mouth-to-mouth resuscitation), moderate (a need for psychological support before surgery) or minor (directions to a store). Second, the nature of the relationship between the person needing help and the person who failed to provide it was varied. Either parents refused to help their children, an adult refused to help a friend, or an adult refused to help a stranger.

Before presenting the results of this investigation, let’s take a moment to consider the predictions. India is a collectivistic culture and people feel obligated to help others. In contrast, America is an individualistic culture and people feel less of an obligation to help. How might these differences affect helping? When the need is great or the relationship close and dependent (e.g., parent–child), these differences should be slight because the situation is strong and calls for helping. In contrast, when the need is minor and the people are strangers, cultural differences should be substantial, because helping in these situations is more or less discretionary.

Figure 12.10 shows just such a pattern. Cultural differences were slight when the need was extreme or the relationship was close, but they were rather substantial when
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**FIGURE 12.10**
Percentage of Participants Saying the Person Had an Obligation to Help

When asked how obligated people are to help in various situations, Indian Hindus replied that people have an obligation to help even in situations of low need from a stranger. In contrast, Americans saw little need to help someone who had a minor need, or a stranger who had a moderate need.

*Source: J. G. Miller, Bersoff, and Harwood (1990).*