When are Heterosexual Men Passive or Compassionate towards Gay Victims of Hate Crime?

Integrating the Bystander and Social Loafing Explanations

Chuma Kevin Owuamalam¹, Andrea Soledad Matos²

Citation

Owuamalam, C. K., & Matos, A. S. (in press). When are heterosexual men passive or compassionate towards gay victims of hate crime? Integrating the bystander and social loafing explanations. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*.

¹Division of Organizational and Applied Psychology, University of Nottingham, Malaysia, Jalan Broga, Semenyih 43500, Selangor, Malaysia. Email: chuma.owuamalam@nottingham.edu.my

²School of Psychology, University of Nottingham, Malaysia, Semenyih, Selangor, Malaysia.

ABSTRACT

Compassionate feelings for people who are victimized because of their perceived sexual deviance (e.g., gay men) may be incompatible with support for heterosexual norms among heterosexual men. But, passivity (even indifference) towards such victims could raise concern over heterosexual men's gay-tolerance attitude. Two classic social psychological theories offer competing explanations on when heterosexual men might be passive or compassionate towards gay victims of hate crime. The bystander model proposes passivity towards victims in an emergency situation if other bystanders are similarly passive, but compassionate reactions if bystanders are responsive to the victims. Conversely, the social loafing model proposes compassionate reactions towards victims when bystanders are passive, but passivity when other bystanders are already responsive toward the victims' predicament. We tested and found supportive evidence for both models across two experiments ($N_{\text{total}} = 501$) in which passivity and compassionate reactions to gay victims of a purported hate crime were recorded after heterosexual men's concern for social evaluation was either accentuated or relaxed. We found that the bystander explanation was visible only when the potential for social evaluation was strong, while the social loafing account occurred only when the potential for social evaluation was relaxed. Hence, we unite both models by showing that the bystander explanation prevails in situations where cues to social evaluation is strong, whereas the social loafing effect operates when concern over social judgement is somewhat relaxed.

Keywords: sexual preference; passive and active compassion; bystander reactions; evaluative concerns; social loafing.

INTRODUCTION

In 1964, the *New York Times* reported the rape and subsequent murder of a 28-year-old lesbian, Kitty Genovese, amidst considerable emphasis on the 38 neighbors who potentially witnessed the incident but failed to act. Although this passive-neighbor narrative has been discredited (Manning, Levine, & Collins, 2007), the Kitty Genovese story has become a powerful legend for urban apathy towards the suffering of others (Rosenthal, 1999). Importantly, this legend treats the victim's sexual identity as an inconsequential element of the Kitty Genovese parable (Gallo, 2014) despite the possibility that "concerns over nonnormative gender and sexual expressions" could have altered the scale of public/media compassion towards the victim (Gallo, 2014, p. 274). We know that people are ordinarily responsive to other's misfortune (Batson et al., 2002), unless the victims have behaved in ways that allow onlookers to excuse the crime against them (Gillmor, Bernstein, & Benfield, 2014). It is entirely possible, therefore, that greater expressions of compassion might be reserved only for norm-abiding (rather than norm-deviating) victims. As the overwhelming majority of heterosexual people in the US attribute gayness to *choice*, according to a 2015 Pew Research Center report (see also Sheldon, Pfeffer, Jayaratne, Feldbaum, & Petty, 2007), we wondered how heterosexual men might respond to individuals who have been victimized on the basis of sexual preferences that they may consider unorthodox.

Two dilemmas are possible here: Heterosexual men might choose to calibrate their compassion in ways that align with the prevailing heterosexual norm, for instance, by expressing reduced concern (even passivity) towards gay victims of hate crime. But they risk accusations of bigotry as a result, especially for those heterosexual men in progressive-leaning societies. Alternatively, they could express compassion towards gay victims, but this could ignite suspicion about their own sexual identity (e.g., of being latently gay:

unexpressed preference for same-sex relationship). This is because such compassionate feelings may be interpreted (at least partly) as being a tacit acceptance of the unorthodox same-sex sexual conduct. Indeed, the tendency to mask personal insecurities (e.g., latent gayness) by expressing hostility towards gay individuals (Weinstein et al., 2012) suggests that, for heterosexual men, expressing the opposite compassionate feelings for gay victims of a hate crime might call their compliance to the heterosexual norm into question. Hence, heterosexual men might diffuse these internal tensions by paying close attention to and imitating the way that other bystanders have reacted to the victimization of gay individuals. Two classic psychological models offer competing explanations on how bystander reactions could influence heterosexual men's passivity or compassionate reactions toward gay victims of hate crime: the bystander model (Darley & Latané, 1968) and the social loafing model (Ringelmann, 1913).

The Bystander Model

There is by now a consensus that bystanders' reaction to an emergency can determine whether others are passive or compassionate towards the victims (Fischer et al., 2011). In one of the classic demonstrations of the bystander effect, Darley and Latané (1968) found that people were more likely to respond compassionately towards the victim of an emergency when they were the only observers, whereas this tendency diminished remarkably when there were one or more additional passive actors in the situation. Such passivity is believed to be caused by a diffusion of responsibility because, in this situation, the actors cannot be singly held accountable for their inaction. The authenticity of the bystander effect is not in doubt: numerous older (e.g., Latané & Darley, 1970; Tice & Baumeister, 1985) and more recent replications attest to its robustness (e.g., Garcia, Weaver, Darley, & Spence, 2009; van Bommel, van Prooijen, Elffers, & van Lange; Voelpel, Eckhoff, & Förster, 2008, 2014, for boundary conditions). Even the evidence from CCTV footages of 81 real-life violent

incidents—involving 764 potential interveners—confirm that increasing numbers of passive bystanders hinders an orientation towards intervention (Liebst et al., 2019; cf. Philpot, Liebst, Levine, Bernasco, & Lindegaard, 2019).

These previous examples demonstrate that exposure to even a single passive bystander is capable of eliciting a passive response toward victims of a (violent) emergency. Following this logic, we reasoned that the opposite tendency (i.e. to intervene) is also possible when people are exposed to a responsive bystander. That is, witnessing an actively compassionate bystander ought to reduce (even eliminate) people's passivity towards the victims of an emergency (see also Fischer et al., 2011). Surprisingly, and as far as we are aware, none of the previous empirical demonstrations of the bystander effect have directly tested this derivative, at least in situations where the victim might be blamed for the predicament they face (e.g., sexual minority victims of a sexuality-linked hate crime). In the context of hate crime, we reasoned that exposure to a responsive (i.e., active) bystander should increase the likelihood of being held accountable for one's inaction. This is because such a situation clarifies the role that people ought to play on the victim's behalf, and this awareness should correspondingly increase the extent to which heterosexual men's passivity can be attributed to internal causes (e.g., of being bigoted, see Weiner, 1995).

Internal attribution (especially for anti-normative behavior) can have dire consequences for self-esteem and social reputation (Kuiper, 1978; Robins, 1988). Hence, heterosexual men should be motivated to avoid a dent to their social reputation by being compassionate towards gay victims, especially when bystanders are similarly compassionate (see Hopkins et al., 2007 for a similar discussion on reputation-induced helping). After all, it is difficult (although not impossible) to be mistaken for being latently gay, if one's behavior merely copies the way that others have responded to the victimization of gay individuals (cf. Falomir-Pichastor & Mugny, 2009). Research on the theory of mind corroborates this

assumption because people can infer the mental states of others/bystanders (Wellman, Cross, & Watson, 2001). On the other hand, a passively compassionate bystander should reassure heterosexual men that a passive orientation towards gay victims is not abnormal and therefore cannot be misattributed to prejudice (see Fasoli et al., 2018). These views are consistent with a burgeoning line of recent work that has similarly documented a strong desire among heterosexual men not to be misjudged (Bosson, Weaver, & Prewitt-Freilino, 2012; Vandello & Bosson, 2013).

The Social Loafing Model

Although the bystander model assumes an inhibitory effect (i.e., passivity) in heterosexual men's orientation towards gay victims when bystanders are similarly passive, but a facilitatory effect on their compassion when bystanders are compassionate, it is possible to generate the opposite set of predictions from the social loafing thesis (Ringelmann, 1913). Central to the social loafing thesis is the assumption that the motivation to intervene or to contribute towards a solution (such as dealing with emergencies) decreases when people are exposed to others who are already helping, but increases with decreasing numbers of potential interveners. In the classic demonstration of the social loafing effect, Ringelmann (1913) observed that the level of effort exerted on a task tended to diminish exponentially with increasing numbers of active interveners. This loafing effect has been termed motivation loss and results (at least in part) from people's quasi-objective assessments of the degree of input that a task requires from them when others are involved. The more active interveners there are, then the more likely that people will assume that less effort is required from them, which should theoretically lead to a downward adjustment to their personal contribution.

The social loafing model is typically applied in the context of several co-actors even when the logic behind the motivation loss principle can be extended to situations in which people are confronted with either a single active or a single passive intervener, as we propose

here. Because an active bystander should accentuate the appraisal that further help is unnecessary (i.e., motivation loss), we reasoned that heterosexual men who hold this mindset might adjust their compassionate input downwards by being passively compassionate towards victimized gay individuals. If, on the other hand, a passive bystander is present, then this should intensify the urgency to intervene because the compassion and support that is normative in this type of situation (Batson et al., 2002) has not yet been met by others. In short, providing such support should allow heterosexual men to re-affirm their adherence to the humanitarian norm of compassion towards the needy (Batson et al., 2002). Given the plausibility of both the bystander and social loafing explanations, the question is when might heterosexual men's reactions towards victimized gay individuals follow either of the two accounts? Concerns over social evaluation might provide a satisfactory answer to this question and, below, we unpack the rationale behind this thesis.

The Moderating Role of Social Evaluation

At its core, the bystander model predicts imitation effects that are responsive to the potential for being evaluated (i.e., social judgments) and such reputational consideration has been shown to be a reliable predictor of prosocial tendencies (Hopkins et al., 2007; Owuamalam & Rubin, 2014; Täuber & van Leeuwen, 2012; cf. Wakefield, Hopkins, & Greenwood, 2012). It is because a reputation management mindset is enlisted by social evaluation (Vorauer, Hunter, Main, & Roys, 2000) that we expected the imitative compassionate reactions derived from the bystander model to be visible when heterosexual men are cued to concerns over social judgments. That is, a focus on social judgment should intensify accountability concerns when others are helping out, but should reduce these concerns when others are not.

Assuming a focus on social judgment elicits the effects predicted by the bystander model, then it is possible that situations that encourage people to unburden themselves of

these evaluative anxieties should produce the opposite pattern of effects predicted by the social loafing model. Specifically, we reasoned that heterosexual men who are not particularly worried about how they may come across to others should be freer to calibrate their compassion against the level of support that gay victims are already receiving. We are not aware of any investigation that has tested these competing propositions in a single research program, let alone attempt a theoretical integration.

PILOT STUDY

One of the concerns unearthed by the limited reproducibility of psychological science (Open Science Collaboration, 2015) is the validity of psychological measurements. A common response to this concern (at least in experimental social psychology) is the use of manipulation checks to ensure that interventions produce the desired mindsets (Simons & Holcombe, 2014). Yet, the inclusion of manipulation checks can introduce unintended psychological states that alter the desired effects in meaningful ways (Hauser, Ellsworth, & Gonzalez, 2018). For this reason, we followed Hauser et al.'s recommendation to pilot the key theoretical and methodological assumptions prior to the main studies. Our aim here was to establish two foundational assumptions: (1) that concerns about latent gayness and bigotry are especially visible among heterosexual men (at least relative to heterosexual women), and; (2) that an increased salience of social evaluation accentuates heterosexual men's concerns over how they might be viewed by others. Additionally, we explored the ways in which our proposed manipulation of social evaluation affected heterosexual men's (and women's) motivation to respond without prejudice given that bigotry concern is at the heart of our internal conflict assumption.

METHOD

Participants

We recruited 100 heterosexual men and 105 heterosexual women from a pool of Prolific.ac survey workers ($M_{\text{age}} = 32.07$ years, $SD_{\text{age}} = 9.69$)¹ who received GBP 5 per hour (pro-rated) in compensation for completing this online study.

Materials and Procedure

Participants were assigned to either a social evaluation condition or a relaxation condition. In the evaluation condition, we strengthened the salience of social judgements by asking participants to evaluate several social groups² (including their heterosexual in-group, and homosexual outgroup) along the dimensions of anger and calm. That is, they gave their stereotypical judgements about how prone to anger/calm that the groups in question normally are. In the relaxation condition, we weakened the salience of social evaluation by requiring participants to empty their minds of all thoughts while watching a relaxing 2-minute YouTube video. We termed this a relaxation condition because it is akin to a mindfulness exercise that has been shown to promote peaceful behavioral and/or attitudinal orientations (for a review, see Keng, Smoski, & Robins, 2011; see also Lueke & Gibson, 2015).

Next, we assessed participants' latent gayness concern using a single-item that we developed in-house: "I am afraid people might even think that I am gay if I acted prejudiced towards gay people" (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). We speculated that concerns over latent gayness should be more visible among heterosexual men than among heterosexual women given the masculinity threat implied by it (e.g., Falomir-Pichastor & Mugny, 2009). We also assessed participants' motivation to behave in nonprejudiced ways towards gay individuals using a 10-item scale that we adapted from Plant and Devine (1998). Five of the items concerned external motivation to behave in nonprejudiced ways (e.g., "I try to hide any negative thoughts about gay people so that I can avoid negative reactions from others", 1 =

¹ See Table 1 for other demographic information across the research program

² The other social groups included: Europeans, Africans, wealthy people, poor people, laborers, and professors.

strongly disagree, 7 = *strongly agree*, $\alpha = .87$). We anticipated that heterosexual men should be particularly susceptible to external concerns than women because, unlike heterosexual women, they are the ones for whom a masculine gender identity is likely to conflict the most with deviations from heterosexual expressions of manhood (cf. Falomir-Pichastor & Mugny, 2009). The remaining five items assessed internal motivation to respond without prejudice (e.g., “Being nonprejudiced towards gay people is important to my self-concept”, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*, $\alpha = .77$). We speculated that heterosexual women should score particularly highly on this scale because, by definition, they should be most likely to demonstrate their genuine acceptance of individuals who deviate from heteronormative masculine conduct.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To address the first aim of the pilot study, we conducted an independent *t*-test, examining differences in heterosexual men’s and women’s concerns over latent gayness and external versus internal motivation to act nonprejudiced towards gay individuals. Results confirmed our hypothesis: concern about latent gayness was more visible among heterosexual men ($M \pm SE$; 2.65 ± 0.17) than among heterosexual women (1.69 ± 0.11 , $t(203) = 4.86$, $p < .001$, $d_{\text{Cohen}} = .68$, 95% $CI = [0.57, 1.36]$). Consistent with our speculation, the motivation to avoid being seen as bigoted by others (i.e., external motivation to behave in nonprejudiced ways towards gay people) was also greater among heterosexual men than among heterosexual women (3.92 ± 0.16 vs. 3.36 ± 0.13 , $t(203) = 2.67$, $p = .008$, $d_{\text{Cohen}} = .37$, 95% $CI = [0.14, 0.96]$). In contrast, heterosexual women reported greater internal motivations to behave in nonprejudiced ways towards gay individuals than heterosexual men did (5.76 ± 0.11 vs. 5.15 ± 0.12 , $t(203) = 3.85$, $p < .001$, $d_{\text{Cohen}} = .54$, 95% $CI = [0.30, 0.91]$). These gender effects were not qualified by the social evaluation manipulation (latent gayness, $F(1, 201) = 0.30$, p

= .582; external, $F(1, 201) = 1.04, p = .309$, and internal, $F(1, 201) < 0.01, p = .994$, motivation to respond without prejudice).

With regards to the second aim, results from a series of correlational analyses revealed that, for heterosexual men, a focus on evaluation, overall, was positively related to concerns about one's latent gayness and external (but not internal) motivations to behave in nonprejudiced ways towards gay individuals (see Table 2). Among heterosexual women, an overall focus on evaluation was positively related to latent gayness concern too, although the magnitude of this effect was somewhat less than the equivalent estimate for heterosexual men (Fisher's $Z = 1.32, p = .094$, two-tailed, see Table 2). An overall focus on evaluation was unrelated to either external or internal motivation to behave in nonprejudiced ways among heterosexual women (see Table 2).

Hence, we demonstrated that concerns about appearing bigoted to others, as well as being latent gay, were indeed more prominent among heterosexual men than among heterosexual women and that an overall focus on evaluation reliably elicited these psychological states, especially among heterosexual men. Importantly, heterosexual men were concerned about avoiding the "prejudice" label when they were focused on social evaluation to the same degree as they were in the relaxation condition.

EXPERIMENT 1

The findings from the pilot study showed that heterosexual men experience internal conflicts with regards to the potentially negative interpretation of their behavior in the context of their relations with gay individuals. The question is whether the behavioral outcomes enlisted by a focus on social evaluation follow the predictions of bystander or social loafing models or both. To find out, we investigated heterosexual men's compassion towards victims of the 2016 Pulse Night Club shooting in Orlando, Florida, USA, using a news article that highlighted the human suffering in that tragedy and the moral outrage (or lack thereof)

against this atrocity. The aim here was to heighten the salience of the humanitarian compassion norm, because it is one of the two elements involved in the internal conflict that our theorizing envisages. The other element—the heterosexual norm—was activated via a biography that explicitly described victims of that incident as being gay. We reasoned that the visibility of the gay categorization should correspondingly increase the salience of heterosexual men’s sexual identity (and the norms associated with this identity) that should then guide subsequent behavior, following the self-categorization theory (Oakes, Turner, & Haslam, 1991; Turner, 1999; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987).

We recognize, however, that compassion can be defined in numerous ways. For example, it could represent the purely emotional state of sympathy/empathy for others; it could also be a behavioral manifestation of sympathy/empathy; or the intention to alleviate the suffering of others (Goetz, Keltner, & Simon-Thomas, 2010). In the current investigation, we assessed compassion in the third way, in terms of peoples’ empathy-induced intention to assist victims of the Orlando shooting incident. We did so because intentions are more proximal predictors of actual behavior (Ajzen, 1991) with the additional bonus of being reliably and straightforwardly examined using a self-report measurement approach.

METHOD

Participants

We used the pre-screening tool on Prolific.ac to eliminate participants who had completed the pilot study (or similar studies run by our team). So, for example, if a researcher only wanted responses from those who have not participated in past studies that the researcher has run on the Prolific.ac platform, then selecting the caption of those studies under the exclusion chamber will render the current study unavailable to those who had completed the previous studies. It was also important that other demographics (e.g., participants’ location and/or country of residence) were roughly identical to the ones reported

in this pilot study (and elsewhere in Experiment 2) so that a meaningful comparison is possible across these studies (see Table 1). Again, we used the Prolific.ac screening tool to pre-select participants who are currently residing in the US.

We recruited 198 Prolific.ac survey takers who self-identified as heterosexual men ($M_{\text{age}} = 33.28$ years, $SD_{\text{age}} = 9.07$) based on an estimated 156 cases that G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009) suggested would be required to power a 2 x 2 between-subject design with one repeated measurement. This calculation assumed a modest effect size of $f = .20$ and 80% power (Cohen, 1992). Participants were paid GBP 5 per hour (pro-rated) for their time.

Materials and Procedure

In line with the British Psychological Society's protocols for the ethical conduct of research with human subjects, participants were briefed about the broad aims of a "survey on social attitudes and perceptions" prior to consenting to participate. They were assured of the confidentiality of their responses and provided an opportunity to withdraw from the study at any point prior to completing the following tasks/measures. In terms of design, participants were assigned to either the evaluation or the relaxation condition prior to being exposed to a passively versus actively compassionate bystander. Afterward, we measured participants' own passive and active compassion towards gay victims.

Evaluation vs. relaxation treatment

Our social evaluation induction followed the approach that we piloted earlier (see Table 1), and this was grounded on the evidence that social judgements accentuate evaluative concerns (Vorauer et al., 2000). As in the pilot study, we strengthened the salience of social evaluation (evaluation condition) by asking participants to evaluate various social groups (including their heterosexual in-group and homosexual outgroup) along the dimensions of anger and the opposite trait of calmness. In the relaxation condition, we weakened the

salience of social evaluation by asking participants to empty their minds of all thoughts prior to watching a 2-minute YouTube video.

Manipulating bystander reaction

Next, participants read an adapted version of a CNN news article about the shooting incident that occurred at the Pulse nightclub that ostensibly targeted the gay community. Although recent evidence now suggests otherwise, we focused on this incident because the prevailing narrative in the immediate aftermath of the shooting, when this investigation was carried out was that of a hate crime against the LGBT community (Coaston, 2018). Indeed, this sentiment was also evidenced in President Barack Obama's address to the nation after the incident, stating that: "We know enough to say this was an act of terror and an act of hate...This is an especially heartbreaking day for our friends who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender" (Ellis, Fantz, Karimi, & McLaughlin, 2016). This was emphasized in the news article presented to participants. The extract from the CNN news article that participants read was:

On June 12, 2016, an American-born man gunned down 49 people at a gay nightclub in Orlando. This incident has been described by authorities as one of the deadliest mass shootings in the USA and the nation's worst terror attack since 9/11. The gunman, 29, of Fort Pierce, Florida, was interviewed by the FBI in 2013 and 2014 but was not found to be a threat. The FBI said the gunman carried an assault rifle and a pistol into the packed Pulse nightclub about 2 a.m. Sunday and started shooting.

According to President Obama, this violence "marks a horrific chapter for our lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender friends."

To enhance the credibility of the news story, we included a title ("Orlando shooting: 49 killed"), the date (June 13, 2016) as well as author names and source (Ellis et al., 2016) at the outset of this passage. Next, participants read extracts of an interview transcript, purported to

have been provided to the news reporters by a bystander at the scene of the incident. In the actively compassionate bystander condition, participants read the following:

Interviewer: What do you think about the shooting at the Pulse gay nightclub last night?

Bystander: Umm...this is terrible and I really empathize with the victims and their families. It's just shameful, to think that terrorism like this still happens. It really isn't fair the sorts of ordeals and hate that some people have towards other people.

Umm...imagine if these individuals were your sibling, your brother or sister...I'm really touched by this tragedy and will be joining fundraising initiatives for the surviving victims. We simply can't allow hatred and discrimination to continue...

In the passively compassionate bystander condition, participants read the following:

Interviewer: What do you think about the shooting at the Pulse gay nightclub last night?

Bystander: Umm...I kinda pity the victims and their families. I feel sorry for the surviving victims, but what can you do really? It's not like raising money or protesting will really do anything...I don't really plan to do anything for the victims, even if I do feel kind of bad for them...Nothing I do will help...it's a lost cause.

To maintain participant's focus on the sexual identity of the victims, we presented participants with a brief biography that the reporters ostensibly obtained from one of the surviving victims, which was purportedly done to put a human face to charitable appeals on behalf of the victims. In reality, this was a cover story to justify the inclusion of this additional thesis-relevant material and, neither the interview nor the charitable appeal was factual. The surviving victim's biography read:

I am a 21-year-old gay man and I was at the Pulse club with my friends for Latin night. Back in college, I was part of the football team and adventure club. I love

repairing old cars because my father was a mechanic and he taught me everything he knew. Emm...I recently graduated with a combined major in business, with a minor in computer programing and have just been accepted for an internship at Oracle Inc. I was aiming to rise to the top and probably become one of the company's chief executives at some point in the future, but I am not so sure anymore...I got shot in the leg, why would somebody do that? [sobs].

Dependent Measures

After reading the foregoing materials, participants then expressed their compassion for the victimized community using 8-items that we adapted from Nickell (1998) and Pommier (2010). Two of the items were designed to tap active compassion (e.g., “if the LGBT community needs my help, I want to offer it), while the other 6 items tapped into passive compassion (e.g., “I pity the LGBT community, but do not think it is my place to help them”; see Appendix A for the full list of items). Responses were obtained on a 7-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). A factor analysis with varimax rotation confirmed the bi-dimensionality of the scale items (see Table 3 for factor loadings and scales reliabilities). We reasoned that greater endorsements of active than passive compassion should demonstrate support for gay victims, while equivalent endorsement of active and passive compassion indicates a mixed (even passive) feeling toward the victims, especially in this US context where blatant dislike/hatred for others based on their social background is both socially and legally sanctioned.

An alternative explanation beyond the bystander and social loafing accounts of compassion is that heterosexual men’s passive vs. active compassion towards gay individuals is due to prejudice and nothing else. That is, prejudiced heterosexual men should express passivity towards gay individuals, whereas their non-prejudiced counterparts should express the opposite compassionate feelings towards this demographic. There are two notable

differences between a prejudice explanation and the two models proposed here. Firstly, prejudiced people generally care less about how they come across to others than nonprejudiced individuals (i.e., a “Trump-like effect”; see also Vorauer, Main, & O’Connell, 1998). Following this reasoning, prejudiced heterosexual men should be less inclined to express active compassion towards gay victims regardless of the social evaluation condition that they have been assigned to and their negative orientation toward the victims should also persist irrespective of bystanders’ reaction to the situation. Nonprejudiced heterosexual men, on the other hand, should be more sensitive to social evaluation (Vorauer et al., 1998) and, for this reason, one might expect such individuals to express more active than passive compassion for gay victims, especially when they are mindful of social evaluation, or when they see that others aren’t helping out. Hence, we included an exit questionnaire that assessed participants’ attitude towards gay individuals with 5 items that were adapted from Herek (1998): “I think gay men are disgusting”; “Male homosexuality is a perversion”; “Male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in men” (reverse coded); “Sex between two men is just plain wrong”; and “Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned (reverse coded)”. Responses were collected on a 7-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*, $\alpha = .86$).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Testing the Dual Process Explanation

A 2 (Compassion Type: Active vs. Passive) x 2 (Bystander Reaction: Active vs. Passive) x 2 (Social Evaluation: Evaluation vs. Relaxation) mixed ANOVA was conducted, with compassion type as a repeated factor, while bystander reaction and social evaluation were between-subject factors. Full model results are shown in Table 4.

Consistent with the compassion norm that is generally evident in the prosocial literature, there was a main effect of compassion type, $F(1, 194) = 25.48, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .12$:

heterosexual men were more likely to express active ($M \pm SE$; 4.67 ± 0.10) rather than passive (3.92 ± 0.09) compassion for gay victims overall. This compassion type effect was neither uniquely qualified by social evaluation, $F(1, 194) = 0.17, p = .678, \eta_p^2 = .001$, nor by bystander reaction, $F(1, 194) = 1.49, p = .224, \eta_p^2 = .01$. However, it was jointly qualified by social evaluation and bystander reaction in a significant 3-way interaction, $F(1, 194) = 8.07, p = .005, \eta_p^2 = .04$. We decomposed this interaction by examining the simple main effect of compassion type at either of the two bystander reaction conditions, and within the evaluation vs. relaxation conditions.

In the evaluation condition

We found patterns that were consistent with the predicted *imitation effect* derived from the bystander model: heterosexual men's active compassion was downgraded to match their passive compassion towards gay victims when the bystander reaction was passive, $F(1, 194) = 2.20, p = .140, \eta_p^2 = .01$ (see Fig. 1a). Meanwhile, our male heterosexual participants in this condition of social evaluation were more actively (than passively) compassionate towards gay victims when the bystander reaction to the victims was also active, $F(1, 194) = 10.27, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .05$ (see Fig. 1a).

In the relaxation condition

We had anticipated that the social loafing explanation should be visible when people's concerns over social judgements were somewhat relaxed. Consistent with this expectation, results showed that heterosexual men experienced a motivation loss when the gay victims were already receiving the needed support (i.e., when exposed to an actively compassionate bystander). Specifically, heterosexual men's active compassion was downgraded to match their passive stance towards gay victims, $F(1, 194) = 0.48, p = .491, \eta_p^2 = .002$ (see Fig. 1b). In contrast, the opposite motivation boost occurred when heterosexual men were exposed to a

passive bystander: they expressed more active than passive compassion, $F(1, 194) = 22.94$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .11$ (see Fig. 1b).

Testing the Alternative Prejudice Explanation

To distinguish our dual process model from an effect based entirely on prejudice, we calculated a mixed ANCOVA, involving compassion type and prejudice, when social evaluation and bystander reaction were included in the model as unique moderators (see Table 5). This analysis yielded a significant compassion type x prejudice interaction, $F(1, 195) = 56.76$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .23$, showing that nonprejudiced heterosexual men expressed greater active (5.18 ± 0.13) than passive (3.42 ± 0.12 ; $p < .001$; $\eta_p^2 = .32$; 95% CI = $|1.39, 2.13|$) compassion, whereas their more prejudiced counterparts showed no such difference (active vs. passive compassion: 4.14 ± 0.14 vs. $4.24 \pm .12$; $p = .157$; $\eta_p^2 = .01$; 95% CI = $|-0.65, 0.11|$). Crucially, this prejudice effect was neither contingent upon bystander reaction nor the social evaluation treatment that participants received (see Table 5).

Key Findings and Limitation

The present results provide initial support for the bystander and social loafing models of how heterosexual men might respond to gay victims of hate crime. It revealed three primary findings: (1) heterosexual men were more likely to imitate bystander behavior when confronted with gay victims who have been targeted due to perceived deviance from the heterosexual norm, but this effect occurred only when the potential for social evaluation was strong; (2) situations where heterosexual men felt relaxed and not particularly concerned about social judgments elicited a social loafing effect that depended on the level of support already available to the victims. Finally, (3) we demonstrated that a prejudice account may not be as nuanced in its explanation of compassionate responses toward gay victims compared to the preferred dual process model, because the effects under this model were

neither singly sensitive to bystander reactions nor the salience of social evaluation that heterosexual men were exposed to.

Our focus on heterosexual men is predicated on the theorized dilemma that members of this demographic might face when confronted with individuals that they perceive as deviating from the heterosexual norm. However, we found in the pilot study that an overall focus on social judgements positively predicted concerns about latent gayness even among heterosexual women and internal motivation to be nonprejudiced was also stronger for them than for heterosexual men. One wonders, therefore, whether the patterns shown here—that are presumably limited to men due to the internal conflict assumption underlying our dual process model—also applies to heterosexual women. We would argue that evaluative concerns are unlikely to be a significant predictor of heterosexual women’s compassion for gay men because they should be less pre-occupied with perceived violations of masculinity-based norms than heterosexual men might be (cf. Herek & Capitanio, 1996, 1999). Consequently, a stronger test of our internal conflict assumption should find that the proposed dual process explanation is visible only among heterosexual men but absent among heterosexual women. These speculations guided the subsequent replication.

EXPERIMENT 2

METHOD

Participants

We doubled the estimated sample size that we calculated in Experiment 1 by recruiting 303 Prolific.ac survey takers who either self-identified as heterosexual men ($N = 151$, $M_{\text{age}} = 34.15$ years, $SD_{\text{age}} = 10.02$) or heterosexual women ($N = 152$, $M_{\text{age}} = 35.47$ years, $SD_{\text{age}} = 11.39$) given the additional interest on heterosexual women. Again, we prescreened participants so that those who took part in the earlier studies could not complete the current replication. As before, we only accepted responses from heterosexual individuals who were

residing in the US, and we used Prolific's screening tool to ensure equal number of responses from men and women (see Table 1 for demographic details). Participants were compensated at the pro-rated fee of GBP 5 per hour.

We closely followed the procedure described in Experiment 1, in manipulating social evaluation (vs. relaxation) and bystander reaction (passive vs. active), while measuring participants' own passive and active compassion afterward (see Table 3 for scale reliabilities). We used the biography of a gay man in the news article that participants read, again to maintain a constant focus on this demographic. We also included the same 5-item exit questionnaire concerning prejudice towards gay people that we used in Experiment 1 ($\alpha = .90$) to be sure that the conclusions we reached about the independence of this alternative account (relative to the dual-process model) are reproducible.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Testing the Dual Process Explanation

We repeated the same 2 x 2 x 2 mixed ANOVA that we described in Experiment 1, only that we additionally included gender in the model as a between-subject factor (full model results are shown in Table 4). Replicating Experiment 1, results revealed a main effect of compassion type, showing that participants expressed greater active compassion (4.77 ± 0.09), than passive compassion (3.46 ± 0.07), for the gay victims, $F(1, 295) = 102.76, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .26$. As in Experiment 1, this compassion type effect was neither qualified by social evaluation, $F(1, 295) = 0.63, p = .429, \eta_p^2 = .002$, nor bystander reaction, $F(1, 295) = 0.20, p = .652, \eta_p^2 = .001$. However, as expected, the compassion type x bystander reaction x social evaluation interaction was conditional on participants' gender, $F(1, 295) = 6.64, p = .010, \eta_p^2 = .02$. To understand this interaction, we calculated a series of simple main effects of compassion type across the conditions of bystander reaction, within the evaluation vs. relaxation conditions and separately for heterosexual men and women.

When social evaluation was salient among heterosexual men

Replicating the patterns in Experiment 1, results confirmed the imitation effect predicted by the bystander model. Heterosexual men's active compassion was adjusted downwards to match their passive compassion when the bystander's reaction was passive, $F(1, 295) = 0.84, p = .360, \eta_p^2 = .003$ (see Fig. 1c). Meanwhile, these men expressed more active than passive compassion towards gay victims when the bystander's reaction was responsive/active, $F(1, 295) = 8.81, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .03$ (see Fig. 1c).

When social evaluation was relaxed among heterosexual men

Corroborating the social loafing patterns that we showed in Experiment 1, results confirmed that heterosexual men experienced a motivation loss in the active bystander condition: They again calibrated their active compassion downwards to match their passivity, but did so only when they were exposed to bystanders who were already helping out, $F(1, 295) = 3.06, p = .081, \eta_p^2 = .002$ (see Fig. 1d). In contrast, heterosexual men experienced a motivation boost when they were exposed to a passive bystander, expressing more active than passive compassion towards the gay victims, $F(1, 295) = 11.67, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .04$ (see Fig. 1d).

Heterosexual women

When gay victims are concerned, we speculated that an internal conflict should be absent (or at least less prominent) among heterosexual women compared to their male counterparts and, for this reason, that their compassionate expressions should tilt in favor of the gay victims. Consistent with these assumptions, we found that heterosexual women consistently expressed greater active than passive compassion for the gay victims regardless of bystander reaction and social evaluation condition to which they were assigned ($ps < .001$, see Figs. 1e-f).

Testing the Prejudice Explanation

As in Experiment 1, we repeated the mixed ANCOVA in which prejudice and gender were included as moderators of the compassion type effect (see Table 5 for full model results). Corroborating Experiment 1, results showed a significant compassion type x prejudice interaction, $F(1, 293) = 253.50, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .46$. Nonprejudiced participants expressed greater active than passive compassion towards the victim (4.82 ± 0.07 vs. $3.43 \pm 0.07; p < .001; \eta_p^2 = .42; 95\% CI = [1.21, 1.58]$). In contrast, their prejudiced counterparts seemed more reluctant to assist the gay victims: their active compassion was no greater than the passive compassion that they expressed (3.94 ± 0.09 vs. $4.05 \pm 0.09; p = .395; \eta_p^2 < .01; 95\% CI = [-0.36, 0.14]$). This compassion type x prejudice effect was qualified by gender, $F(1, 293) = 13.54, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .03$. To understand this 3-way interaction, we decomposed the compassion type x prejudice effect for nonprejudiced and prejudiced heterosexual men and women.

Nonprejudiced heterosexual men and women

Corroborating Experiment 1, results revealed greater active than passive compassion among nonprejudiced heterosexual men ($4.78 \pm .10$ vs. $3.68 \pm 0.09, p < .001; \eta_p^2 = .18; 95\% CI = [0.83, 1.37]$) and women ($4.86 \pm .10$ vs. $3.17 \pm 0.09, p < .001; \eta_p^2 = .36; 95\% CI = [1.43, 1.95]$). Hence, the interaction emerged because, overall, heterosexual women were more likely to express active compassion than heterosexual men did, while heterosexual men were more likely to express passive compassion than heterosexual women did ($ps < .05$).

Prejudiced heterosexual men and women

Replicating Experiment 1, results showed that participants' active compassion was adjusted downwards to match their passive compassion for the gay victims, and this was evident among heterosexual men ($4.09 \pm .12$ vs. $4.19 \pm 0.12, p = .543; \eta_p^2 < .01; 95\% CI = [-0.44, 0.23]$); and women ($3.79 \pm .14$ vs. $3.91 \pm 0.13, p = .550; \eta_p^2 = .01; 95\% CI = [-0.49, 0.26]$).

As in Experiment 1, the compassion type x prejudice effect was neither contingent upon the evaluation vs. relaxation conditions to which participants were assigned, nor was it dependent on bystander reactions (see Table 5).

Summary of Key Findings

In short, we demonstrated: (1) that an imitation effect is visible when people are focused on social evaluation consistent with the bystander model, (2) that a loafing effect is apparent when concern over social evaluation is relaxed somewhat, and, (3) that the dual process model of compassionate reactions towards gay victims offer a more nuanced explanation compared to the prejudice account. We further found supportive evidence that these effects may, in fact, be driven by internal conflicts in heterosexual men because they were largely absent among heterosexual women.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

How does concern over social evaluation affect heterosexual men's compassion towards gay victims, especially in situations where allegiance to the compassion norm potentially conflicts with the prevailing norms of sexual conduct that prescribes passivity to norm violators? Here, we tested and found supportive evidence for two competing explanations on how heterosexual men might react in this type of situation. Firstly, following the bystander model, we found evidence that heterosexual men might imitate the reaction of bystanders, especially in situations where the salience of social judgement is strong. This finding corroborates other research programs outside the bystander model, demonstrating that concerns over social judgement both enhance (Fischer et al., 2011; Owuamalam & Rubin, 2014) as well as reduce (van Leuween, Oostenbrink, & Twilt, 2014) prosocial behavior.

Secondly, and consistent with the social loafing model, we demonstrated that heterosexual men could also express passivity toward gay victims even when bystanders are responsive to the victims, provided the immediate situation soothes their worries over social

judgements, giving scope for a rational consideration of the level of support warranted in the situation to operate. Hence, we reconcile both models by showing that the degree to which social judgement are inherent in the situation can determine whether heterosexual men's passivity or compassion for gay victims follow a bystander or a social loafing explanation. Indeed, our findings provide one possible answer to the contrasting evidence for the bystander effect that was reported under conditions that were likely to have accentuated evaluative concerns (e.g. CCTV surveillance; Liebst et al., 2019 vs. Philpot et al., 2019), by demonstrating that the behaviour of other people in the situation matter.

Theoretical Opportunities

We have limited a test of our internal conflict theory of compassion towards gay victims of hate crime to heterosexual men's reactions towards gay men. We demonstrated that such internal conflict may be absent among heterosexual women who are confronted with gay (male) victims of hate crime. However, other permutations of the internal conflict thesis are possible. For example, it is entirely conceivable that the compassion biases shown by heterosexual men with regards to gay men might also be visible among heterosexual women when considering lesbians, especially those that embrace the masculine virtue. This is because (1) the common-in-group bond is likely weakened as a result of the latter's attraction to masculinity, and (2) the perception of deviance from the heterosexual norm is likely to be most visible among heterosexual women in this situation. These derivatives have yet to be tested. So, although the current findings provide a promising start, future studies could aim to test the derived assumptions directly, by, for example, extending our propositions to reactions towards lesbians and transgendered victims of hate crime, and also comparing reactions towards norm-conforming versus norm-deviating heterosexual victims.

Applied Implications

Research on bystander effects has typically sought to understand and predict the ways in which bystander behavior affects people's responses to victims of emergencies. Here, we extend the traditional focus on passive bystanders, group size, and bystander commitment (Fischer et al., 2011; Levine & Crowther, 2008) by describing how internal struggle among heterosexual men might affect their responses to victims of emergencies when bystanders are supportive (or not). This is important, especially in the context of jury deliberation of cases concerning hate crimes against gay individuals, given the greater representation of heterosexual jurors who might harbor these internal conflicts. When this happens, it is likely that a positive or negative verdict may no longer be down to objective facts alone, but may incorporate self-serving decisions that helps to soothe their internal struggle.

It is important to note, however, that most studies on the bystander effect have focused extensively on live emergencies, where the victimization/emergency is ongoing. Our research focused on those cases in which victimization/emergency isn't live (e.g., a few days/weeks following the relevant incident). Nonetheless, we were still able to generate effects that mirror the patterns often reported in studies that have used the live emergency approach. Hence, we advance scholarship on the bystander effect, by showing that a live emergency may not be necessary requirement to obtain the sorts of effects typically reported using the traditional "live" approach. Our approach could therefore enable researchers in the area to better navigate the ethical dilemma that potentially surrounds the "live" approach. That being said, it is important to acknowledge that our findings may be limited, for example, to compassionate expressions in situations involving fundraising appeals on behalf of victims and, therefore, may not generalize to purely affective aspects of compassion, or even to emergencies that potentially require immediate and/or costly behavioral intervention.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Studies

The ratings of the heterosexual in-group, homosexual outgroup and the other filler groups, could have different implications on people's compassionate expressions and, one might wonder which specific group evaluation was driving the effects in the salient social evaluation condition. To address the question, we first merged the data across Experiments 1 and 2 and then correlated these with the measures of active and passive compassion. Results showed that specific group evaluations did correlate with the two compassion types, although this was not always in a consistent manner as we observed with the index of generic social evaluation (see Table 6). Hence, it was the generic focus on social evaluation (rather than specific group evaluations) that more parsimoniously explained participants' compassionate expressions towards gay victims, even though there is some merit to the specific group evaluation argument (see Table 6). Future research could aim to untangle generic and specific group evaluation to see, for example, whether a social evaluation mindset is more/less potent when the evaluation is tied to a specific intra- or inter-group setting.

It is also possible to question the masculine description of the gay exemplar that was used in Experiments 1 and 2 on the basis that masculine gay men generally elicit greater positivity from heterosexual men, and, consequently that the results might have been different if a description of a feminine gay victim was used instead. For example, a feminine gay victim could have significantly accentuated a passive (over an active) compassion for the victim in the conditions of the experiment in which passivity was expected, while at the same time causing an equivalent degree of active and passive compassion in the relevant conditions of the experiment, in light of the animosity sometimes directed towards this demographic (Glick et al., 2007). It is important to note three things in this regard. Firstly, a masculine gay target is likely to accentuate distinctiveness-induced threats to heterosexual men's masculine identity, and this should theoretically increase negativity towards this demographic in an attempt to positively distinguish their ingroup from this "similar" outgroup (Jetten & Spears,

2003). Secondly, a masculine depiction of the gay target is also unlikely to have contaminated our manipulation of sexual identity with gender expression, in the way that a feminine depiction might, especially when the focus is on heterosexual men. And, finally, we see no reason why people who are outwardly masculine may not also be perceived as inwardly feminine, especially when such individuals are described as gay—a euphemism often used colloquially to refer to men with a feminine character. Indeed, the “gentle giant” English idiom supports the view that people with a masculine exterior (e.g., large and strong) can also have a feminine interior (e.g., soft and gentle). That being said, it is important to more conclusively demonstrate the role gender expressions might play in compassionate (vs. passive) reactions to gay victims of hate crime. This issue is beyond the scope of the current investigation and future studies could benefit from looking into it.

Finally, we modelled our measure of anti-gay attitudes on previous studies, but it is entirely possible that the explicit nature of this measurement could have forced a floor effect given the sanctions against blatant prejudice in the US (also as indicated in Appendix B, Table B1). It is important to note, however, that differential patterns of results for those scoring high (i.e. $M+1SD$) and low ($M-1SD$) on this scale with regards to their passive and active compassionate responses suggests that there was sufficient variability in the data to test our assumptions. The results also remained largely similar to the ones that we have reported in-text, when we transformed the data across the two experiments to normality using Templeton’s (2011) 2-Step normality transformation (see Appendix B, Table B2). Nonetheless, future investigations could deal with issues around floor effects by using more subtle alternatives singly, or in combination with implicit measures of attitudes towards gay individuals (e.g., Pinsof & Haselton, 2016).

Concluding Remarks

Amidst the populist surge in several Western societies (and elsewhere), minority groups (such as those based on sexual orientation) continue to be targets of hate crime. Often, an effective way to address such concern might be through compassionate advocacy by members of groups that occupy a dominant/majority position in society (Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006). But here we show that heterosexual men (the sexual majority group) may be burdened with internal struggles that might cause them to be more reluctant to assist gay victims of hate crime under certain conditions. Nevertheless, our finding also presents a silver lining to this situation, in that it prescribes two ways to encourage heterosexual men to intervene on behalf of gay victims of hate crime: 1) By increasing the salience of social judgements, combined with exposing heterosexual men to examples of other people who have helped (or are helping), or; 2) By relaxing social judgements, but at the same time making it clear to heterosexual men that people aren't really doing much to ease the suffering victimized gay individuals. These situations might prompt the compassion norm to override concerns over adherence to heteronormativity, which could in turn allow compassionate expressions for gay victims of hate crime to manifest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are grateful to the Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education for a grant to the first author (grant #: FRGS/1/2016/SS05/UNIM/02/2). All opinions expressed in the paper are the authors' own and do not necessarily represent the views of the Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
- Batson, C. D., Chang, J., Orr, R., & Rowland, J. (2002). Empathy, attitudes, and action: Can feeling for a member of a stigmatized group motivate one to help the group? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(12), 1656-1666. doi:10.1177/014616702237647
- Bosson, J., Weaver, J. R., & Prewitt-Freilino, J. L. (2012). Concealing to belong, revealing to be known: Classification expectations and self-threats among persons with concealable stigmas. *Self and Identity*, 11(1), 114-135. doi:10.1080/15298868.2010.513508
- Coaston, J. (2018). New evidence shows the Pulse nightclub shooting wasn't about anti-LGBTQ hate. *Vox*. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2018/4/5/17202026/pulse-shooting-lgbtq-trump-terror-hate>.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 784-803. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784
- Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8(4), 377-383. doi:10.1037/h0025589
- Ellis, R., Fantz, A., Karimi, F., & McLaughlin, E. C. (June, 2016). Orlando shooting: 49 killed, shooter pledged ISIS allegiance. *CNN*. Retrieved 17 June 2019 from <https://edition.cnn.com/2016/06/12/us/orlando-nightclub-shooting/index.html>

- Falomir-Pichastor, J. M., & Mugny, G. (2009). "I'm not gay...I'm a real man!": Heterosexual men's gender self-esteem and sexual prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(9), 1233-1243. doi:10.1177/0146167209338072
- Fasoli, F., Hegarty, P., Maass, A., & Antonio, R. (2018). Who wants to sound straight? Sexual majority and minority stereotypes, beliefs and desires about auditory gaydar. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 130, 59-64. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2018.03.046
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analysis using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analysis. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149-1160. doi:10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149.
- Fischer, P., Krueger, J. I., Greitemeyer, T., Vogrincic, C., Kastenmüller, A., Frey, D., . . . Kainbacher, M. (2011). The bystander-effect: A meta-analytic review on bystander intervention in dangerous and non-dangerous emergencies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137(4), 273-294. doi:10.1037/a0023304
- Gallo, M. M. (2014). The parable of Kitty Genovese, The *New York Times*, and the erasure of lesbianism. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 23(2), 273-294. doi:10.7560/JHS23206
- Garcia, S. M., Weaver, K., Darley, J. M., & Spence, B. T. (2009). Dual effects of implicit bystanders: Inhibiting vs. facilitating helping behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 19(2), 215-224. doi:10.1016/j.jcps.2009.02.013
- Gillmor, K., Bernstein, M. J., & Benfield, J. A. (2014). Have you no shame? Infrahumanization of promiscuous sexual assault victims as moderated by dispositional and situational Just World orientation. *Journal of Student Research*, 3(1), 34-45.

- Glick, P., Gangl, C., Gibb, S., Klumpner, S., & Weinberg, E. (2007). Defensive reactions to masculinity threat: More negative affect toward effeminate (but not masculine) gay men. *Sex Roles*, 57(1-2), 55-59. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9195-3
- Goetz, J. L., Keltner, D., & Simon-Thomas, E. (2010). Compassion: An evolutionary analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(3), 351 -374. doi: 10.1037/a0018807
- Hauser, D. J., Ellsworth, P. C., & Gonzalez, R. (2018). Are manipulation checks necessary? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(998). doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00998
- Herek, G.M. (1998). The Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG) scale. In C.M. Davis, W.L. Yarber, R. Bauserman, G. Schreer, & S.L. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of sexuality-related measures* (pp. 392-394). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Herek, G. M., & Capitanio, J. P. (1996). "Some of my best friends": Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(4), 412-424. doi:10.1177/0146167296224007
- Herek, G. M., & Capitanio, J. P. (1999). Sex differences in how heterosexuals think about lesbians and gay men: Evidence from survey context effects. *Journal of Sex Research*, 36(4), 348-360. doi:10.1080/00224499909552007
- Hopkins, N., Reicher, S., Harrison, K., Cassidy, C., Bull, R., & Levine, M. (2007). Helping to improve the group stereotype: On the strategic dimension of prosocial behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(6), 776-788. doi:10.1177/0146167207301023
- Jetten, J., & Spears, R. (2003). The divisive potential of differences and similarities: The role of intergroup distinctiveness in intergroup differentiation. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 14(1), 203-241. doi:10.1080/104632803400000063

- Keng, S. L., Smoski, M. J., & Robins, C. J. (2011). Effects of mindfulness on psychological health: A review of empirical studies. *Clinical Psychology Review, 31*(6), 1041-1056. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2011.04.006
- Kuiper, N. A. (1978). Depression and causal attributions for success and failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*(3), 236-246. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.36.3.236
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Levine, M., & Crowther, S. (2008). The responsive bystander: How social group membership and group size can encourage as well as inhibit bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1429-1439. doi:10.1037/a0012634
- Liebst, L. S., Philpot, R., Bernasco, W., Lykke Dausel, K., Ejbye-Ernst, P., Nicolaisen, M. H., & Lindegaard, M. R. (2019). Social relations and presence of others affect bystander intervention: Evidence from violent incidents captured on CCTV. *Aggressive Behavior, 45*(6), 598-609. doi:10.1002/ab.21853
- Lueke, A., & Gibson, B. (2015). Mindfulness meditation reduces implicit age and race bias: The role of reduced automaticity of responding. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 6*(3), 284-291. doi:10.1177/1948550614559651
- Manning, R., Levine, M., & Collins, A. (2007). The Kitty Genovese murder and the social psychology of helping: The parable of the 38 witnesses. *American Psychologist, 62*(6), 555-562. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.6.555
- Nickell, G. (1998). *The Helping Attitudes scale*. Paper presented at the Meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.
- Oakes, P. J., Turner, J. C., & Haslam, S. A. (1991). Perceiving people as group members: The role of fit in the salience of social categorizations. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 125-144. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.1991.tb00930.x

- Open Science Collaboration, (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251). doi:10.1126/science.aac4716
- Owuamalam, C. K., & Rubin, M. (2014). When do low status groups help high status groups? The moderating effects of in-group identification, audience group membership, and perceived reputational benefit. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 2(1), 289-312. doi:10.5964/jspp.v2i1.33
- Pew Research Center, (2015). Americans are still divided on why people are gay. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/03/06/americans-are-still-divided-on-why-people-are-gay/>
- Philpot, R., Liebst, L. S., Levine, M., Bernasco, W., & Lindegaard, M. R. (2019). Would I be helped? Cross-national CCTV footage shows that intervention is the norm in public conflicts. *American Psychologist*. Advance online publication. doi.org/10.1037/amp0000469
- Pinsof, D., & Haselton, M. (2016). The political divide over same-sex marriage: Mating strategies in conflict? *Psychological Science*, 27, 435–442. doi:10.1177/0956797615621719
- Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(3), 811-832. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.3.811
- Pommier, E. A. (2010). *The compassion scale*. Doctoral thesis, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Ringelmann, M. (1913). Recherches sur les moteurs animes: Travail de rhomme [Research on animate sources of power: The work of man]. *Annales de l'Institut National Agronomique*, 12(2), 1-40.

- Robins, C. J. (1988). Attributions and depression: Why is the literature so inconsistent? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(5), 880-889. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.880
- Rosenthal, A. M. (1999). *Thirty-eight witnesses: The Kitty Genovese case*. Brooklyn, NY: Melville House Publishing.
- Salvati, M., Ioverno, S., Giacomantonio, M., & Baiocco, R. (2016). Attitude toward gay men in an Italian sample: Masculinity and sexual orientation make a difference. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy Journal of NSRC*, 13(2), 109-118. doi:10.1007/s13178-016-0218-0
- Sheldon, J. P., Pfeffer, C. A., Jayaratne, T. E., Feldbaum, M., & Petty, E. M. (2007). Beliefs about the etiology of homosexuality and about the ramifications of discovering its possible genetic origin. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 52, 111-150. doi:10.1300/J082v52n03_06
- Simons, D. J., & Holcombe, A. O. (2014). Registered replication reports. *Psychological Science*. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/registered-replication-reports>
- 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(2), 98-107. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000088
- Templeton, G. F. (2011). A two-step approach for transforming continuous variables to normal: implications and recommendations for IS research. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 28(1), 41-58.
- Tice, D. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (1985). Masculinity inhibits helping in emergencies: Personality does predict the bystander effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(2), 420-428. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.49.2.420

- Turner, J. C. (1999). Some current issues in research on social identity and self-categorization theories. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 6–34). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- van Bommel, M., van Prooijen, J. W., Elffers, H., & van Lange, P. A. (2014). Intervene to be seen: The power of a camera in attenuating the bystander effect. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5(4), 459-466. doi:10.1177/1948550613507958
- Vandello, J. A., & Bosson, J. K. (2013). Hard won and easily lost: A review and synthesis of theory and research on precarious manhood. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 14, 101-113. doi:10.1037/a0029826
- van Leeuwen, E., Oostenbrink, J.-J., & Twilt, A. (2014). The combined effects of meta-stereotypes and audience on outgroup and in-group helping. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 18(3), 189-202. doi:10.1037/gdn0000005
- Voelpel, S. C., Eckhoff, R. A., & Förster, J. (2008). David against Goliath? Group size and bystander effects in virtual knowledge sharing. *Human Relations*, 61(2), 271-295. doi:10.1177/0018726707087787
- Vorauer, J. D., Hunter, A. J., Main, K. J., & Roys, S. A. (2000). Meta-stereotype activation: Evidence from indirect measures for specific evaluative concerns experienced by members of dominant groups in intergroup interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 690-707. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.78.4.690
- Vorauer, J. D., Main, K. J., & O'Connell, G. B. (1998). How do individuals expect to be viewed by members of lower status groups? Content and implications of meta-

stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(4), 917-937.

doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.4.917

Wakefield, J. R., Hopkins, N., & Greenwood, R. M. (2012). Thanks, but no thanks: Women's avoidance of help-seeking in the context of a dependency-related stereotype.

Psychology of Women Quarterly, 36(4), 423-431. doi:10.1177/0361684312457659

Weaver, K. S., & Vescio, T. K. (2015). The justification of social inequality in response to masculinity threats. *Sex Roles*, 72(11-12), 521-535. doi:10.1007/s11199-015-0484-y

Weiner, B. (1995). *Judgments of responsibility: A foundation for a theory of social conduct*. New York: Guilford Press.

Weinstein, N., Ryan, W. S., DeHaan, C. R., Przybylski, A. K., Legate, N., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Parental autonomy support and discrepancies between implicit and explicit sexual identities: Dynamics of self-acceptance and defense. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(4), 815-832. doi:10.1037/a0026854

Wellman, H. M., Cross, D., & Watson, J. (2001). Meta-analysis of theory-of-mind development: The truth about false belief. *Child development*, 72(3), 655-684. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00304

Table 1.

Other Demographic Information

Ethnicity		Country of current residence		Household income		Religion		Highest education	
Pilot study									
Groups	<i>N</i>	Nation	<i>N</i>	Brackets	<i>N</i>	Faith groups	<i>N</i>	Program	<i>N</i>
Whites	139	USA	205	\$24,999 or less	39	Christianity	N/A	Middle/high school	N/A
Blacks	16	Others	0	\$25,000-49,000	53	Islam	N/A	Vocational training	N/A
Hispanic/Native	13			\$50,000-\$99,000	72	Hinduism/Buddhism	N/A	College (Bachelors)	N/A
Asians	28			\$100,000-\$199,000	33	Atheist/Agnostic	N/A	Postgraduate degree	N/A
Others	9			\$200,000 or more	8	others	N/A	Others	N/A
Experiment 1									
Whites	148	USA	198	\$24,999 or less	34	Christianity	91	Middle/high school	32
Blacks	5	Others	0	\$25,000-\$49,000	27	Islam	14	Vocational training	15
Hispanic/Native	22			\$50,000-\$99,000	77	Hinduism/Buddhism	4	College (Bachelors)	86
Asians	22			\$100,000-\$199,000	52	Atheist/Agnostic	74	Postgraduate degree	65
Others	1			\$200,000 or more	8	others	15	Others	N/A
Experiment 2									
White	255	USA	303	\$24,999 or less	49	Christianity	163	Middle/high school	66
Black	17	Others	0	\$25,000-\$49,000	74	Islam	6	Vocational training	39
Hispanic/Native	10			\$50,000-\$99,000	108	Hinduism/Buddhism	5	College (Bachelors)	129
Asian	20			\$100,000-\$199,000	57	Atheist/Agnostic	101	Postgraduate degree	69
Others	1			\$200,000 or more	15	others	28	Others	N/A

Note. N/A = Not applicable (information about religion and highest education were not collected in the pilot study).

Table 2.

Bivariate Correlations Between Group Evaluations and Concerns of Latent Gayness, and External vs. Internal Motivation to Respond without Prejudice Towards Gay Individuals.

Evaluation type	Heterosexual men			Heterosexual women		
	Latent gay concern	External Motivation	Internal Motivation	Latent gay concern	External Motivation	Internal Motivation
Anger - Heterosexuals	.05	-.07	.29*	-.25	-.04	.28*
Calm - Heterosexuals	.26 ⁺	.37**	-.20	.44**	.11	-.11
Anger - Homosexuals	.12	.21	-.43**	-.01	-.14	-.28*
Calm - Homosexuals	.23	-.01	.45**	.13	.17	.06
Anger – Other groups	.07	.02	.02	-.19	-.16	.14
Calm – Other groups	.26 ⁺	.24 ⁺	.02	.27*	.30*	-.20
Generic focus on social evaluation	.42**	.31*	.03	.34*	.17	-.11

Note. We generated the generic focus on evaluation by computing the average evaluation score across the groups that participants rated. ⁺ $p < .10$, * $p < .050$, ** $p < .010$.

Table 3.

Factor Loadings on the Compassion Scale for Both Studies.

Items	Experiment 1		Experiment 2	
	Active compassion	Passive compassion	Active compassion	Passive compassion
1. COMP1	.92	-.11	.91	-.19
2. COMP2	.92	-.03	.91	-.02
3. COMP3	-.22	.82	-.29	.82
4. COMP4	.02	.81	-.19	.81
5. COMP5	-.30	.61	-.35	.59
6. COMP6	-.20	.83	-.32	.80
7. COMP7	.25	.74	.14	.68
8. COMP8	-.04	.69	.03	.75
Variance explained	24.24%	42.57%	25.23%	42.29%
Scale reliability	$r = .77^{***}$	$\alpha = .85$	$r = .75^{***}$	$\alpha = .86$

Note. Varimax rotation was used. Factor loadings in bold face represent items that constitute the relevant scale.

$***p < .001$.

Table 4.

Test of Within-Subject Effects of Compassion Type as a Function of Social Evaluation, Bystander Reactions and Gender.

	Experiment 1			Experiment 2		
	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2
Compassion Type (CT)	29.82	< .001	.13	102.76	< .001	.26
Bystander Reaction (BR)*CT	1.58	.210	.01	0.20	.652	< .01
Social Evaluation (SEV)*CT	.184	.668	< .01	0.63	.429	< .01
Gender (G)*CT	--	--	--	13.45	< .001	.04
CT*BR*SEV	7.62	.006	.04	0.05	.831	< .01
CT*BR*G	--	--	--	0.40	.530	< .01
CT*G*SEV	--	--	--	0.03	.871	< .01
CT*BR*SEV*G	--	--	--	6.64	.010	.02

Table 5.

Test of Within-Subject Effects of Compassion Type as a Function of Social Evaluation, Bystander Reactions, Gender, and Anti-gay Attitudes.

	Experiment 1			Experiment 2		
	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2
Compassion Type (CT)	87.68	< .001	.31	411.77	< .001	.58
Bystander Reaction (BR)*CT	1.45	.229	.01	1.53	.218	.01
Social Evaluation (SEV)*CT	1.11	.294	.01	< 0.01	.955	< .01
Anti-gay Attitude (AA)*CT	94.76	< .001	.23	253.50	< .001	.46
Gender (G)*CT	--	--	--	17.08	< .001	.06
CT*AA*BR	1.05	.308	.01	1.73	.189	.01
CT*AA*SEV	2.47	.118	.01	0.48	.490	< .01
CT*AA*G	--	--	--	10.12	.002	.03
CT*AA*BR*G	--	--	--	0.02	.885	< .01
CT*AA*SEV*G	--	--	--	1.79	.182	.01

Note. Across both studies prejudice was operationalized as anti-gay attitudes. Prejudice effects compassion towards gay victims were largely independent of social evaluation and bystander reactions.

Table 6.

Bivariate Correlations Between Group Evaluations and Compassionate Expressions Towards Gay Victims

Evaluation type	Heterosexual men		Heterosexual women	
	Active compassion	Passive compassion	Active compassion	Passive compassion
Anger: Heterosexuals	.17*	.37***	.14	-.19
Calm: Heterosexuals	.17*	.08	-.11	.15
Anger: Homosexuals	.07	.17*	-.33**	.38**
Calm: Homosexuals	.26***	.25**	.15	-.02
Anger: Other groups	.10	.30***	-.08	.03
Calm: Other groups	.26**	.21**	.04	.03
Generic focus on social evaluation	.33***	.44***	-.10	.22

Note. We generated the overall evaluation focus by computing the average evaluation score across the groups that participants rated.

* $p < .050$

** $p < .010$

*** $p < .001$

When social evaluation is salient...

When social evaluation is relaxed...

Fig. 1. The effect of bystander reaction on straight men's (and women's) compassion for gay victims of hate crime in the evaluation vs. relaxed conditions. Figs. A-B = Experiment 1 ($N = 198$), and C-F = Experiment 2 ($N = 303$). Figs. E-F depict data for straight women. Error bars are standard errors.

ns = nonsignificant, $**p < .010$, $***p < .001$.

Appendix A

Full list of items for the compassion towards the victimized LGBT community (COMP) scale.

Active Compassion items:

1. COMP1: If the LGBT community needs my help, I want to offer it.
2. COMP2: I feel at peace with myself knowing that I have the capacity to help LGBT individuals fight hatred and discrimination against them, if called upon to serve in this way.

Passive Compassion items:

1. COMP3: I pity the LGBT community, but do not think it is my place to help them.
2. COMP4: I feel sorry for the LGBT community, but I cannot pretend that I understand all the fuss.
3. COMP5: I don't get emotionally wrapped up with the LGBT community's problems even though I do care.
4. COMP6: I feel sorry for bad things happening to the LGBT community but It's probably not worth the effort to try to get involved.
5. COMP7: Aiding the LGBT community is such a losing battle that only a collective effort can solve.
6. COMP8: I feel sorry for the LGBT community, but I do not know that any amount I offer to charities on their behalf can help to solve their problems.

Appendix B

Table B1.

The Distribution of Scores on the Anti-Gay Attitude Measure used in Experiments 1 and 2.

Experiment 1							
Items	Response Category (%)						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	33.3	20.7	9.1	15.2	7.1	6.1	8.6
2	34.3	19.7	7.1	18.7	5.6	6.6	8.1
3	17.2	19.7	16.7	23.2	6.1	9.6	7.6
4	30.8	19.2	9.1	11.6	7.1	11.1	11.1
5	28.3	25.8	12.1	15.2	5.1	6.6	7.1
Experiment 2							
Items	Response Category (%)						
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	45.5	22.1	5.9	9.2	7.6	3.0	6.6
2	39.9	18.5	7.3	13.2	7.6	5.9	7.6
3	8.6	9.2	9.2	18.5	15.2	19.1	20.1
4	38.0	17.2	6.9	13.2	6.9	6.3	11.6
5	6.9	5.9	7.9	15.5	10.9	24.1	28.7

Note. Skewness and standard error of skewness were: Experiment 1 (.47 and .17 respectively, $p < .05$), Experiment 2 = 1.14 and .14 respectively, $p < .05$).

Appendix B continued

Table B2.

Test of Within-Subject Effects of Compassion Type as a Function of Attitude towards Gay Men.

			Experiment 1			Experiment 2		
			<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2
Compassion Type (CT)			27.48	< .001	.13	130	< .001	.31
Bystander Reaction (BR)*CT			0.16	.688	< .01	0.26	.608	< .01
Social evaluation (SEV)*CT			0.78	.379	< .01	0.88	.350	< .01
Anti-gay attitude (AA)*CT			59.08	< .001	.24	58.23	< .001	.17
Gender (G)*CT			--	--	--	8.15	.005	.03
CT*AA*BR			0.68	.412	< .01	0.87	.351	< .01
CT*AA*SEV			3.26	.072	.02	< 0.01	.953	< .01
CT*AA*G			--	--	--	13.47	< .001	.04
CT*AA*BR*G			--	--	--	0.01	.938	< .01
CT*AA*SEV*G			--	--	--	1.60	.207	.01
Simple effects			Passive compassion	Active compassion	95% CI	Passive compassion	Active compassion	95% CI
Prejudiced	men		4.46 ± .13	4.12 ± .14	-0.73, 0.04	3.99 ± .12	4.49 ± .15	0.09, 0.92
	women		--	--	--	3.72 ± .16	3.98 ± .19	-0.28, 0.80
Nonprejudiced	men		3.41 ± .13	5.18 ± .13	1.39, 2.15	3.30 ± .13	4.78 ± .16	1.02, 1.94
	women		--	--	--	2.57 ± .14	5.62 ± .17	2.58, 3.52