeable they are. Moreover, A chose to draw attention to their offer in the local media. Spokespersons of A reported their offer to B widely in newspapers, on the radio, and on tv, and explained that this is a good example of how knowledgeable A is.”

When the participants finished reading the scenario, they filled in a questionnaire that included the dependent measures (see Appendix B). Upon completion, participants were thanked, debriefed and offered a small chocolate treat.

**Dependent Measures**

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

Unless otherwise indicated, the answers to all questions were assessed on 5-point Likert scales (ranging from 1 = *absolutely not* to 5 = *very strong*). After a reliability analysis scales were computed by averaging items.

*Attitude towards the helper* was assessed by five items which were preceded by: “To what extent do the following questions apply to you?” (“I respect the help provider”, “I appreciate the help provider”, “I am positive about the help provider”, “The inhabitants of A seem like nice people”, “I would feel comfortable with the help providers”;  $\alpha = .89$ ). *Attitude towards the help offer* was assessed using five items preceded by “To what extent would you describe the help offer as..” (“..hypocritical?”, “..strategic?”, “..sanctimonious?”, “..insincere?”, “..selfish?”;  $\alpha = .79$ ). *Receiver benefit* was assessed with two variables: “To what extent does the help receiver benefit from the help that the help provider has offered them?” and “To what extent is the offered help good for the help receiver?” ( $r = .59$ ). *Public knowledge of help* was comprised of two items, “To what extent do you think the other residents of the planet on which A and B live know about the help A offered B?”, “To what extent do you think A wanted others to see that they offered help to B?” ( $r = .68$ ). This scale was included to check the effectiveness of the audience manipulation. *Genuine warmth* was assessed using four items. These questions were preceded by “To what extent did A offer B help,..” (“..because A genuinely cares about the fate of B?”, “..because they have B’s best interest?”, “..because they are naturally friendly and helpful?”, “.. because they care about B?”;  $\alpha = .92$ ).

Two variables were included to check the effectiveness of the motive manipulation: “To what extent did A offer B help to show how competent and knowledgeable they are?” (*helper is competent*) and “To what extent did A offer B help to show how friendly helpful they are?” (*helper is friendly*).

The scale *attitude towards the helper* and the item “How do you feel about the help provider?” (*1 = very negative to 5 = very positive; feelings about the help provider*) were used to test Hypothesis 1. The scale *attitude towards the help offer* and the following separate variables were used to test Hypothesis 2. “To what extent would you describe the help offer as genuine?”, “To what extent would you describe the help offer as selfless?”, “To what extent do you think the help provider had an interest in offering the help?” and “To what extent do you think the help provider benefitted from offering the help?”.

The questionnaire also included items for exploratory purposes. The following two were added to see the perceived extent of the benefit of offering the help for the help provider: “To what extent does A profit from the help offer to B?” (*profit helper*), “To what extent is the help offer to B good for A?” (*help benefit*). The following two variables were added to what extent participants thought that the help receiver actually needed the help: “To what extent would B have been able to solve their drought without help?” (*need for help*), “To what extent was B knowledgeable in the field of irrigation?” (*expertise*). Several items assessed perceived alternative motives for the help offer: “To what extent did A offer B help to show how independent they are?” (*autonomy*), “To what extent did A offer B help to make B dependent on them?” (*dependency*), “To what extent did A offer B help because A expects reciprocity?” (*reciprocity*), “To what extent did A offer B help because they live on the same planet, therefore they should care for each other?” (*common identity*), “To what extent did A offer B help to show how powerful they are?” (*power*) and the scale *Genuine warmth*.

To see how the opinions about the helper were influenced by the help and the publicity given afterwards, we included the following explorative questions: “To what extent do you think that other inhabitants of the planet see A as competent and knowledgeable?” (*opinion of helper as competent*), “To what extent do you think that other inhabitants of the planet see A as friendly and helpful?” (*opinion of helper as friendly*). To see how the

perceptions of the help receiver were influenced by the received help and the publicity given afterwards, we included the following two explorative questions: “To what extent do you think that other inhabitants of the planet see B as competent and knowledgeable?” (*opinion of help receiver as competent*), “To what extent do you think that other inhabitants of the planet see B as friendly and helpful?” (*opinion of help receiver as friendly*).

The demographic details, e.g. age and gender (male, female, non-binary) were recorded at the end of the questionnaire.

### Results

All analyses were separate two-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) with Motive (warmth vs. competence) and Audience (private vs. public) as independent variables. All significant effects are reported.

#### Manipulation Checks

The effectiveness of Motive was checked with two items that were analyzed separately (e.g. ‘*helper is competent*’ and ‘*helper is friendly*’). First, we analyzed the perceived competence of the help provider. Participants in the competence condition felt more strongly that the motive of the helper was to show competence ( $M = 3.85, SD = .96$ ) than participants in the warmth condition ( $M = 3.45, SD = 1.05$ ),  $F(1, 180) = 8.00, p = .005, \eta_p^2 = .04$ . This confirms the effectiveness of Motive. Participants in the public condition also felt more strongly that the motive of the helper was to show competence ( $M = 3.92, SD = .92$ ) than participants in the private condition ( $M = 3.38, SD = 1.06$ ), as demonstrated by an unexpected main effect of Audience,  $F(1, 180) = 13.96, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .07$ .

Secondly, we analyzed the perceived warmth of the help provider. Expectedly, participants in the warmth condition felt more strongly that the motive of the helper was to show warmth ( $M = 3.69, SD = .93$ ) than participants in the competence condition ( $M = 3.35, SD = .99$ ),  $F(1, 179) = 5.95, p = .016, \eta_p^2 = .03$ , thereby confirming the effectiveness of

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

Motive. Participants in the public condition also felt more strongly that the motive of the helper was to show warmth ( $M = 3.72$ ,  $SD = .87$ ) than participants in the private condition ( $M = 3.33$ ,  $SD = 1.02$ ), as demonstrated by an unexpected main effect of Audience,  $F(1, 179) = 7.73$ ,  $p = .006$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .04$ .

The effectiveness of Audience was tested by analyzing *public knowledge of help*. This revealed a main effect of Audience,  $F(1, 181) = 149.29$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .45$ , thereby confirming the effectiveness of Audience. Participants in the public condition viewed the help offer more as public knowledge ( $M = 4.02$ ,  $SD = .74$ ) than participants in the private condition ( $M = 2.52$ ,  $SD = .91$ ).

These results show that both manipulations were successful. Participants recognized the different motives behind the offered help as well as the extent to which the broader public was aware of the help. However, it should be noted that Audience also influenced the extent to which the different motives were accurately recognized by participants. This is an unexpected effect but can be explained by the understanding that the boosting of a public image is generally more effective when efforts to this end are conducted publicly (versus privately). Thus, actions are more likely to be attributed to the motive to boost one's public image (be it warm or competent) when these actions are conducted publicly.

### Hypothesis Testing

In Hypothesis 1, we expected that help providers with a strategic motive to demonstrate warmth would be judged more negatively by a third party when an audience is present compared to when no audience is present, whereas the presence or absence of an audience should not affect judgements of help providers with a strategic motive to demonstrate competence. Analysis of *attitude towards the helper* showed a significant effect of Motive,  $F(1, 184) = 4.05$ ,  $p = .046$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .02$ . Participants in the warmth condition reported more positive feelings towards the help provider ( $M = 3.97$ ,  $SD = .07$ ) than participants in the

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

competence condition ( $M = 3.76, SD = .07$ ). The analysis also showed a significant effect of Audience,  $F(1, 184) = 4.47, p = .036, \eta_p^2 = .02$ . Participants in the private condition reported more positive feelings towards the help provider ( $M = 3.97, SD = .07$ ) compared to participants in the public condition ( $M = 3.75, SD = .08$ ). Unexpectedly, the interaction between Motive and Audience was not significant,  $F(1, 184) = .04, p = .840, \eta_p^2 < .01$ . In contrast to Hypothesis 1, the absence or presence of an audience did not significantly influence the extent to which strategically motivated help affected participants' positive attitudes towards the help provider.

Hypothesis 1 was also examined using participant's *feelings about the help provider*. This analysis showed a significant effect of Motive,  $F(1, 167) = 7.38, p = .007, \eta_p^2 = .04$ . Participants in the warmth condition reported feeling more positive about the help provider ( $M = 4.19, SD = .09$ ) compared to participants in the competence condition ( $M = 3.85, SD = .09$ ). We found neither a significant effect of Audience ( $F(1, 167) = .40, p = .528, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ) nor did we find an interaction effect,  $F(1, 167) = .09, p = .766, \eta_p^2 < .01$ . Unexpectedly, participants reported feelings about the help provider were not significantly affected by the absence or presence of an audience when they received strategically motivated help. Due to the lack of this interaction effect we did not find any evidence to support our first hypothesis.

In Hypothesis 2, we expected that help given with a strategic motive to demonstrate warmth would be judged more strategically by a third party when an audience is present compared to when no audience is present, whereas the presence or absence of an audience should not affect judgements of help given with a strategic motive to demonstrate competence. Analysis of *attitude towards the help offer* showed a significant effect of Motive,  $F(1, 181) = 10.82, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .06$ . Participants in the competence condition reported a more negative attitude towards the help that is offered ( $M = 2.48, SD = .08$ ) than participants in the warmth condition ( $M = 2.12, SD = .08$ ). Furthermore attitude towards the

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

help offer showed a significant effect of Audience,  $F(1, 181) = 4.46, p = .036, \eta_p^2 = .02$ .

Participants in the public condition judged the offered help as more negative ( $M = 2.42, SD = .08$ ) compared to participants in the private condition ( $M = 2.19, SD = .07$ ). Unexpectedly, the interaction of Motive and Audience was not significant,  $F(1, 181) = .29, p = .591, \eta_p^2 < .01$ , which means that the absence or presence of an audience did not significantly influence the extent to which strategically motivated help affected participants negative attitude towards the help provider.

To further test Hypothesis 2 we analyzed the extent to which the participants believed the help was *genuine*, which showed a significant effect of Motive,  $F(1, 181) = 4.27, p = .040, \eta_p^2 = .02$ . Participants in the warmth condition judged the help offer as more genuine ( $M = 3.85, SD = .11$ ) than did participants in the competence condition ( $M = 3.54, SD = .11$ ). This is an important finding as it showed that the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth is seen as more genuine than the strategic motive to demonstrate competence, and therefore thus as less strategic, irrespective of whether the help was offered in public or private conditions. We will address this finding in more detail in the discussion. Other than the effect of Motive our analysis also showed an effect for Audience,  $F(1, 181) = 7.51, p = .007, \eta_p^2 = .04$ . Participants in the private condition believed the help was more genuine ( $M = 3.90, SD = .10$ ) opposed to participants in the public condition ( $M = 3.49, SD = .11$ ). Unexpectedly, we did not find an interaction effect  $F(1, 181) = .13, p = .723, \eta_p^2 < .01$ , which means that the absence or presence of an audience did not significantly affect the extent to which participants reported the strategical help offer to be genuine.

Analysis of the extent to which participants viewed the help as *selfless* showed a significant effect of Audience only,  $F(1, 178) = 11.98, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .06$ . Participants in the private condition viewed the help as more selfless ( $M = 3.08, SD = .12$ ) than participants in the public condition ( $M = 2.47, SD = .13$ ). In line with Hypothesis 2 we anticipated an



interaction effect, we did however not find this ( $F(1, 178) = .52, p = .471, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ), indicating that the absence or presence of an audience had no significant influence on the extent to which the strategically motivated help was seen as selfless by participants.

Analysis of the extent to which participants believed the help provider had an interest in offering the help showed a significant effect of Audience,  $F(1, 180) = 6.35, p = .013, \eta_p^2 = .03$ . Participants in the public condition believed the help provider to have more interest in offering the help ( $M = 3.70, SD = .11$ ) compared to participants in the private condition ( $M = 3.32, SD = .10$ ). Unexpectedly, the interaction of Motive and Audience was not significant,  $F(1, 180) = .63, p = .427, \eta_p^2 < .01$ . This demonstrates that the extent to which participants believed that the help provider had an interest in offering the help was not significantly influenced by strategically motivated help, offered in the presence or absence of an audience.

The analysis of the extent to which participants believed the help provider would benefit from the help, did not show any significant effects, which means that the expected interaction effect was also not present,  $F(1, 181) = .63, p = .427, \eta_p^2 < .01$ . These results show that the absence or presence of an audience did not significantly influence the extent to which participants believed the help provider to benefit from offering help that was strategically motivated. Therefore, we did not find any evidence to support Hypothesis 2.

### **Exploratory Analyses**

To obtain a broader understanding of the perceived benefits for the help provider, possible other perceived motives, possible explanations for the lesser perceived strategic nature of warmth and the impact the strategic help has on participants impressions of judgements other people might have towards the help an help provider; we analyzed some other variables.

First, we analyzed perceptions of the help receiver. Analysis of *receiver benefit* did not reveal any significant effects, all  $F$ 's  $< 2$ . We also examined whether participants thought

that the helper could have solved the problem by themselves, because it can be expected that help offered to receivers that are seen as perfectly capable to solve their own problems would be driven primarily by the help provider's own (strategic) motive. There was exclusively a significant effect of Audience,  $F(1, 180) = 5.29, p = .023, \eta_p^2 = .03$ . Both the main effect of Motive as well as the interaction effect of Motive and Audience were not significant,  $F$ 's  $< 3$ . Participants in the public condition thought that the help receiver was more likely to solve their problem themselves ( $M = 3.02, SD = .65$ ) than participants in the private condition ( $M = 2.80, SD = .67$ ). This suggests that a public help offer is perceived as more strategic and indicates that a public help offer tells us more about the needs of the helper than the needs of the help receiver. Analysis of the *expertise* of the help receiver revealed no significant effects, all  $F$ 's  $< 2$ .

We subsequently examined perceived alternative motives of the helper. Independent analysis of the *autonomy* motive, the *dependency* motive and the *reciprocity* motive of the helper revealed no significant results, all  $F$ 's  $< 2$ . Examination of the *common identity* motive, whether participants felt that the helper offered help because they felt like they should take care of other groups on the same planet, showed only a significant effect of Motive,  $F(1, 178) = 18.70, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .10$ . Participants in the warmth condition felt like the statement was true more often ( $M = 3.86, SD = .91$ ) than participants in the competence condition ( $M = 3.19, SD = 1.14$ ). This suggests that participants perceived the warmth motive of the help offer as a common identity motive, which is a non-strategic motive for helping. This again showed participants recognize the strategic aspect of the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth to a lesser extent than the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth. We will elaborate on this finding in the discussion section. Afterwards, we also examined the *power* motive, analysis showed a significant main effect of Motive only,  $F(1, 180) = 5.00, p = .027, \eta_p^2 = .03$ . Participants in the competence condition thought that the helper wanted to

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

show how powerful they are more often ( $M = 3.13$ ,  $SD = 1.10$ ) than participants in the warmth condition ( $M = 2.78$ ,  $SD = .98$ ). The motive to demonstrate power is a clear strategic motive, and often runs parallel to the motive to demonstrate competence.

To see if help given with a motive to demonstrate warmth is seen as strategic or as genuine warmth we examined *genuine warmth*, which showed a significant effect of Motive,  $F(1, 180) = 10.19$ ,  $p = .002$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .05$ . Participants in the warmth condition judged help providers intentions as more genuine ( $M = 3.50$ ,  $SD = .08$ ) than participants in the competence condition ( $M = 3.13$ ,  $SD = .08$ ). This suggests that participants saw the strategic use of warmth as a reflection of genuine warmth, more than the strategic use of competence. The main effect of Audience and the interaction of Motive and Audience were both not significant, both  $F$ 's  $< 1$ .

To examine what effects the offer of help had on participants' perception of the impressions other people on the planet had about the help provider, we inspected the following variables. The extent to which participants believed other inhabitants of the planet viewed the help giver as competent showed a marginally significant effect of Audience,  $F(1, 181) = 3.26$ ,  $p = .072$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .02$ . Participants in the public condition believed that others on the planet judged the help giver to be more competent ( $M = 3.84$ ,  $SD = .08$ ) than participants in the private condition ( $M = 3.64$ ,  $SD = .08$ ). This suggests that knowing that someone has helped someone else makes them appear knowledgeable and competent. The degree to which participants believed that others on the planet see the help giver as friendly and helpful showed no significant effects.

To examine what effects the offer of help had on participants' perception of the impressions other people on the planet had about the help receiver, we inspected the following variables. The extent to which participants believed other inhabitants of the planet viewed the help receiver as competent and knowledgeable showed a marginally significant

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

effect of Motive,  $F(1, 180) = 2.87, p = .092, \eta_p^2 = .02$ . Participants in the warmth condition thought others would judge the help receiver to be more competent ( $M = 2.91, SD = .09$ ) compared to participants in the competence condition ( $M = 2.70, SD = .09$ ). This seems to suggest that when the help provider is helping to show their competence this will diminish the competence that is attributed to the help receiver. This is in line with the Stereotype Content Model (Fiske et al., 2002) notion that the strategic motive to demonstrate competence is a status motive (Van Leeuwen, 2017) and that status is relative. The extent to which participants thought others on the planet would think that the help receiver was friendly and helpful showed a marginally significant effect of Audience,  $F(1, 180) = 2.87, p = .092, \eta_p^2 = .02$ . The participants in the public condition thought other inhabitants on the planet would judge the help receivers as more friendly ( $M = 3.26, SD = .08$ ) compared to participants in the private condition ( $M = 3.07, SD = .08$ ). This seems to suggest that when others know someone received help, they might think they are not a big threat and therefore more friendly.

### Discussion

Prior research has shown that the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth and the strategic motive to demonstrate competence are on paper equally strategic according to the SOUTH model (Van Leeuwen, 2017). Therefore, there is no reasons to believe there would be vast differences in practice. However, van Leeuwen (2019) showed that people had more negative attitudes towards helpers who wanted to appear competent compared to helpers who wanted to appear warm. We expect that this stems from the fact that people have difficulty recognizing the strategic nature of the warmth motive, and that the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth is more often interpreted as genuine warmth than the motive to demonstrate competence. This idea is supported by the stereotype content model (Fiske et al., 2002), which showed that for competence people look more at the relative status a group has

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

compared to others, while in warmth people looked less at relative status and more at the extent to which an outgroup competes with other groups. So, the less a group competes, the more warmth is attributed to that group, and vice versa. A group that is high in warmth is thus a group that does not (or rarely) compete with other groups. Competence is on the other hand something over which there is always competition, because this is based on the relative status one group has compared to others. So, a group that is high in warmth is therefore perceived as less competitive than a group that is high in competence and is thus associated with being more genuine towards others. Accordingly, it could be that people don't see the connection between a person or situation that is high in warmth, and competition. In other words, based on previous research we believe people have difficulty seeing the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth as something over which groups can have competition and we believe this is the reason for the perceived differences between the strategic nature of warmth and competence.

We believed that the presence of an audience would make the intentions behind the offered help clearer to participants, thereby possibly ensuring that the strategic nature of warmth would also become more apparent. Studies conducted in the field of prosocial behavior, namely, showed tendencies that more people would be willing to help or donate when they know that others are aware of this (Castillo et al., 2015; Riordan et al., 2001; Satow, 1975). This shows that the aforementioned help is at least partly selfish and driven by desires to boost one's image, which led us to believe that the presence of an audience might be the key to let people see the strategic nature of the warmth motive. This awareness should then in turn, according to the literature on moral hypocrisy (Caviola & Faulmüller, 2014; Jordan et al., 2017; Tong & Yang, 2011), lead to a more negative view of the motive to demonstrate warmth as compared to the motive to demonstrate competence. To test this, we looked at third party judgements of strategic helping, in specific at the strategic motive to

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

either demonstrate warmth or competence, in a public and a private setting. We hypothesized that help and help providers with a strategic motive to demonstrate warmth would be judged more negatively by a third party when an audience was present compared to when no audience was present, whereas the presence of an audience should not affect judgements of help or help providers with a strategic motive to demonstrate competence.

Contrary to our hypotheses, the absence or presence of an audience did not influence the perceptions participants had towards either the strategically motivated help or the strategically motivated help provider. Individually both strategic motives were attributed more negative characteristics in a public setting compared to a private setting. Nonetheless, attitudes towards help and helpers who helped to appear competent were still more negative than towards help and helpers given with a motive to demonstrate warmth. This stems from the fact that the motive to demonstrate competence is also seen as more strategic than the motive to demonstrate warmth. So, while both competence and warmth are expected to be equally strategic and self-serving (Van Leeuwen, 2017) our results showed that people see the strategic motive to demonstrate competence as more strategic than the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth.

Our findings showed that an explanation for why the strategic motive to demonstrate competence is seen as more strategic than the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth can be found in the fact that people generally seem to have issues recognizing the strategic component of warmth. In this study strategic motives to demonstrate warmth were seen as more genuine compared to strategic motives to demonstrate competence. Indicating that participants saw the intentions of help providers who offered help to appear warm and friendly as more genuine and less strategic compared to help providers who offered help to appear competent. Furthermore, a common identity motive was more often seen as a possible motive for the help provider when they were actually helping with a strategic motive to

demonstrate warmth than for help providers who had a strategic motive to demonstrate competence. A common identity motive indicates that the help was offered, because the provider felt that the help receiver was part of a common group and that one should take care of people within their group. This is, in fact, a very selfless motive to offer help and thus not at all a strategic offer. This finding therefore again indicates that the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth was seen as less strategic and more genuine than the motive to demonstrate competence. In conclusion, the undermining of our hypothesis can be explained by the clear pattern that becomes visible after interpreting our data; the strategic use of warmth is seen as a reflection of genuine warmth, more than the strategic use of competence.

Both of the instances in the aforementioned paragraph show that even in our research, in which we did everything to ensure that participants would see the true intentions of the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth, it still seems inevitable for people to see warmth as a less strategic motive than competence. The possible ways to make the strategic nature of warmth even clearer are becoming scarce. So, the question that this implicitly seems to give rise to is, 'Is it a matter of recognizing the possibility of warmth as a strategic tool in helping or rather of acknowledging it?'. Due to the predominantly positive outcomes of help, people might not want to see that someone is only helping to pursue their own interests. This could especially be the case in instances where this own interest is not abundantly clear and in which it is thus easier to not acknowledge the fact that someone might not have an altruistic motive. In other words, instead of a lack of recognizing the strategic nature of warmth our results could also be due to people not wanting to acknowledge the strategic nature of warmth.

### **Theoretical Implications**

Earlier research hypothesized the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth to be judged more negatively by participants than the strategic motive to demonstrate competence

(Sillevis Smitt, 2019; Van Leeuwen 2019). However, they did not find this and Van Leeuwen (2019) even found the opposite. Our research builds further on these findings and again did not find this effect but found an explanation for the absence of these findings.

Van Leeuwen (2019) showed that people had a more negative attitude towards help that was offered with the strategic motive to appear as competent than with the strategic motive to appear as warm. In line with these findings, we saw a clear pattern in our data that showed that the attitude towards help and helpers with a strategic motive to demonstrate competence was more negative and seen as more strategic compared to help and helpers with the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth. Different from the study by Van Leeuwen (2019) we looked at the combination of the strategic motives (i.e., warmth and competence) and at two audience settings (i.e., private and public). We found that the attitudes towards help and help providers with the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth was more negative in a public compared to a private situation, still the attitudes towards help and helpers with a strategic motive to demonstrate competence were more negative than towards help and helpers with a strategic motive to demonstrate warmth. However, we found a notable and consistent pattern in our data to explain why the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth is judged to be less negative than the strategic motive to demonstrate competence. The findings seem to come from the extent to which participants seem to be unable to see the strategic nature of the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth. This is a possible explanation for the repeated findings of an underestimation of the strategic nature of warmth which according to the South model (Van Leeuwen 2017) should be equally selfish and strategic as the motive to appear competent.

As mentioned in the previous paragraph in this research we found a possible explanation for why attitudes towards help and helpers with the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth are less negative, less strategic and more genuine and selfless than



towards help and helpers with the strategic motive to demonstrate competence; the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth is seen more as an expression of genuine warmth than the strategic motive to demonstrate competence. A possible explanation for this phenomenon is the Stereotype Content Model (Fiske et al., 2002). Being high in warmth is seen as not or rarely competing with other groups and is associated with being more genuine towards others. Therefore, the helpers who helped with a strategic motive to demonstrate warmth were possibly seen as more genuine and selfless and were also judged more positive than the helpers who wanted to be seen as competent, because people did not see how they could compete while being high in warmth.

The findings of the current study are in line with findings by Täuber and van Leeuwen (2017). We found evidence that the mere knowledge of help being provided by one group to another group makes the provider of that group seem more competent and knowledgeable compared to the help receiver.

Previous research has shown that the group receiving help was often seen as inferior and dependent on the help of the other group (Nadler, 2002; Täuber & Van Leeuwen, 2012). We found that people thought others would judge help receivers to be more friendly in public settings than in private settings. Research by Nadler (2002) and Täuber and Van Leeuwen (2012) showed us that the receivers of help are seen as less competent than providers of help. Being seen as less competent might mean that people will be seen as less threatening. This in turn might be a likely cause for these help receivers to be seen as more friendly. Our finding therefore might be in line with these studies as it shows that in a public setting, so when more people should be aware of the help, the receivers of help are seen as more friendly. This finding might therefore indicate that when others know someone received help, they could think that those people are less competent, a smaller threat and therefore more friendly.

Our research has added to the existing knowledge on the perceptions of strategic helping by adding a new component, namely an audience. We anticipated based on earlier studies (Castillo et al., 2015; Fiske et al., 2002; Riordan et al., 2001; Satow, 1975; Van Leeuwen 2017) that the presence of an audience might be the key to amplifying the strategic nature of warmth. People in a public setting believed that the help receiver was more capable to solve their own problem than in a private setting. Believing that a receiver of help is very capable of solving the problem itself might come from an insight in the more strategic nature of the help and likely from the feeling that this tells more about the help provider than the help receiver. Other than that, people also believed help providers in public settings to have more interest in offering the help and thus saw that the provider had not just altruistic motives in offering the help. Furthermore, people in private settings viewed the help as more selfless and genuine compared to people in public settings. The public condition might thus, based on these finding, have been seen as more strategic and obvious in showing the motive of the help provider than the private condition. This finding, thereby, showed support for our initial idea that the presence of an audience amplified the extent to which the strategic nature of warmth would be recognized.

### **Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research**

An important limitation of our research is the hypothetical nature of our scenario. We described a non-existing planet, with fictional villages and inhabitants. We asked participants to imagine themselves being on this planet and talking to an inhabitant. Some participants might have had trouble with imagining this scenario as something that can truly happen. Therefore, our results could have been less strong compared to when we would have performed the same study with a scenario that described an actual real-life event. Future research, therefore, should look into possibilities to deduct a similar research with a non-hypothetical scenario. Sillevs Smitt (2019) already tried this, be it, however, in not the exact

form as this research. Sillevi Smit used a made-up story that was placed in the aftermath of the bombing of Rotterdam, which took place at the beginning of the second World War. This scenario, due to it being a long time ago, could have the same lowered impact as our hypothetical scenario. Future research should, thus, not only try to use a real event, but also an event that took place recently.

In this research we specifically choose to focus ourselves on the third-party perspective as there is still a lot unknown of how outsiders view help that is offered with a strategic motive. We were also motivated by the importance of a broader concept of the perceptions of third parties on help givers, because in today's society companies seem to use more and more ways to boost their image using public platforms. Knowing more about reactions of unbiased observers to this specific act of helping, might tell us if these strategies are a good way to boost one's image. However, another interesting aspect to look at could be the perceptions of helpers from the receivers of this help. This is interesting because different acts of help take place each day, from small individuals helping one another to governments offering developmental aid or helping other governments based on the expertise of their country. The direct effects of the impact of strategic help on attitudes towards helpers in these situations might teach us why some people, organizations or governments refuse help when it is in their best interest to accept it. Sillevi Smit (2019) did already look at the perceptions of help receivers toward their help provider, who had either a strategic (i.e., warmth or competence) or a non-strategic (i.e., empathy) motive. He used a fabricated example from the past and did not find a confirmation of any of his hypotheses. The help receivers did not have significant different attitudes towards helpers with different strategic motives. This research was limited because it used a made-up scenario which was placed in the aftermath of the bombing of Rotterdam in the second World War. So, these people might have had a hard time with empathizing with the scenario because it took place a long time ago. Therefore, another

research in this area, which preferably would not make use of a scenario that is placed in the past, would be a great addition to existing literature.

### **Practical Implications**

Our research clearly showed that help and helpers with the strategic motive to demonstrate competence are judged more negatively compared to help and helpers with the strategic motive to demonstrate warmth. This is very relevant information for individuals, organizations and governments offering help with the sole purpose of boosting their image. Offering help with the goal of looking knowledgeable and competent has negative influences on further perceptions of the organization, government or individual in question. They will be seen as less genuine, less selfless and more strategic, hypocritical, sanctimonious and egotistical. If these less positive and more negative attitudes towards the company are not important compared to the gained image of being competent, than offering help to appear competent may be a good way to boost one's image. However, if it is important for the group in question to also maintain a good public image as friendly, caring and genuine, it might be wise to overthink using the strategic motive to demonstrate competence. Another possible obstacle might be giving publicity to the act of helping which, independently of the strategic motive (e.g. warmth or competence), would lead to more negative perceptions of the helper.

Nowadays climate change is a well-known and often discussed topic which is not only relevant to governments anymore. With more and more consumers interested in sustainable products and limiting their negative impact on the climate, businesses have to adapt. Being seen as a non-eco-friendly company can have a negative impact on their image, so they attempt to boost their image by presenting themselves as eco-friendly. The intentions of these businesses are in this case not (entirely) genuine and more strategic, wanting to boost their image to earn more money. This research gave an insight in the consequences of consumers perception of two of the possible approaches these businesses could take to boost

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

their image. This knowledge would be very relevant for them, as we have shown that wanting to appear as competent by helping others will lead people to have more negative feelings toward the company than when they wanted to help to appear as friendly and caring. Other than that, these companies would presumably want to give attention to their help for the environment, which would make their strategic motives more obvious and would thereby also have a negative impact on consumers attitudes towards the company. In other words, it would be wise for companies to be aware of the negative impact strategic helping can have on their image.

**References**

- Ames, D. R., Flynn, F. J., & Weber, E. U. (2004). It's the thought that counts: On perceiving how helpers decide to lend a hand. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(1), 461–474. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203261890>.
- Castillo, M., Petrie, R., & Wardell, C. (2015). Friends asking friends for charity: The Importance of gifts and audience. *Available at SSRN 2658294*.  
<https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2658294>
- Caviola, L., & Faulmüller, N. (2014). Moral hypocrisy in economic games—how prosocial behavior is shaped by social expectations. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*, 897.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00897>
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(6), 878–902. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878>
- Halabi, S., (2003). Reactions to receiving assumptive help in or out-group member: The moderating effects of task difficulty. Unpublished master's thesis, Tel Aviv University, Israel.
- Jordan, J. J., Sommers, R., Bloom, P., & Rand, D. G. (2017). Why do we hate hypocrites? Evidence for a theory of false signaling. *Psychological Science, 28*(3), 356-368.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616685771>
- Nadler, A. (2002). Inter-group helping relations as power relations: Maintaining or challenging social dominance between groups through helping. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 487–502. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4560.00272>.

- Riordan, C. A., James, M. K., & Dunaway, F. A. (2001). Interpersonal determinants of helping and the transgression-compliance relationship. *Journal of Social Psychology, 125*(3), 365-372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1985.9922899>
- Satow, K. L. (1975). Social approval and helping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 11*(6), 501-509. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(75\)90001-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(75)90001-3)
- Sillevis Smitt, K. (2019). The influence of (non-)strategic motives for outgroup-helping on recipients' attitude towards the helper. Unpublished Master's thesis, *Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Leiden University*.
- Schneider, M. E., Major, B., Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1996). Social stigma and the potential costs of assumptive help. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(2), 201–209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167296222009>
- Täuber, S., & van Leeuwen, E. (2012). When high group status becomes a burden: Requesting outgroup help and spying by members of high and low status groups. *Social Psychology, 43*, 98-107. DOI: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000088
- Täuber, S. & van Leeuwen, E. (2017). The impact of intergroup helping on third parties' perceptions of group reputation. *Social Psychology, 48*(5), 279-292. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000320>
- Tong, E. M., & Yang, Z. (2011). Moral hypocrisy: Of proud and grateful people. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 2*(2), 159-165. DOI: 10.1177/1948550610385711
- Van Leeuwen, E., & Täuber, S. (2011). Demonstrating knowledge: The effects of group status on outgroup helping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(1), 147-156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.09.008>

- Van Leeuwen, E., & Täuber, S. (2012). Outgroup helping as a tool to communicate ingroup warmth. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(6), 772-783. DOI: 10.1177/0146167211436253
- Van Leeuwen, E. (2017). The SOUTH model: On the pros and cons of strategic outgroup helping. In: E. van Leeuwen and H. Zagefka (Eds.), *Intergroup Helping*. New York: Springer (pp. 131-158). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53026-0\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53026-0_7)
- Van Leeuwen, J. (2019). Third parties' attitudes to strategically motivated outgroup help. Unpublished Master's thesis, *Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Leiden University*.
- Van Leeuwen, E. & Zagefka, H. (2017). Introduction to Intergroup Helping. In: E. van Leeuwen and H. Zagefka (Eds.), *Intergroup Helping*. New York: Springer (pp. v-x). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53026-0>



## Appendix A

The four scenario texts (text in Dutch)

### **Manipulation Condition 1: Private and Warmth**

Op een verre planeet leeft een beschaving net zoals wij die kennen op aarde. Ergens in een vallei liggen twee dorpjes naast elkaar, die we A en B zullen noemen. Stelt u zich voor dat u op reis bent op deze planeet.

Op een dag vertelt een inwoner van A over een probleem waar de dorpen last van hadden. Door extreme droogte was er niet genoeg water voor de gewassen in A en B. Nu hebben de inwoners van A een nieuwe uitvinding gedaan op het gebied van watervoorziening. Door deze uitvinding is A nu beter bestand tegen de droogte.

De inwoner van A vertelde ook dat ze hun nieuwe uitvinding aan B hebben aangeboden. Door B te helpen, konden ze laten zien hoe warm en behulpzaam ze zijn.

A heeft ervoor gekozen om het aanbod van hulp alleen met de burgemeester van B te bespreken, en er verder geen media-aandacht aan te geven.

### **Manipulation Condition 2: Private and Competence**

Op een verre planeet leeft een beschaving net zoals wij die kennen op aarde. Ergens in een vallei liggen twee dorpjes naast elkaar, die we A en B zullen noemen. Stelt u zich voor dat u op reis bent op deze planeet.

Op een dag vertelt een inwoner van A over een probleem waar de dorpen last van hadden. Door extreme droogte was er niet genoeg water voor de gewassen in A en B. Nu hebben de inwoners van A een nieuwe uitvinding gedaan op het gebied van watervoorziening. Door deze uitvinding is A nu beter bestand tegen de droogte.

De inwoner van A vertelde ook dat ze hun nieuwe uitvinding aan B hebben aangeboden. Door B te helpen, konden ze laten zien hoe competent en deskundig ze zijn.

A heeft ervoor gekozen om het aanbod van hulp alleen met de burgemeester van B te bespreken, en er verder geen media-aandacht aan te geven.

### **Manipulation Condition 3: Public and Warmth**

Op een verre planeet leeft een beschaving net zoals wij die kennen op aarde. Ergens in een vallei liggen twee dorpjes naast elkaar, die we A en B zullen noemen. Stelt u zich voor dat u op reis bent op deze planeet.

Op een dag vertelt een inwoner van A over een probleem waar de dorpen last van hadden. Door extreme droogte was er niet genoeg water voor de gewassen in A en B. Nu hebben de inwoners van A een nieuwe uitvinding gedaan op het gebied van watervoorziening. Door deze uitvinding is A nu beter bestand tegen de droogte.

De inwoner van A vertelde ook dat ze hun nieuwe uitvinding aan B hebben aangeboden. Door B te helpen, konden ze laten zien hoe vriendelijk en behulpzaam ze zijn.

A heeft er bovendien voor gekozen om hun hulpaanbod onder de aandacht van de lokale media te brengen. Woordvoerders van A hebben hun hulp aan B breed uitgemeten in kranten, op de radio en op tv, en uitgelegd dat dit een goed voorbeeld is van hoe vriendelijk A is.

### **Manipulation Condition 4: Public and Competence**

Op een verre planeet leeft een beschaving net zoals wij die kennen op aarde. Ergens in een vallei liggen twee dorpjes naast elkaar, die we A en B zullen noemen. Stelt u zich voor dat u op reis bent op deze planeet.

Op een dag vertelt een inwoner van A over een probleem waar de dorpen last van hadden. Door extreme droogte was er niet genoeg water voor de gewassen in A en B. Nu hebben de inwoners van A een nieuwe uitvinding gedaan op het gebied van watervoorziening. Door deze uitvinding is A nu beter bestand tegen de droogte.

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

De inwoner van A vertelde ook dat ze hun nieuwe uitvinding aan B hebben aangeboden. Door B te helpen, konden ze laten zien hoe competent en deskundig ze zijn.

A heeft er bovendien voor gekozen om hun hulpaanbod onder de aandacht van de lokale media te brengen. Woordvoerders van A hebben hun hulp aan B breed uitgemeten in kranten, op de radio en op tv, en uitgelegd dat dit een goed voorbeeld is van hoe deskundig A is.

## Appendix B

Example of a questionnaire (text in Dutch)

**Welkom bij dit onderzoek. Lees eerst aandachtig het onderstaande artikel door, en beantwoord daarna de vragen over het artikel.**

Op een verre planeet leeft een beschaving net zoals wij die kennen op aarde. Ergens in een vallei liggen twee dorpjes naast elkaar, die we A en B zullen noemen. Stelt u zich voor dat u op reis bent op deze planeet.

Op een dag vertelt een inwoner van A over een probleem waar de dorpen last van hadden. Door extreme droogte was er niet genoeg water voor de gewassen in A en B. Nu hebben de inwoners van A een nieuwe uitvinding gedaan op het gebied van watervoorziening. Door deze uitvinding is A nu beter bestand tegen de droogte.

De inwoner van A vertelde ook dat ze hun nieuwe uitvinding aan B hebben aangeboden. Door B te helpen, konden ze laten zien hoe competent en deskundig ze zijn.

A heeft ervoor gekozen om het aanbod van hulp alleen met de burgemeester van B te bespreken, en er verder geen media-aandacht aan te geven.

De volgende vragen gaan over A. A heeft hulp aangeboden aan B. In hoeverre zijn de volgende uitspraken op u van toepassing? (Omcirkel het antwoord van uw keuze. Let erop dat u maar één antwoord omcirkelt, en dat u geen vragen overslaat)

	Absoluut niet					Zeer sterk
Ik heb respect voor A	1	2	3	4	5	
Ik heb waardering voor A	1	2	3	4	5	
Ik sta positief tegenover A	1	2	3	4	5	
De inwoners van A lijken me aardige mensen	1	2	3	4	5	
Ik zou me op mijn gemak voelen bij A	1	2	3	4	5	

Hoe staat u tegenover A?

Zeer negatief	1	2	3	4	5	Zeer positief
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------

De volgende vragen gaan over de hulp die A heeft aangeboden aan B. In hoeverre zou u dit hulpaanbod willen omschrijven als...

	Absoluut niet					Zeer sterk
Oprecht	1	2	3	4	5	
Hypocriet	1	2	3	4	5	
Strategisch	1	2	3	4	5	
Schijnheilig	1	2	3	4	5	
Onzelfzuchtig	1	2	3	4	5	
Huichelachtig	1	2	3	4	5	
Egoïstisch	1	2	3	4	5	

	Absoluut niet					Zeer sterk
In hoeverre heeft A zelf belang bij de hulp die ze aan B hebben aangeboden?	1	2	3	4	5	
In hoeverre is het aanbieden van hulp aan B goed voor A?	1	2	3	4	5	

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

De volgende vragen gaan over B. B heeft een aanbod van hulp ontvangen van A.

	<b>Absoluut niet</b>					<b>Zeer sterk</b>
In hoeverre heeft B belang bij de hulp die A aan B heeft aangeboden?	1	2	3	4	5	
In hoeverre is de geboden hulp goed voor B?	1	2	3	4	5	

	<b>Absoluut niet</b>					<b>Zeer sterk</b>
In hoeverre had B hun droogte-probleem zelf kunnen oplossen, zonder hulp?	1	2	3	4	5	
In hoeverre is B, naar uw idee, deskundig op het gebied van watervoorzieningen?	1	2	3	4	5	

	<b>Absoluut niet</b>					<b>Zeer sterk</b>
In hoeverre denkt u dat de andere bewoners van de planeet waarop A en B zich bevinden weten dat A hulp heeft aangeboden aan B?	1	2	3	4	5	
In hoeverre denkt u dat A wilde dat anderen zouden zien dat zij hulp hebben aangeboden aan B?	1	2	3	4	5	

In hoeverre heeft A hulp aangeboden aan B...

	<b>Absoluut niet</b>					<b>Zeer sterk</b>
...om te laten zien hoe competent en deskundig ze zijn?	1	2	3	4	5	
...om te laten zien hoe vriendelijk en behulpzaam ze zijn?	1	2	3	4	5	
...om te laten zien hoe onafhankelijk ze zijn van anderen?	1	2	3	4	5	
...om B afhankelijk van zich te maken?	1	2	3	4	5	
...omdat A een wederdienst verwacht?	1	2	3	4	5	
...omdat ze uiteindelijk allemaal op dezelfde planeet wonen, en dan hoor je voor elkaar te zorgen?	1	2	3	4	5	
...om te laten zien hoe machtig ze zijn?	1	2	3	4	5	
...omdat A oprecht geeft om het lot van B?	1	2	3	4	5	
...omdat ze het beste met de bewoners van B voor hebben?	1	2	3	4	5	
...omdat ze van nature vriendelijk en behulpzaam zijn?	1	2	3	4	5	
...omdat ze de inwoners van B een warm hart toedragen?	1	2	3	4	5	

In hoeverre denkt u dat de andere bewoners van de planeet...

	<b>Absoluut niet</b>					<b>Zeer sterk</b>
...de inwoners van A als competent en deskundig zien?	1	2	3	4	5	
...de inwoners van A als vriendelijk en behulpzaam zien?	1	2	3	4	5	
...de inwoners van B als competent en deskundig zien?	1	2	3	4	5	
...de inwoners van B als vriendelijk en behulpzaam zien?	1	2	3	4	5	

## THIRD PARTY JUDGEMENTS OF STRATEGIC HELPING

Wat is uw leeftijd? ..... jaar

Wat is uw geslacht?     Vrouw                       Man                       Anders

**Hartelijk dank voor het invullen van de vragenlijst.**