

Awareness of Intergroup Help Can Rehumanize the Out-Group

Tamar Saguy¹, Hanna Szekeres¹, Rikki Nouri¹, Amit Goldenberg², Guy Doron¹, John F. Dovidio³, Chaim Yunger¹, and Eran Halperin¹

Social Psychological and
Personality Science
2015, Vol. 6(5) 551-558
© The Author(s) 2015
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1948550615574748
spps.sagepub.com



Abstract

Dehumanizing the enemy is one of the most destructive elements of intergroup conflict. Past research demonstrated that awareness of harm that the in-group imposed on a specific out-group can increase out-group dehumanization as means of justifying the harm. In this research, we examined whether the opposite process would occur when people become aware of help given to an adversary. We reasoned that the need to justify a good deed toward a persistent enemy can result in more human-like out-group attributions. In two experiments, Israeli-Jews read about their group either helping Palestinians or not. In Study 1, awareness of help provided by the in-group to the out-group resulted in greater out-group humanization. In Study 2, we further established that when a third party helped the out-group, the rehumanization effect was not obtained, suggesting that the phenomenon is of specific intergroup nature. Theoretical and applied implications for conflict resolution are discussed.

Keywords

intergroup help, dehumanization, rehumanization, intergroup conflict

One of the most destructive features of intergroup conflict is group members' tendency to perceive their enemy as less than human (Bar-Tal & Hammack, 2012; Castano, 2008; Haslam, 2006; Kelman, 1973; Staub, 1989). Dehumanization of the other is associated with a range of destructive consequences (Bandura, Caprara, Barbaranelli, Pastorelli, & Regalia, 2001; Bandura, Underwood, & Fromson, 1975; Goff, Eberhardt, Williams, & Jackson, 2008; Turner, Layton, & Simons, 1975; Vaes, Paladino, Castelli, Leyens, & Giovanazzi, 2003) such as support for war (Jackson & Gaertner, 2010), support for war-related violence (Viki, Osgood, & Phillips, 2013), and support for extreme policies and measures against one's counterpart (Leidner, Castano, & Ginges, 2013; Maoz & McCauley, 2008). Although large amount of research has focused on the characteristics, emergence, and prevalence of dehumanization, little is known about potential ways to elicit the opposite process of *rehumanization*. Our goal in this study was to introduce and test a new avenue for eliciting such a positive change in perceptions of the out-group.

In the context of intergroup conflict, dehumanization of the out-group is often seen as a motivated phenomenon, enabling to remove the burden of moral concerns that are likely to arise when one becomes aware of in-group-committed atrocities (Bandura, 2002; Kelman, 1973; Opatow, 1990). The idea underlining this notion is that peoples' view of themselves as moral beings is threatened when confronted with misdeeds committed by the in-group against others. Such threat, which occurs by virtue of one's group membership and sense of

collective identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), needs to be mitigated. As explained by Castano, such mitigation effectively occurs by denying the victimized group's status as "fully fledged human beings" (Castano, 2008, p. 157). Dehumanized members of the other group no longer evoke the compassion and moral emotions that inhibit violence.

Supporting this idea, several studies have documented a tendency to dehumanize targets of in-group harm across different intergroup contexts. For example, Castano and Giner-Sorolla (2006) have demonstrated this tendency among British participants who learned about Britain harming Australian Aborigines and among White Americans who learned about Whites transgressing against Native Americans. Similarly, Čehajić and colleagues found, both in Chile and in Bosnia, that reminders of in-group responsibility for intergroup atrocities increased tendencies to dehumanize the victims (Čehajić, Brown, & González, 2009). Thus, becoming aware that one's in-group had harmed an out-group is sufficient to motivate dehumanization of the out-group by individuals not directly involved in the

¹ The Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzliya, Herzliya, Israel

² Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

³ Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA

Corresponding Author:

Tamar Saguy, The Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzliya, P.O. Box 167, Herzliya 46150, Israel.

Email: tamar.saguy@idc.ac.il

transgression but rather connected to it by virtue of their group membership.

The described process is consistent with cognitive dissonance theory which asserts that when people hold certain cognition and perform a contradictory action, they tend to experience discomfort (Festinger, 1957; Stone & Cooper, 2001). This psychological unease motivates individuals to employ strategies for reducing the dissonance such as changing one of the dissonance elements (e.g., changing the relevant belief that contradicts the behavior) or adding a cognition that helps reduce the overall level of inconsistency (Festinger, 1957). Cognitive dissonance was also found to occur at the group level, when the behavior committed by one's in-group contradicts one's personal values (Glasford, Pratto, & Dovidio, 2008). This process can account for the dehumanization effect described earlier (Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006; Čehajić et al., 2009): The view of oneself and one's group is at odds with the behavior the group has committed—and in order to resolve this inconsistency, individuals view the out-group as less human.

Drawing on this literature, which greatly advances understandings of the process leading to out-group's dehumanization, in this research, we test a mirror image of Castano and Giner-Sorolla's (2006) findings. Specifically, we examined whether becoming aware of a *positive* action committed by one's in-group toward one's adversary can result in the opposite process of rehumanization in which people see members of the out-group as more human. In the context of protracted violent conflict, good deeds toward the enemy are rather unusual and may require justification, even more so than violent deeds. Stated differently, the view of the out-group as one's enemy, being deeply entrenched in most groups' narratives in the context of protracted adversary (Bar-Tal & Salomon, 2006), is likely to be at odds with the in-group's prosocial behavior toward that enemy. One way to resolve such inconsistency can be by viewing the out-group as more human.

To test this idea, we focused our investigation on the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. We assumed that this context, involving clear-cut adversarial relations, is likely to necessitate some justification of a good deed. Second, this context has provided a fertile ground for research on dehumanization, demonstrating its devastating effects in protracted conflicts (Bar-Tal & Hammack, 2012; Leidner et al., 2013; Maoz & McCauley, 2008; see also Gaunt, 2009). For example, Leidner and colleagues have shown the consequential effects of denial of sentience, the capacity to experience emotions, from one's adversary among both Israeli-Jews and Palestinians. According to the authors, this capacity is paramount to one's conception of human nature, and its denial reflects mechanistic dehumanization of the other (i.e., seeing others as objects; Haslam, 2006). In their studies, such denial was shown to have a unique role, over and above a range of other factors, in predicting support for punishment of the out-group—indicating its central importance in the contexts of intractable conflicts.

Given this prior work, in this research, we investigated whether when Israeli-Jews become aware of help that Israel provided to Palestinians, they will rehumanize Palestinians both in the sense of seeing them as less mechanistic and also as less animalistic. In particular, to assess rehumanization, we relied on extensive work by Haslam and colleagues (Haslam, 2006; Haslam, Bain, Douge, Lee, & Bastian, 2005; Haslam, Loughnan, Kashima, & Bain, 2008), which distinguishes between animalistic and mechanistic forms of dehumanization. As stated earlier (see Haslam, 2006; Leidner et al., 2013), mechanistic dehumanization involves the denial of qualities that separate humans from machines, such as curiosity or impulsiveness, termed as “human nature” characteristics. Animalistic dehumanization involves denying others the qualities that separate humans from animals such as humbleness or politeness, termed as “uniquely human” characteristics. Although we did not have strong predictions as to which form of dehumanization would be most affected by our manipulation of help, we were particularly interested in whether we could impact the sense of mechanistic dehumanization, being shown to be so central in the Israeli–Palestinian context (Leidner et al., 2013).

Study 1

The goal of Study 1 was to provide an initial test of our hypothesis. We exposed Jewish-Israeli participants to one of two reports: either one describing Israeli physicians providing humanitarian help to Palestinian children or to a report which involved no mention of help. We expected participants in the help condition to rehumanize Palestinians more than those in the no-help condition. Importantly, across conditions we described the poor medical conditions in the Palestinian authority, such that the only element that varied in the help condition was the mention of help. This was done in order to control for elements such as the need for help that may render the target more worthy of positive regard independent of whether the in-group provided help to that out-group or not.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Seventy Jewish-Israeli train passengers took part in the study (48% women, $M_{age} = 30.55$, $SD_{age} = 15.16$). Data were collected by having a research assistant approach passengers on the train asking them to participate in a short survey about impressions and judgments of different groups. Participants who agreed to take part in the study received chocolate as compensation. Eight participants were omitted from the analyses for not answering attention check items that were placed right after the manipulation text, and an additional five participants were omitted due to being outliers (deviating more than 2.5 standard deviations from the mean) on the main outcome measures. The remaining 57 participants were randomly assigned to either the help condition or the no-help condition.

Manipulation and Measures

The survey in both conditions opened with a paragraph describing a general overview of medical issues in the West Bank including details such as the number of hospitals and common causes of death describing the relatively poor medical status of Palestinians. In the control condition, the text ended after this description. In the help condition, participants read an additional segment, titled “Israeli doctors treating Palestinian children,” which stated that “In recent years, there is an increasing number of Israeli physicians from all around Israel volunteering to treat Palestinian babies, children, and adolescence from the West Bank. This is part of an independent, nongovernmental initiative, and involves performing complex medical procedures. In 2012, around 4,500 Palestinian children were helped by Israeli physicians for treatments such as cardiac surgery, bone transplants, brain and neurosurgery, and cancer treatment.” This information was based on actual occurrences (e.g., Save a Child’s Heart, 2014; The Peres Center for Peace, 2014). Following the text, participants were asked to answer three reading-check items.

In line with previous research (Crawford, Modri, & Motyl, 2013; Haslam et al., 2005; Loughnan, Haslam, & Kashima, 2009) to measure mechanistic and animalistic dehumanization, participants were asked to imagine that they meet a Palestinian from the West Bank and to rate the extent to which each of 12 characteristics is typical of him or her on a scale ranging from 1 (*not typical at all*) to 6 (*very typical*). The choice of these specific characteristics was based on research aimed at establishing the cross-cultural validity of the human nature and human unique traits, theorized to reflect mechanistic and animalistic forms of dehumanization, respectively (Loughnan et al., 2010). Across six different cultural contexts (including Israel in the Middle East), a total of 80 characteristics were rated on degree of human nature (“this characteristic is an aspect of human nature”), human uniqueness (“this characteristic is exclusively or uniquely human”), and on desirability. We chose, for this study, six attributes that were rated high on human nature and low on human uniqueness in the Israeli sample (independent, careful, curious, controlling, stubborn, suspicious; with the first three rated as highly desirable and the last three as low on desirability) and six attributes that were rated high on human uniqueness and low on human nature (humble, polite, reserved, shy, conservative, blabbermouth; with the first three rated as highly desirable and the last three as low on desirability). From these ratings, we computed a composite score of mechanistic dehumanization, which reflected the average of the human nature traits ($\alpha = .53$)¹ and of animalistic dehumanization, which reflected the average of the human unique traits ($\alpha = .72$).

Results and Discussion

Our analysis strategy involved a preliminary stage in which we first ran an omnibus analysis of variance (ANOVA) considering help condition as a between-subjects factor and type of

rehumanization (mechanistic vs. animalistic) and valence (positive vs. negative) as within-subjects factors. Then, consistent with the relevant literature in which human nature and human unique traits are analyzed separately (e.g., Bain, Park, Kwok, & Haslam, 2009), we conducted our main analysis with separate tests on the mechanistic and animalistic composite scores.

The preliminary omnibus ANOVA revealed the expected main effect for condition, $F(1, 55) = 4.68, p = .04, \eta^2_p = .08$, indicating that across traits, in the help condition, participants attributed more humanizing traits to Palestinians.² Separate analysis on the human nature and human unique traits demonstrated that this effect was significant for the human nature traits, reflecting less mechanistic dehumanization in the help condition ($M = 3.70, SD = 0.68$ vs. $M = 4.20, SD = 0.71$), $F(1, 55) = 4.15, p = .047, d = 0.72$, and marginally significant for the uniquely human traits reflecting less animalistic dehumanization in the help condition (M 's = $3.28, SD = 0.90$ vs. $M = 3.68, SD = 0.55$), $F(1, 55) = 3.75, p = .06, d = 0.54$.

Thus, becoming aware of help provided by Israeli doctors to Palestinian children (vs. a condition where no help was mentioned) led participants to view Palestinians as less machine like and also (but albeit to a lesser extent) as less animal like. These findings provided initial support for our predictions that in the context of adversarial intergroup relations, help provided to the out-group might give rise to a justification process, resulting in seeing the out-group as more human. Such humanization might help to justify or make sense of the prosocial action that the in-group provided to the enemy. Despite the support that Study 1 lends to these ideas, it remains unclear whether the effect obtained is specific to help from the in-group or whether it is a result of becoming aware of help more generally. It could be the case that when a group is treated kindly, no matter by whom, its members are seen as more human or more worthy of positive regard. If this is the case, Palestinians would be seen as more human also when another group (not Israel) is providing help to them. The goal of Study 2 was to test this alternative process.

Study 2

The goal of Study 2 was to examine whether the process we observed in Study 1 reflects an intergroup process. In other words, we set out to examine whether the help provided to the out-group needs to be provided by the in-group or whether awareness of any help to the out-group is sufficient for rehumanization (perhaps because it makes the out-group appear “only human”). To examine this possibility, in Study 2, in addition to having an in-group help condition compared to a no-help condition, we added another condition in which a third group helped the out-group. If indeed our effects reflect a motivated phenomenon rooted in adversarial intergroup relations, then the rehumanization effect should only occur when help to one’s enemy is provided by the in-group.

Another goal of Study 2 was to establish the ecological validity of the predicted process by testing it at a time of visceral intergroup violence, accompanied by some instances of

intergroup help. In particular, Study 2 was run among Israeli-Jews in summer 2014, during the recent deadly clashes between Israel and Gaza, which involved unparalleled amount of bombing and killing, resulting in many innocent victims, the vast majority of them belonging to the Palestinian side. During this war, the Israeli army (Israel Defence Force [IDF]) set up a field hospital at the main border crossing aimed at treating wounded Gazans. This was mentioned briefly in the Israeli media in the midst of the war (Haaretz, 2014). We relied on these actual occurrences to test our predictions, examining whether making Israeli-Jews aware of actual help provided by the Israeli army to Palestinians during this war would result in greater humanization of Palestinians. Importantly, in addition to comparing this condition to a no-help condition, in this study, we further compared the help condition to a condition in which a third party (the European Union [EU]) was described as providing help to Palestinians.

Method

Participants

Ninety-eight Jewish-Israeli participants took part in the study (48% women, $M_{\text{age}} = 37.06$, $SD = 13.39$). Participants were part of an Israeli online panel and received about US\$4 for participation. Seven participants did not complete the dependent variables and were therefore excluded from the analyses.

Procedure and Measures

The study was ran in July 2014, in the midst of the war between Israel and Gaza. It was described to the participants as composed of two parts. The first aimed at examining reactions to news reports and the second measuring perceptions of groups. Across conditions, two identical brief news reports were presented. The first described general information about the war (with the headline being “The fighting continues: IDF bombed Hamas headquarter in Gaza”), and the second described the Palestinian victims of a deadly bombing by the IDF on a neighborhood in Gaza called Shuja’iyy (with the headline being: “Dozens of victims in Shuja’iyya, including children”). The goal of these two headlines was to verify that across conditions, the violence is equally primed as well as the need for help in the other side.

Each condition included a third report which varied according to the manipulation: In the control condition, the third report described a recent google innovation. In the Israel-help condition, the third report described humanitarian help provided to Gazans by Israel (with the headline being “Humanitarian aid from Israel to Gaza,” with the text describing information about Israeli hospitals and doctors treating Gazans and the IDF setting up a field hospital in the border crossing). Finally, we included another condition, almost identical to the Israel-help condition with the only difference being that the agent of help was the EU. To strengthen the manipulation, after reading the texts, we asked all participants to write down the title of the third news report. As in Study 1, and using the same

measures, we then assessed both mechanistic ($\alpha = .64$) and animalistic ($\alpha = .69$) forms of dehumanization and demographic information.

Results and Discussion

Preliminary Analysis

As in Study 1, as a preliminary analysis, we first ran an omnibus ANOVA considering help condition as a between-subjects factor and type of rehumanization (mechanistic vs. animalistic) and valence (positive vs. negative) as within-subjects factors. The analysis revealed a main effect for traits, indicating that overall, participants ascribed more human nature characteristics to Palestinian than uniquely human traits ($M = 3.95$, $SD = .78$ vs. $M = 3.18$, $SD = .86$, respectively), $F(1, 88) = 43.62$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .33$. In addition, there was a main effect for valence indicating that overall, Israelis ascribed more negative traits to Palestinians than positive traits ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 0.70$ vs. $M = 3.28$, $SD = .84$, respectively), $F(1, 88) = 33.51$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .28$. No other effects, including the effect of condition ($p = .36$) and the Condition \times Trait interaction ($p = .26$), reached significance.

Main Analysis: Human Nature and Human Uniqueness

We next turned to our main analysis examining the effect of the manipulation on human nature traits and uniquely human traits separately. For the human nature attributes, condition had a marginally significant effect, $F(2, 88) = 2.70$, $p = .07$. A follow-up contrast analysis demonstrated that when Israelis provided help to Palestinians, Palestinians were seen as significantly more human ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.56$) relative to the perceptions of humanness in the combination of the two other conditions, (M 's = 3.79, $SD = 0.92$ vs. $M = 3.83$, $SD = .81$ in the European help and control condition, respectively), $t(88) = 2.29$, $p = .03$. An orthogonal contrast indicated the control condition and the European help condition did not differ significantly from one another, $t = .11$, $p > .84$. A parallel analyses for the uniquely human attributes did not reveal any significant effects (M 's = 3.17 vs. 3.17 vs. 3.19 for the in-group help, European help, and control condition, respectively). Thus, as in Study 1, the help manipulation gave rise to perceptions of Palestinians as less mechanistic. Moreover, and unlike the findings of Study 1, animalistic dehumanization was resistant to our manipulation in Study 2.

Results from Study 2 further supported our predictions regarding the effect of awareness of help provided to an adversarial out-group on tendencies to rehumanize that out-group. Exposing Israeli-Jewish participants, who were at the midst of a devastating war with Hamas, to information about Israelis providing help to Gazan victims resulted in viewing Palestinians from Gaza as less machinelike. Given the unparalleled intensity of emotions and attitudes that characterize this particular clash between the two sides, these findings are quite striking. Moreover, perceptions of Palestinians changed only when the agent of help was the in-group and not when a third party

(the EU) provided them help—pointing to the intergroup nature of the predicted effect.

General Discussion

Dehumanization allows individuals and groups to harm others without the usual restraints of moral burden. Once an out-group is considered less than human, their mistreatment is less troubling and therefore may become justified and more intense. In this research, we investigated a strategy that can potentially produce the opposite process of rehumanization. We hypothesized that when the in-group acts in a prosocial manner toward an adversary, in-group members may view the adversary as more human—as means of justifying the good deed.

Two experiments, both conducted within the context of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict, provided support to this idea. In Study 1, Jewish-Israelis who became aware of help provided by their in-group to Palestinians saw Palestinians as more human than those not exposed to the help. In Study 2, which was conducted in the midst of deadly violence between the groups, results were generally replicated and were further shown to occur only when the help was given by the in-group and not by a third party. This latter finding is consistent with the notion that a shared collective identity with the perpetrators is a key component of the psychological processes of dehumanization as a result of harm the in-group inflicted on the out-group (Castano, 2008). Only that in our case, the shared identity is with the prosocial agent. Previous research has demonstrated a relationship between dehumanization and help, showing that perceiving the out-group as more capable of experiencing complex emotions, predicted intentions to volunteer time to help out-group victims of a natural disaster (Cuddy, Rock, & Norton, 2007). This work offers that the opposite direction might also be true: Once help is provided, the out-group can be seen as more human. Thus, just as dehumanization might be a cause and an outcome of in-group–committed atrocities (Castano, 2008), rehumanization might be both a cause and an outcome of prosocial in-group actions.

Our results are less conclusive as to the nature of rehumanization that is most amenable to help manipulation. Although across studies Israelis seemed to view Palestinian as less machine like, in Study 2, we did not replicate the rehumanization effect on the animalistic measure. It could be the case that due to the specific nature of the study context, being conducted in one of the most violent episodes in a long time in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict involving perceptions of the out-group as a generally capable enemy, mechanistic views of the out-group were more affected by the manipulation. As such, the enemy is seen as capable (less machinelike) but still vicious (animal-like). These ideas, however, should be considered with caution, given that the interaction between condition and type of rehumanization was not significant.

Looking ahead, we believe that future work can help illuminate the mechanism underlining the effect of in-group help on rehumanization. Few processes are likely to be at play. As described earlier, viewing the out-group as more human might

help align one's in-group behavior with one's views of the adversarial out-group. Such process mirrors the one documented in Castano and Giner-Sorolla's research (2006), where people change their views of the outgroup to be *less* human so that such views are consistent with the in-group's harmful actions. Another process which might explain these results has to do with the reminders of common humanity that help might elicit. Given that help often characterizes the mutual care that people feel for each other and function as the psychological glue that binds people together (Caprara & Steca, 2006; Reicher & Haslam, 2010), the awareness of help provided by the in-group to the out-group may serve as a reminder of the common human nature between the rival groups. Such views can result in increased perceptions of out-group members as human beings. The rehumanization of the out-group as a result of awareness of in-group help might also be a result of normative influence (Haslam, McGarty, & Turner, 1996). The influence of group norms on intergroup attitudes has been shown to be quite powerful (Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1996) such that group behavior becomes a source of information as to the correct, or normative, attitude to have about the other (Schopler et al., 1993). Thus, learning about prosocial in-group acts might signal a normative prescription as to how the out-group should be viewed.

Our findings seem to challenge some recent studies on vicarious moral licensing (Kouchaki, 2011; Merritt, Effron, & Monin, 2010). According to this alternative line of thinking, providing help to the out-group could license in-group members to experience and express more negative out-group attitudes—because one feels he or she already paid their moral “dues” (see also Hofmann, Wisneski, Brandt, & Skitka, 2014). Our work, which points to the exact opposite effect, calls to further explore the boundary conditions of both our hypothesized effect and of the moral licensing theory. For example, the prolonged nature of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict can potentially constitute such boundary condition. It could be the case that in such context, when good deeds toward the out-group are rather unusual, a rationalization process would be more likely to come into play.

Indeed, one limitation of this study is its focus on a particular context. According to our reasoning, when intergroup relations are less intense and conflictual, the rehumanization effect might be less pronounced because less justification is called for. Future research should also examine whether the predicted process occurs among disadvantaged members in the intergroup conflict. When one feels like the victim in a conflict, awareness of help provided to the out-group perpetrator might result in a backlash effect of anger and resentment. Another possibility is that members of disadvantaged groups would feel empowered by learning about their group being able to help the powerful enemy. Related to the power dynamics angle, future work may further clarify the nature of help that is most likely to produce the predicted effects. The nature of help described in both studies was not likely to advance the autonomy of Palestinians and as such was less threatening to the power dynamics (Nadler, 2002; Nadler & Chernyak-Hai, 2014).

Indeed, high-status group members were shown to be in support of forms of help that would increase the dependency of the out-group (Halabi, Dovidio, & Nadler, 2008). It could be that, help which is perceived as more likely to advance the autonomy of the low-status group will not be perceived positively and might lead to different effects.

The current findings, in addition to their importance on the theoretical level, also have potential to expand the applied knowledge regarding conflict resolution interventions. According to the proposed approach, peace facilitators may encourage acts of help toward out-group members. Given that such prosocial gestures are expected to be well perceived by both in-group and out-group members, it can lead to a win-win situation and increase chances for conflict resolution. The current findings also emphasize the need to disseminate information about current and past intergroup help. As such, this research contributes a novel dimension to the literature on dehumanization and on psychological interventions in conflict resolution and has applied implications for promoting moral engagement in the context of violent intergroup relations.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: The research was supported by the United States–Israel Binational Science Foundation grant (2009145).

Notes

1. We omitted 1 item (controlling) from the mechanistic dehumanization composite score because including it caused a substantial drop in the reliability of the scale.
2. The analysis further revealed a three-way interaction among traits, valence, and condition. To interpret this interaction, we examined the effects of valence and condition on human nature traits and on human unique traits separately. The analysis for the human nature traits revealed a marginally significant interaction between valence and condition, $F(1, 55) = 3.05, p = .09, \eta^2_p = .05$, indicating that help increased attributions of human nature, only when these were positive (M 's = 3.58, $SD = 1.03$ vs. $M = 4.17, SD = .92$ in the no-help and help condition respectively); while for the negative human nature traits, condition had no effect (M 's = 4.10, $SD = 0.77$ vs. $M = 4.15, SD = 0.71$ in the no-help and help conditions, respectively). The analysis for the human unique attributes revealed a somewhat different pattern: There was, again, a marginally significant interaction between valence and condition, $F(1, 55) = 2.75, p = .10, \eta^2_p = .05$, but this time the help condition seemed to had more of an effect on human unique traits that were negative in valence (M 's = 3.23, $SD = .70$ vs. $M = 3.82, SD = 0.57$ in the no-help and help conditions, respectively); while for the positive human unique traits, condition had less of an effect (M 's = 3.32, $SD = 1.27$ vs. $M = 3.52, SD = 0.77$ in the no-help and help conditions, respectively). Thus, the three-way interaction suggests that

while the help condition gave rise to both a less-animalistic view of Palestinians and a less-mechanistic view of them, it did so differently across types of humanization, having more of an impact on positive aspect of mechanistic dehumanization and on negative aspect of animalistic dehumanization.

References

- Bain, P., Park, J., Kwok, C., & Haslam, N. (2009). Attributing human uniqueness and human nature to cultural groups: Distinct forms of subtle dehumanization. *Group Process and Intergroup Relations, 12*, 789–805.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education, 31*, 101–119.
- Bandura, A., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli, C., & Regalia, C. (2001). Sociocognitive self-regulatory mechanisms governing transgressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 125.
- Bandura, A., Underwood, B., & Fromson, M. E. (1975). Disinhibition of aggression through diffusion of responsibility and dehumanization of victims. *Journal of Research in Personality, 9*, 253–269.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Hammack, P. L. (2012). Conflict, delegitimization, and violence. In L. R. Tropp (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of intergroup conflict* (pp. 29–52). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Salomon, G. (2006). Israeli-Jewish narratives of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: Evolvement, contents, functions and consequences. In R. I. Rotberg (Ed.), *Israeli and Palestinian narratives of conflict: History's double helix* (pp. 19–46). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Caprara, G. V., & Steca, P. (2006). The contribution of self-regulatory efficacy beliefs in managing affect and family relationships to positive thinking and hedonic balance. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 25*, 603–627.
- Castano, E. (2008). On the perils of glorifying the in-group: Intergroup violence, in-group glorification, and moral disengagement. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 1*, 154–170.
- Castano, E., & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2006). Not quite human: Inframanization in response to collective responsibility for intergroup killing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 804–818.
- Čehajić, S., Brown, R., & González, R. (2009). What do i care? Perceived ingroup responsibility and dehumanization as predictors of empathy felt for the victim group. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 12*, 715–729.
- Crawford, J. T., Modri, S. A., & Motyl, M. (2013). Bleeding-heart liberals and hard-hearted conservatives: Subtle political dehumanization through differential attributions of human nature and human uniqueness traits. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 1*, 86–104.
- Cuddy, A. J., Rock, M. S., & Norton, M. I. (2007). Aid in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina: Inferences of secondary emotions and intergroup helping. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 10*, 107–118.
- Festinger, L. A. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Gaunt, R. (2009). Superordinate categorization as a moderator of mutual inhumanization. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 12, 731–746.
- Glasford, D. E., Pratto, F., & Dovidio, J. F. (2008). Intragroup dissonance: Responses to ingroup violation of personal values. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 1057–1064.
- Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M. J., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). Not yet human: Implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 292–306.
- Haaretz. (2014, July 13). *Despite rockets, Israeli hospital treating Gazan children*. Retrieved from <http://www.haaretz.co.il/>
- Halabi, S., Dovidio, J. F., & Nadler, A. (2008). When and how do high status group members offer help: Effects of social dominance orientation and status threat. *Political Psychology*, 29, 841–858.
- Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 252–264.
- Haslam, N., Bain, P., Douge, L., Lee, M., & Bastian, B. (2005). More human than you: Attributing humanness to self and others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 937–950.
- Haslam, N., Loughnan, S., Kashima, Y., & Bain, P. (2008). Attributing and denying humanness to others. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 19, 55–85.
- Haslam, S. A., McGarty, C., & Turner, J. C. (1996). Salient group memberships and persuasion: The role of social identity in the validation of beliefs. In J. Nye & A. Brower (Eds.), *What's so social about social cognition? Research on socially shared cognition in small groups* (pp. 29–56). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofmann, W., Wisneski, D. C., Brandt, M. J., & Skitka, L. J. (2014). Morality in everyday life. *Science*, 345, 1340–1343.
- Jackson, L. E., & Gaertner, L. (2010). Mechanisms of moral disengagement and their differential use by right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation in support of war. *Aggressive Behavior*, 36, 238–250.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. (1996). Intergroup norms and intergroup discrimination: Distinctive self-categorization and social identity effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 1222.
- Kelman, H. C. (1973). Violence without moral restraint: Reflections on the dehumanization of victims and victimizers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 29, 25–61.
- Kouchaki, M. (2011). Vicarious moral licensing: The influence of others' past moral actions on moral behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 702.
- Leidner, B., Castano, E., & Ginges, J. (2013). Dehumanization, retributive and restorative justice, and aggressive versus diplomatic intergroup conflict resolution strategies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39, 181–192.
- Loughnan, S., Haslam, N., & Kashima, Y. (2009). Understanding the relationship between attribute-based and metaphor-based dehumanization. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 12, 6747–6762. doi:10.1177/1368430209347726
- Loughnan, S., Leidner, B., Doron, G., Haslam, N., Kashima, Y., Tong, J., & Yeung, V. (2010). Universal biases in self-perception: Better and more human than average. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, 627–636.
- Maoz, I., & McCauley, C. (2008). Threat, dehumanization, and support for retaliatory aggressive policies in asymmetric conflict. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 52, 93–116.
- Merritt, A. C., Effron, D. A., & Monin, B. (2010). Moral self-licensing: When being good frees us to be bad. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4, 344–357.
- Nadler, A. (2002). Inter-group helping relations as power relations: Helping relations as affirming or challenging inter-group hierarchy. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 487–503.
- Nadler, A., & Chernyak-Hai, L. (2014). Helping them stay where they are: Status effects on dependency/autonomy-oriented helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106, 58. doi:10.1037/a0034152
- Opatow, S. (1990). Moral exclusion and injustice: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46, 1–20.
- Reicher, S. D., & Haslam, S. A. (2010). Beyond help: A social psychology of collective solidarity and social cohesion. In S. Stürmer & M. Snyder (Eds.), *The psychology of pro-social behavior: Group processes, intergroup relations, and helping* (pp. 289–309). Oxford, England: Wiley Blackwell.
- Save a Child's Heart. (2014). *Children we help*. Retrieved from <http://www.sach.com.dev.pulpandfiber.net/global/children-we-help/>
- Schopler, J., Insko, C. A., Graetz, K. A., Drigotas, S., Smith, V. A., & Dahl, K. (1993). Individual-group discontinuity: Further evidence for mediation by fear and greed. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 419–431.
- Staub, E. (1989). *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Stone, J., & Cooper, J. (2001). A self-standards model of cognitive dissonance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 228–243.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, 33, 74.
- The Peres Center for Peace. (2014). *Saving children*. Retrieved from http://www.peres-center.org/saving_children
- Turner, C. W., Layton, J. F., & Simons, L. S. (1975). Naturalistic studies of aggressive behavior: Aggressive stimuli, victim visibility, and horn honking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 1098.
- Vaes, J., Paladino, P. M., Castelli, L., Leyens, J. Ph., & Giovannazzi, A. (2003). On the behavioral consequences of inhumanization: The implicit role of uniquely human emotions in intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 1016–1034.
- Viki, G. T., Osgood, D., & Phillips, S. (2013). Dehumanization and self-reported proclivity to torture prisoners of war. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 325–328.

Author Biographies

Tamar Saguy is an associate professor at the Interdisciplinary Center (IDC), Herzliya, Israel. Her research examines how power differences and related motivations impact intergroup processes.

Hanna Szekeres is a PhD student at the Interdisciplinary Center (IDC), Herzliya, Israel. She studies different aspects of intergroup relations, particularly within intractable conflicts, between minority and majority members, and between men and women.

Rikki Nouri is a post-doctoral researcher at the Interdisciplinary Center (IDC), Israel. She obtained her PhD in Organizational Psychology from the IE&M Faculty, Technion, Israel. Her research focuses on creativity, cross-cultural organizational behavior, and intergroup relations.

Amit Goldenberg is a graduate student at Stanford University. His research examines social emotions and emotions regulation and the role they play in intergroup processes.

Guy Doron is an associate professor at the Interdisciplinary Center (IDC), Herzliya, Israel. As a Clinical Psychologist his work examines a variety of methods of reducing anxiety and obsessive tendencies in a range of contexts.

John F. Dovidio is Carl Iver Hovland Professor of Psychology at Yale University. His research examines the cause and consequences of intergroup bias and the actions that members of both disadvantaged and advantaged groups can take to address this bias.

Chaim Yunger is the founder and CEO of Actback. He empowers people to transform their personal moments of inspiration into meaningful action.

Eran Halperin is an Associate Professor and the Dean of the School of Psychology in the Interdisciplinary Center, Herzliya. His research focuses on the role of emotions and emotion regulation in conflicts and conflict resolution, integrating psychological theories and methods to explain intergroup relations and conflicts.