As American society continues to become more racially and ethnically diverse, various organizations, groups, and charities have formed in order to support and advocate for racial minority groups (e.g., National Black United Fund, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People). However, with the current state of the economy, many of these organizations lack the funds and resources needed to increase opportunities for minority group members (Fairlie & Robb, 2008). This raises the question: how much financial support do these organizations receive from nonminority individuals and groups? As an example, a study of the National Institute of Health’s (NIH) research funding of Black and White applicants found that Blacks were 10% less likely than Whites to receive research funding (Ginther et al., 2011). Although we cannot say for certain, this disparity in the allocation of funds may be explained as a result of discrimination, prejudice, and negative perceptions of minorities, as the rates of funding given to minority members is considerably less than the funding given to White nonminority group members. Although racism and subsequent discrimination may appear to be declining (Bonilla-Silva & Dietrich, 2011; Dovidio & Gaertner, 1991; Pearson, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2009), examples such as these provide evidence that this may not truly be the case, as these unsettling differences suggest that the decision to help others may be significantly influenced by the race of those in need of help (McManus & Saucier, 2012).

Racism and discrimination are rarely expressed openly or as apparently as in the past, instead manifesting in more subtle forms that are harder to detect (Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Dutton & Lake, 1973; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). As a result, researchers have employed various methods ranging from the use of hypothetical to real-life behavioral situations in order to identify what moderates these expressions of prejudice and discrimination, specifically in the

**ABSTRACT.** In interracial helping situations, discrimination is likely to occur particularly when it cannot be justified by using other situational factors (e.g., the justification-suppression model of prejudice; Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). Through use of the justification-suppression model of prejudice as a theoretical foundation, we conducted a study to examine if individuals who were higher in racism would be less likely to allocate funds to organizations that help racial minority students. White participants completed a racism measure and later were asked to allocate a large sum of money across a variety of student organizations, one of which helped racial minority students. Results revealed that participants allocated less money to the organization that benefitted Black students. Participants’ racism scores, however, were uncorrelated with the amount of money that was allocated to each group. These results add to the literature on discrimination in helping situations, suggesting that in interracial allocation situations, the race of those in need may significantly influence how much is ultimately given.
realm of helping situations (e.g., Bryan & Test, 1967; Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hodson, 2002; Plant & Devine, 2003; Rosenfeld, Greenberg, Folger, & Borys, 1982).

**Discrimination in Helping Situations**

Previous research on helping and discrimination has found that various factors may aid in justifying discriminatory behavior. Such factors are often implicit biases in our society, which may play a pivotal role in the ultimate decision to withhold aid from Blacks in helping situations (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Crosby et al., 1980; Kunstman & Plant, 2008).

A review of nonverbal behavior, aggression, and helping paradigms examined by Crosby et al. (1980) revealed that Whites offered less help to Blacks than to Whites in 40% of the studies they examined, suggesting that anti-Black discrimination occurs frequently in helping situations. This review predominantly examined discrimination from majority group members (Whites) toward minority group members (Blacks). Specifically, they found discrimination to occur in situations where there was no direct face-to-face contact and when the White helper and the Black recipient in need of help were farther apart. It is important to note that the synthesis of past literature conducted by Crosby and colleagues focused primarily on between group design studies. Findings from Crosby et al. (1980) illustrated that although discrimination may not be as evident in our society, it still may play a significant role in the decision to help. These findings were again illustrated by Saucier, Miller, and Doucet (2005) in a meta-analysis inspired by the results of Crosby and colleagues’ study. Results from Saucier et al. (2005) illustrated that when potential helpers had more opportunities to rationalize not helping with reasons having nothing to do with race (e.g., high risk, lack of time, scarcity of resources) Black targets were helped less than White targets. Similar findings can also be seen in Kunstman and Plant’s (2008) study investigating the influences of the severity of emergencies on racial biases in helping situations. In line with the previous findings, Kunstman and Plant found that as the severity of an emergency increased, the speed and quality of help offered from White participants to Blacks compared to Whites decreased.

Together, Crosby et al. (1980), Kunstman and Plant (2008), and Saucier et al. (2005) illustrated that although discrimination may not be as evident in our society, it still may play a significant role in the decision to help. A more recent study by Saucier, McManus, and Smith (2010) supported these findings, revealing that Whites higher in racism were more likely to support an expensive scholarship proposal only when the scholarship recipient was seemingly White, not Black. Helping paradigm studies such as those mentioned have shown that although it is socially unacceptable to act in a prejudiced manner (Plant & Devine, 2003), some Whites may subtly express discrimination by offering less help to Blacks than to Whites in some situations (Crosby et al., 1980; Saucier et al., 2005, 2010). As such, it is our belief that discrimination will occur in the allocation of funds between in-group and out-group members.

The hypothetical task of allocating resources (i.e., funds, time, effort) is often used within the social psychology field as a measure of helping (e.g., Chen & Li, 2009; Murphy-Berman, Berman, & Campbell, 1998). However, research investigating the allocation of funds, specifically in interracial helping situations, appears to be under-investigated. One such study conducted by Stepanikova, Triplett, and Simpson (2011) examined allocation tendencies between Whites with high and low implicit biases toward Blacks. This study asked participants to decide how to split up a monetary endowment between themselves and an imaginary White or Black partner. Through use of a one-shot dictator game (Eckel & Grossman, 1996), which is a common standard of behavioral measures of both altruism and generosity in several fields (e.g., Benenson, Pascoe, & Radmore, 2007; Eckel & Grossman, 1996; Simpson & Willer, 2008), it was illustrated that those with higher implicit biases toward Blacks allocated significantly more money to a White partner than a Black partner. These results suggest that a potential helper’s decision to help may be greatly influenced by the race of the individual or group in need of help. The current study seeks to further examine discrimination in interracial helping situations by examining helping disparities between in-groups and out-groups through the relationship between racial attitudes and the allocation of student privilege fees between student organizations that do and do not support racial minority groups.

**Justification-Suppression Model of the Expression of Prejudice**

The expressions of prejudice have changed from more overt to covert methods, creating the illusion that racism is declining (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1991). As a result of this shift, various paradigms...
have been created in order to aid researchers in studying the covert expression of contemporary prejudice. One such theory that may help to explain why discrimination is likely to occur in more subtle or ambiguous situations is the justification-suppression model of the expression of prejudice (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). In short, this theory argues that people in general want to appear nonprejudiced to themselves and others. The conscious decision to suppress prejudice is often related to internal forces (e.g., egalitarian beliefs) or external forces (e.g., social norms condemning prejudice). As such, when behaviors may be perceived as prejudiced, people are more likely to suppress the expression of prejudice. However, prejudiced behavior is less likely to be suppressed when it is not easily perceived or when it can be justified by other factors having nothing to do with prejudice. However, prejudiced behavior is less likely to be suppressed when it is not easily perceived as being prejudice, or when it can be justified by other factors having nothing to do with prejudice. When this prejudice is expressed, it is done in a way that is justifiable to self and others as something other than discrimination in order to avoid contradicting one’s own egalitarian beliefs and social norms (Devine, Monteith, Zuwerink, & Elliot, 1991; Plant & Devine, 1998). It is our contention that individuals higher in racism would be less likely to suppress their negative attitudes toward out-group members when compared to individuals lower in racism. As such, we believed individuals higher in racism would allocate significantly less money to organizations that support a racial minority group when compared to student organizations that do not support racial minority groups.

Arousal: Cost-Reward Model of Helping
The inconsistencies we expected to arise among participant allocation responses between student organizations that did and did not support racial minority groups may further be explained through the arousal: cost-reward model of helping. This model states that individuals experience feelings of arousal when witnessing others in need of help (Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Clark, 1981). As a result, individuals will attempt to reduce this arousal, making decisions about how to do so based on their assessment of the comparative costs of helping (e.g., assumed risk, effort, or time) and the costs of not helping (e.g., guilt, level of target’s suffering, or perception of the emergency). Interestingly, research suggests that Whites may provide more quality help (e.g., additional time, additional resources, or extra effort) to Whites than they do to members of another race, which may be a result of Whites associating more costs with helping Blacks and more rewards with helping Whites (Saucier et al., 2005). These differences of perceptions between Whites and Blacks may be explained as a result of various perceived differences, such as the lack of similarity between the potential helper and person or group in need of help (Avdeyeva, Burgetova, & Welch, 2006; Marjanovic, Greenglass, Struthers, & Faye, 2009).

The Current Economy in the United States
The current American economy inspired us to create a study focusing on the allocation of resources to certain student groups, as our economy has forced organizations including federal and state governments, as well as universities, to make significant budget cuts. The recent economic and financial crisis in the Unites States and other countries is the worst it has been in 50 years (Aiginger, 2009), and it has forced many families, businesses, and organizations to make significant cuts in spending and has resulted in an increase in unemployment rates. Consequently, budget cuts are an unfortunate, but common occurrence as a result of the down economy. Frequently, these budget cuts force organizations to be pitted against each other, forcing a difficult decision to be made by the organizations of whom to fund. An example of this can be seen in California, as Governor Jerry Brown signed a state budget that cut $195 million in college financial aid and state childcare programs. Often, these decisions of allocating resources are based on cost and reward analyses when decisions of who to help and who not to help must be made. However, the costs and rewards of helping Blacks and Whites may be seen differently (Piliavin et al., 1981; Saucier et al., 2005), and as a result, the race of the individual or group in need of help may influence the assessments of the cost and rewards in a helping situation. In college settings, different clubs, groups, and organizations compete for funding in order to support their endeavors. This leads one to question if the race of the group in need of support influences others’ decisions to support them.

Current Study
Past studies have primarily examined the allocation of funds among differing groups (e.g., Ford, Boxer, Armstrong, & Edel, 2008; Stepanikova
et al., 2011), however few have investigated the discrepancies in money allocation that may occur when allocating resources among groups that may or may not support a racial minority group. Utilizing predictions from the justification-suppression model of prejudice and the arousal: cost-reward model of helping, the purpose of this study was to examine the differences in money allocation of student privilege fees to a student organization that supports a racial minority group (i.e., Black Student Union or BSU), when placed among other student organizations that do not support a racial minority group. We hypothesized that a student organization that supported a racial minority group would be allocated significantly less money than student organizations that did not support a racial minority group. Further, we contended that individuals’ levels of racism would be negatively correlated with how much money they allocated to the student organization that supported a racial minority group.

Method

Participants

This study was completed with approval from the institutional review board where the research was conducted. For the current study, the researchers were interested in examining racial discrimination from Whites towards Blacks. As a result, the current study included only White undergraduate participants (N = 207) that attended Kansas State University, which is predominantly composed of White students. The university is located in a rural area of Kansas with a predominately White population. However, three participants failed to fully complete all parts of the study and their data were not included in further analyses. Of the 207 participants, 53.1% were men and 46.9% were women, with the average age being 19.24 years (SD = 3.06). Participants received credit to partially fulfill their General Psychology course research participation requirement.

It is important to note that because we were specifically interested in the expression of racism by the majority (i.e., White) on minority (i.e., Black) group members, we did not look at a more diverse sample of participants. Additionally, because we were interested in the manifestations of racism and discrimination on a college campus, we wanted to examine the expression of prejudice within the college student population, specifically at a university with a predominantly White student body.

Materials

Racial Argument Scale (RAS). The RAS (Saucier & Miller, 2003) was used to assess participants’ level of racial prejudice against Blacks. The RAS is an indirect measure of racial attitudes that asks participants to rate how much an argument supports a conclusion about contemporary social issues involving the treatment of Blacks. The RAS consisted of a series of five short paragraphs arguing positions that represented various contemporary social issues that involve the treatment of Blacks. To complete the RAS, participants were asked to rate their agreement with the conclusion that followed each argument with a Likert-type scale from 1 (not at all) to 9 (very much). According to the RAS, participants with higher scores on this scale are higher in racism than those with lower scores. The scale has been found to have good internal consistency, convergent validity, test-retest reliability, predictive validity, and is not influenced by social desirability (Saucier & Miller, 2003). Participants completed the Racial Argument Scale as part of an online mass screening at the beginning of the semester. A sample argument and conclusion can be seen below.

Argument: It has been shown that White Americans score 15 points higher on IQ tests than African Americans. This difference in IQ scores has even been shown when other variables such as education levels and socioeconomic status are taken into account.

Conclusion: Whites are more intelligent than African Americans.

Allocation task. Participants completed an allocation task that would indirectly measure levels of discrimination toward Blacks. The task consisted of allocating $300 in student privilege fees among 15 different student organizations; only one of these groups supports a racial minority groups (i.e., the Black Student Union). Students at Kansas State University are required to pay a student privilege fee as part of their tuition during their time spent attending the school. Students currently pay roughly $365 per semester in privilege fees; however $300 was used in our study to make the allocation task simpler for participants. This privilege fee allows students access to various commodities on campus, such as the recreation center, the campus health center, and various organizations around campus. As a result, emphasis was put on describing the $300 as student privilege fees; however $300 was used in our study to make the allocation task simpler for participants. This privilege fee allows students access to various commodities on campus, such as the recreation center, the campus health center, and various organizations around campus. As a result, emphasis was put on describing the $300 as student privilege fees.
fees in order for participants to perceive the money as their own money being allocated.

Each student organization used was an actual student organization at Kansas State University, and each was followed by a short explanation describing the organization’s purpose. Additionally, the organizations that we selected benefited different subsets of the student population. This was done in order for participants to have a random yet broad selection of organizations in which they could potentially allocate funds. The presentation order was randomized (with the exception of BSU), in order to convey that there were no biases toward any organizations. However, BSU was listed third, in order to ensure participants noticed this organization was on the list, thus not allowing the justification of saying they ran out of money to allocate to BSU. See the appendix for a full list of student organization names and descriptions along with the instructions provided to the participants.

Procedure
The study was conducted in two phases, with the first being the completion of the RAS as a part of an online mass screening session via Sona Systems, at the beginning of the semester. The second phase of the study was conducted in the following months of the semester. For phase two of the study, participants signed up via Sona Systems. We were particularly interested in students who participated in phase one of the study in order to link racism scores from the RAS to allocation responses; however, any White undergraduate was eligible to participate. At the time of the study, participants were placed in a classroom setting and instructed to make decisions regarding the allocation of $300 in student privilege fees among 15 different student organizations within the university. At this time participants were presented with the allocation measure and instructed that all $300 had to be allocated; however, how the fees were allocated were entirely up to them. In order to make the allocation task more believable, emphasis was put on describing the $300 as “student fees” so they would perceive it as their money being allocated. After their completion of the task, participants were debriefed and thanked for their time.

Results
Allocation Between Groups
Our first hypothesis was that the student organization that supported a racial minority group would have less money allocated to them than the student organizations that did not support a racial minority group. To test this hypothesis, we conducted a repeated measures analysis of variance to examine mean differences in the amount of money allocated to each of the 15 organizations. The ANOVA revealed differences in the average amount of money allocated across the 15 student organizations, $F(14, 2842) = 9.93, $p < .001$. This significant main effect was probed using Bonferroni-corrected multiple comparison procedures. Through these analyses, it was found that BSU was allocated less money ($M = 11.70, SD = 12.47$) than each of the other student organizations. Specifically, BSU was allocated significantly less money than nine of the 14 other student organizations ($M = 17.41 to 34.97, SD = 19.65 to 47.49), $M_{\text{org}} = 5.72$ to $23.27, SFs = 1.52 to 3.53, $p < .022$. BSU was allocated significantly less than: the Dairy Science Club, Kinesiology Student Association, Architecture Planning and Design, Engineering Student Council, College of Business Ambassadors, International Honor Society of Psychology, International Buddies, Arts and Sciences Council, Agriculture Student Council, and Union Program Council. Out of the 207 participants, 19 participants allocated money to two or less organizations and 110 participants allocated some portion of the money to all 15 organizations. Most importantly, we found that 79 participants donated $0 to BSU but made donations to other groups. When participants allocated $0 to BSU, on average they allocated $20.24 to the remaining organizations. Ultimately, our primary hypothesis was supported; the BSU was allocated significantly less money than was allocated to of the majority of the other student organizations (see Figure 1).

Although we found significant differences in the average amount of money allocated across the 15 student organizations, it is not reasonable to conclude that BSU was allocated less money because it serves a smaller student population. In actuality, each organization serves only a minority of students on campus. As such, the number of students BSU serves is similar to that of every other student organization (see Figure 1).

Racism Levels and Money Allocation
Our second hypothesis was that levels of racism would be negatively correlated with the amount of money allocated to the student organization that supported a racial minority group (i.e., BSU). To test this, we calculated correlation coefficients between participants’ scores on the RAS and how much money they allocated to each student
First, the finding that BSU was allocated significantly less money than nine of the student organizations could be explained through the justification-suppression model of prejudice (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003) because participants may have allocated more money to the student organizations that they most identified with. This may have allowed justifications to be made in defending the discrepancies in money allocation to the student organization that supported out-group members. As a result, BSU may have been seen as the least beneficial of the student organizations, thus, leading to the discrepancy in allocation of student privilege fees. There were many organizations in this study that only supported a specific group of interests (e.g., Dairy Science Club, Agricultural Student Council, Kinesiology Student Organization), however these organizations were all allocated significantly more money than BSU, suggesting that the race of the individuals belonging to the organization may have been a factor in the ultimate allocation decision. Secondly, these findings may be explained by the arousal: cost reward model of helping (Piliavin et al., 1981) because by allocating even a small amount of money to BSU, participants may have been able to affirm their egalitarian beliefs and values, consequentially alleviating any arousal and conflict of their beliefs that may have arisen if they had allocated no money to a group that supported a racial minority group. Participants may have viewed the risks of allocating funds to BSU as higher than the risks of allocating funds to organizations that do not support a racial minority group. This could be because White individuals may see little personal benefit to donating to smaller minority organizations, and past research suggests that Whites have been found to associate more costs with helping Blacks and more rewards with helping Whites (Saucier et al., 2005).

It is logical to think that an individual’s racism level would be inversely related to the amount of money they would allocate to a group that supported minorities. However, our results showed that no significant relationship was revealed between RAS scores and allocation tendencies. These unanticipated results may be explained through the aversive racism theory (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986), which explains that although Whites believe they have egalitarian attitudes, they may experience anxiety and discomfort around Blacks. The current method did not place participants in a situation in which direct face-to-face contact was needed, which may have lessened the feelings of discomfort and anxiety felt by helpers in a face-to-face interaction. However, because BSU was allocated less money overall, this suggests that the race of the individuals receiving help may ultimately affect an individual’s overall decision to provide help, despite their levels of racism. Overall, our results suggest that participants may be more likely to allocate significantly more amount of funds to organizations in which they may directly benefit, and significantly less to organizations that support a specific group of which they are not a member (i.e., racial minority groups).

**Limitations**

One limitation of this study may have been the type

---

1. During both phases of the study, participants were asked to indicate the last six digits of their school ID number. However, due to participants incorrectly reporting their school ID number, not reporting their school ID number, or only participating in one phase of the study, we were only able to match 80 participants’ RAS scores and their allocation responses. Therefore, the following correlations only reflect those 80 participants.
of resources we asked participants to allocate. Many students are able to afford and attend college only as a result of loans, scholarships, and part-time jobs. As a result, many college students do not have a lot of money and may find the student privilege fees unnecessary. As such, student privilege fees may be a “sore issue” among students; therefore student’s resentment in paying these student fees may have emerged in their responses. This resentment may also have emerged from students who do not participate in any organizations because they too must pay these student fees, regardless of how involved they are on campus. As a result, the allocations may not have been a truthful representation of their beliefs. Moreover, students whose parents fund their college education would not be concerned about the student privilege fees because they are included in tuition. However, college students were examined because student organizations on campuses are constantly competing for money, and students are usually the ones who decide who receives the funding through student governing associations. Another possible limitation may have been that our study utilized self-report measures, and as a result have been affected by the common biases related to the self-report method. However, by including realistic information such as student privilege fees and actual student organizations on campus, this situation was made as plausible as possible, because organizations on university campuses are constantly searching for funding and support. Lastly, although there are many types of prejudice and discrimination, we focused solely on White discrimination against Blacks. However, if this study were conducted with another minority organization, we contend the results would likely be similar, because aversive racism theory has been shown to apply to the treatment of other minority groups and does not apply exclusively to White against Blacks discrimination (Sue et al., 2007).

**Future Directions and Conclusions**

Unfortunately, decisions to offer aid and resources are often unfairly made (e.g., Ginther et al., 2011) and may be influenced by negative attitudes toward certain groups (e.g., Stepanikova et al., 2011). Our findings revealed that participants unfairly allocated money to BSU, illustrating that there are differences in allocation responses when allocating between organizations that do and do not specifically support racial minority groups. This may have a significant impact on the future growth and success of organizations that openly advocate for racial minorities groups (e.g., NAACP, National Black United Fund, National Latino Professional Organizations). As such, future research should continue to study the relationship between prosocial behavior and prejudice, specifically in hopes of identifying the decision-making factors that may influence the ultimate decision to help. Overall, these results offer insight into the role that racism and discrimination may play role in the ultimate decision of the allocation of resources to competing groups.
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# APPENDIX

## Privilege Fee Allocation Among Student Organizations

Over the past couple of years, Kansas State University (KSU) has been trying to find a better way to allocate the money from the privilege fees that are included in every student’s tuition. Currently a student’s privilege fee is used to fund different organizations such as the Rec, the Student Union, the Collegian, etc. As of this year, each student pays roughly a total of $600 per academic year to cover their privilege fee, about half of which will go to the Union and Lafene, leaving about $300 to be allocated to remaining student organizations. Below are 15 KSU student organizations that are also the most common organizations across schools in the Big 12 Conference. Different students will get different lists of student organizations to ensure all student groups are represented.

Knowing this, please allocate the remaining amount of money ($300) to KSU organizations by giving as much or as little to each group as you see fit. This is your money and the administration wants to know how you would like to spend it. Please do not exceed $300 total across these 15 organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agricultural Student Council</td>
<td>promotes the college of agriculture to students at KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Architecture Planning and Design</td>
<td>raises awareness of architecture at KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Black Student Union</td>
<td>brings together African American students at KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College of Business Ambassadors</td>
<td>created by business majors who represent KSU at major events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dairy Science Club</td>
<td>promotes dairy science to students at KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Engineering Student Council</td>
<td>promotes engineering to students at KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Arts &amp; Sciences Student Council</td>
<td>promotes the arts and sciences to students at KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. History Club</td>
<td>raises historical awareness about KSU to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. International Buddies</td>
<td>pairs international students with students from the United States who also attend KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kinesiology Student Association</td>
<td>promotes and enhances knowledge of kinesiology at KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Economics Club</td>
<td>promotes the importance of economics to students at KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Math Club</td>
<td>created for students to promote the importance of math in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. International Honor Society of Psychology</td>
<td>promotes psychology to students at KSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Social Work Organization</td>
<td>educates the community about the role that social work plays in society and the lives of its members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Union Program Council</td>
<td>provides entertainment to KSU community and an opportunity for students to gain leadership skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>