

Solidarity in times of crisis: A latent profile approach

Franco Bastias¹, Adrian Rothers² y Aristobulo Goldstein³

^{1,2}*Philipps-Universität Marburg, Department of Psychology, Germany*

^{1,3}*Universidad Católica de Cuyo, Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades,
Argentina*

Solidarity is a multifaceted phenomenon whose forms and underlying motivations become especially salient in contexts of economic crisis. This article examines distinct expressions and motivations for solidarity with those economically affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. In a sample of 395 Argentine participants, we conducted a latent profile analysis of self-reported solidarity behaviours. Then, we examined their associations with theoretically relevant antecedents, namely community identification, personal and vicarious economic hardship, and poverty attributions measured with a novel scale. The results revealed three solidarity profiles and their possible motivations. Compared to the low-solidarity profile, high-solidarity profiles were characterized by stronger community identification and by knowing individuals who were economically affected by the pandemic. However, the two high-solidarity profiles differed in their expressions of political and welfare solidarity, which may be explained by differences in poverty attributions.

Keywords: community identification, COVID-19, latent profile analysis, poverty attributions, solidarity.

Solidaridad en tiempos de crisis: un enfoque de perfiles latentes

La solidaridad es un fenómeno multifacético cuyas formas y motivaciones subyacentes se vuelven especialmente salientes en contextos de crisis económica. Este artículo examina distintas expresiones y motivaciones de solidaridad con quienes se vieron económicamente afectados por la pandemia de COVID-19. En una muestra de 395 participantes argentinos, realizamos un análisis de perfiles latentes de comportamientos de solidaridad autorreportados. Luego, examinamos sus asociaciones con antecedentes teóricamente

Franco Bastias  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9477-1417>

Adrian Rothers  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2141-0338>

Aristobulo Goldstein  <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-0206-3531>

All correspondence related to this article must be addressed to Aristobulo Goldstein. Email: aris.goldstein@uccuyo.edu.ar

relevantes, tales como, la identificación comunitaria, dificultad económica propia o de personas cercanas y las atribuciones de la pobreza medidas mediante una escala original. Los resultados revelaron tres perfiles de solidaridad y sus posibles motivaciones. En comparación con el perfil de baja solidaridad, los perfiles de alta solidaridad se caracterizaron por una mayor identificación comunitaria y por conocer a personas que se vieron económicamente afectadas por la pandemia. Sin embargo, los dos perfiles de alta solidaridad difirieron en sus expresiones de solidaridad política y apoyo a intervenciones estatales, lo que puede explicarse por diferencias en las atribuciones de la pobreza.

Palabras clave: identificación comunitaria, COVID-19, análisis de perfiles latentes, atribuciones de pobreza, solidaridad.

Solidariedade em tempos de crise: uma abordagem de perfis latentes

A solidariedade é um fenómeno multifacetado cujas formas e motivações subjacentes se tornam especialmente salientes em contextos de crise económica. Este artigo examina diferentes expressões e motivações de solidariedade com aqueles economicamente afetados pela pandemia de COVID-19. Numa amostra de 395 participantes argentinos, realizámos uma análise de perfis latentes de comportamentos de solidariedade autorrelatados. Em seguida, examinámos as suas associações com antecedentes teoricamente relevantes, nomeadamente a identificação comunitária, a dificuldade económica própria ou de pessoas próximas e as atribuições da pobreza, medidas com um instrumento inovador. Os resultados revelaram três perfis de solidariedade e as suas possíveis motivações. Em comparação com o perfil de baixa solidariedade, os perfis de alta solidariedade caracterizaram-se por uma maior identificação comunitária e por conhecer indivíduos economicamente afetados pela pandemia. No entanto, os dois perfis de alta solidariedade diferiram nas suas expressões de solidariedade política e de apoio a intervenções estatais, o que pode ser explicado por diferenças nas atribuições de pobreza.

Palavras-chave: identificação comunitária, COVID-19, análise de perfis latentes, atribuições de pobreza, solidariedade.

Declarations

The first author disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: Funded by the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD) under the funding programme Short-Term Grants 2021 [57552337, Personal ref. no.: 91764517]

Economic consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic

Crisis and natural disasters do not affect everyone to the same extent. A decade ago, the earthquake in Haiti caused more than 300,000 deaths, while an even stronger one in Japan took around 15,000 lives. Earthquakes damage the frailest and most shoddy houses; floods disproportionately affect poor communities that often reside in flood-prone areas (Erikson, 1976), and pandemics most strongly affect those who are already in a socioeconomically vulnerable situation (Gauthier et al., 2021; Perry et al., 2021). Poor people were more likely to contract COVID-19 because they faced difficulties in implementing preventive measures. Washing hands, one of the basic recommendations of the World Health Organization, was often not possible in contexts where there was a lack of clean water. Physical distancing was difficult in densely populated neighborhoods, and staying home was often not feasible if people needed to keep working to survive or if their occupations did not allow them to switch to working from home with access to a computer and an internet connection.

In addition to facing a higher risk of contracting COVID-19, economically vulnerable populations also bore a disproportionate share of the pandemic's economic consequences. The pandemic triggered a global health crisis, but also an economic one, which was felt most strongly in regions of the world that already had high levels of poverty and social inequality. In Latin America, the most unequal region in the world (before and during the COVID-19 pandemic), the total number of people in poverty amounted to 209 million at the end of 2020, 22 million more than the previous year (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean [ECLAC], 2021). One such country is Argentina, where the poverty rate increased from 40.8% of its population in 2019 to 44% in 2020 (Observatorio de la Deuda Social Argentina [ODSA], 2020).

Forms of solidarity in the context of crises

A crisis can be defined, in sociological terms, as a sudden event that occurs with little, if any, warning and typically results in a breakdown of the general organization and daily life of a community (Kutak, 1938). This disruption has the potential to shift the scope of solidarity within a community, contributing to a reconfiguration of solidarity among its members (Koos, 2019). Emerging forms of solidarity have been documented during crises associated with natural disasters (Cassar et al., 2017; Chantarat et al., 2019; Maki et al., 2019; Rao et al., 2011) and, more recently, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic (e.g., Bertogg & Koos, 2021, 2022; Tekin et al., 2021). In fact, many countries witnessed an unprecedented surge in solidarity aimed at helping vulnerable groups in the wake of the pandemic. For example, in Argentina, never before had so many people been directly involved with NGOs to help others (Bucari, 2020) or donated money and goods such as hygiene products and food (D'Angelo, 2020). However, while research has focused on lockdown adherence, vaccine acceptance, and other actions aimed at preventing the spread of infectious diseases as forms of solidarity (Ayalon et al., 2021; Fischer et al., 2020; Friehs et al., 2022; Karić & Mededović, 2021; Liekefett & Becker, 2021), comparatively little research has examined solidarity with those experiencing the economic consequences of the pandemic.

Shortly after the pandemic reached Latin America, a large proportion of people experienced a decline in their financial resources and required assistance to cope with the crisis. Specifically, between 13 March and 24 April 2020, 29 countries in the region adopted a total of 126 social protection measures targeting the most vulnerable and precarious households (ECLAC, 2020). According to ECLAC (2020), monetary transfers were the most widely adopted measure, accounting for 40% of all initiatives, followed by food transfers at 33%. Together, these two types of public policy reached around 58% of the region's population. In Argentina, the government rapidly introduced measures to support the most vulnerable households. The most

relevant and well-known policies were the so-called Emergency Family Income (Ingreso Familiar de Emergencia, IFE) and food price caps. Public support for these policies varied considerably. These measures were particularly important in preventing a further increase in poverty during this period, both in Argentina (ODSA, 2020) and across the region (ECLAC, 2020).

Nevertheless, public support for government intervention to assist people in poverty may not necessarily increase following the onset of the economic crisis caused by the pandemic (Wiwad et al., 2021). Studies have shown that, whereas people may strongly express medical solidarity during the pandemic, their willingness to support financial assistance policies may be limited (Koos & Leuffen, 2020).

Types of solidarity

The aforementioned examples illustrate that solidarity during the pandemic was expressed through multiple channels and forms of action. Such diversity can be understood in light of existing conceptualisations and taxonomies of solidarity, including social, political, and welfare solidarity.

The concept of social solidarity gained prominence with the seminal work of Durkheim (1893), who helped to characterise solidarity as a basic sociological concept (Van Oorschot & Komter, 1998). Since then, there has been broad agreement that the term refers to an attribute of the social system resulting in ties between individuals and groups and may refer to different actions ranging from informal private assistance and donations to formal activities such as volunteering for foundations or NGOs. Solidarity can also take on a more explicitly political dimension. Political solidarity has been defined as collective action that articulates a common interest within the political system (Koos, 2019; Scholz, 2008). It is claimed that political solidarity, instead of being motivated mainly by a shared identity and utility, as in social solidarity (Van Oorschot & Komter, 1998), is ultimately founded on an individual's moral conscience and a sense of collective responsibility

to respond to situations of injustice, oppression, social vulnerability, or tyranny (Scholz, 2008). Similarly, welfare solidarity refers to positive attitudes toward social policies that pursue a benefit for a certain group (Sachweh, 2016; Svallfors, 2010; van Oorschot, 2000) or attitudes toward redistribution and welfare state support (Meuleman, 2019).

In addition to these distinctions, conceptualising solidarity according to levels of institutionalisation is particularly useful for analysing responses to crises, when both civil society and public institutions react to emergency situations. In this regard, Bertogg and Koos (2021, 2022) define informal solidarity during the pandemic as social support and assistance provided privately by others, including time, money, goods, or emotional support, in contrast to formal support or assistance provided by governments.

Motivation for solidarity

Another aim of the current study was to trace the forms of solidarity to theoretically important antecedent variables to better understand their origin. Not every crisis evokes solidarity responses to the same extent or in the same ways. For instance, people respond differently to crises caused by natural catastrophes, such as floods, tornadoes, and earthquakes, compared to crises resulting from human decisions, such as economic crises (Genschel & Hemerijck, 2018). Thus, we consider that attribution processes concerning the causes of economic misfortune during the pandemic are relevant for understanding solidarity actions.

On the other hand, we acknowledge the importance of a shared identity and utility as sources of solidarity (Durkheim, 1893; Van Oorschot & Komter, 1998), as well as recent evidence highlighting their role in times of crisis (Drury et al., 2016; Maki et al., 2019; Stevenson et al., 2020; Tekin et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023). Consequently, we also considered community identification and personal and vicarious experiences of being affected during the pandemic as predictors of solidarity.

Poverty attributions in the context of crisis

Framed in Attribution Theory, the explanations that people endorse about the causes of poverty have been frequently identified as motivators of helping behaviour and attitudes toward public policies to alleviate poverty (e.g., Yúdica et al., 2021; Zucker & Weiner, 1993). Literature consistently finds that individuals are more willing to help when they attribute the causes of poverty to external factors rather than to internal factors, such as a lack of willingness or effort (for a review, see Bastias et al., 2024). In the context of a crisis, the relative weight of these factors may shift. According to Kluegel and Smith (1986), structuralist attributions of poverty might predominate during times of extreme social or economic strain. For example, during the Great Depression, structuralist beliefs dominated US-Americans' views on unemployment and inequality, which boosted support for wealth redistribution and unprecedented social welfare initiatives (Piven & Cloward, 1971).

A recent study suggests a similar dynamic during the COVID-19 pandemic. Wiwad et al. (2021) tested whether the pandemic altered beliefs about the extent to which poverty is caused by external forces or internal dispositions. The same sample of participants completed a survey before (April 2019) and during (May 2020) the pandemic. The findings showed a shift in poverty attributions, with respondents perceiving poverty as more strongly influenced by external-situational causes and less by internal-dispositional causes. Although the study by Wiwad et al. (2021) is revealing, the role of the pandemic in shaping poverty was not explicitly captured in the scale items because the first wave of data collection preceded the pandemic. Moreover, the taxonomy of poverty attributions used was limited to internal-dispositional and external-situational dimensions, with the fatalistic (Feagin, 1972) or uncontrollability factors (Weiner, 1985) not being considered. Here we believe that there is an important point to make. Although the pandemic as a cause of poverty is evidently external to individuals, it is not clear whether its effects are controllable or uncontrollable. For example,

if the pandemic is considered a natural disaster that strikes unexpectedly, it may elicit uncontrollable or fatalistic attributions. Conversely, if emphasis is placed on the role of authorities in mitigating its economic consequences, these effects may be perceived as controllable through government action and policy decisions.

In the current study, we aim to develop a new scale to measure poverty attributions that explicitly incorporates the COVID-19 pandemic as a causal factor, and to examine how this item clusters with other external controllable and uncontrollable factors. In addition, we analyse the relationship between attributions and solidarity to explore whether perceiving the pandemic as a cause of poverty may foster solidarity.

Community identification

In another vein, the literature on solidarity in times of crisis and natural disasters points to the importance of a common identity that motivates people to take collective action for disaster relief. Drury et al. (2016) explain that natural disasters can elicit a shared identity, which in turn fosters helping behaviour towards other in-group members who are affected by the disaster. For example, Maki et al. (2019) found that, in the aftermath of a disaster, national identity and prosocial values were closely linked to helping behaviour following the earthquake in Chile.

Similarly, recent studies on the pandemic highlight the fundamental role played by community identification in prosocial responses towards those affected during the crisis. Stevenson et al. (2020) showed that local community identification predicts giving and receiving emotional support to others in the local area, as well as adherence to COVID-19 prevention norms. Likewise, Tekin et al. (2021) found that perceiving oneself as part of a shared community is one of the drivers of altruism and prosocial behaviour during the pandemic. Finally, Wang et al. (2023) provided cross-national evidence, based on two international datasets, of a positive association between global citizen identification and prosociality. Taking this background into account, the present study aims to examine the role of community identification

as a motivator of solidarity. In addition, experiences of hardship constitute an important source of information about social vulnerability and may shape individuals' willingness to support others in need. Accordingly, we consider personal and vicarious economic hardship during the pandemic as relevant antecedent variables, capturing both individuals' own experiences of economic impact and their exposure to others who were affected.

Overview of the present study

Building on this conceptual framework, the present study aims to provide a comprehensive examination of solidarity with those economically affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and to explore its motivations. To capture the heterogeneity of solidarity, we adopt a person-centred approach and use latent profile analysis (LPA) to identify distinct patterns of solidarity actions in a comprehensive manner. We acknowledge that while individuals may express certain solidarity intentions, these do not necessarily translate into actual behaviour and may vary in intensity and form. Therefore, we incorporate a measure of past solidarity behaviours, allowing us to identify different manifestations of solidarity during 2020, the first year of the pandemic. In addition, the study aims to advance understanding of the underlying motivations of these patterns by examining their associations with theoretically relevant antecedents. We focus on community identification and poverty attributions as key explanatory factors. While community identification reflects the role of social bonds in fostering solidarity, poverty attributions capture how individuals interpret the causes of economic hardship, particularly in terms of externality and controllability. By integrating these perspectives, the present study aims to shed light on both the structure of solidarity and the factors associated with its different expressions in the context of a crisis.

- H1: Distinct profiles of solidarity will emerge, differing in both the extent and the forms of solidarity behaviours displayed during the COVID-19 pandemic.

- H2: Higher levels of community identification will be associated with an increased likelihood of belonging to high-solidarity profiles rather than to low-solidarity profiles.
- H3: Personal and vicarious economic hardship will be associated with an increased likelihood of belonging to high-solidarity profiles.
- H4: Poverty attributions that emphasise external and controllable causes will be associated with an increased likelihood of belonging to high-solidarity profiles, while internal attributions will be associated with low-solidarity profiles.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 395 adults from Argentina, aged 18 to 74 years ($M = 30.93$, $SD = 13.37$), of whom 29.4% ($n = 116$) were male and 70.6% ($n = 278$) were female. Regarding the highest educational level attained, 29.9% ($n = 117$) reported having completed university education, 55.5% ($n = 217$) reported having incomplete university education, 2.0% ($n = 8$) reported completed tertiary education, and 6.6% ($n = 26$) reported incomplete tertiary education. Likewise, 0.3% ($n = 1$) reported completed secondary education as their highest educational qualification, 5.4% ($n = 21$) reported incomplete secondary education, and 0.3% ($n = 1$) reported completed primary education as their highest level of education. Total income ranged from ARS 4,000 to ARS 750,000, with a mean of ARS 106,505 ($SD = \text{ARS } 93,923$) (see Table 1).

Table 1*Characterization of the sample*

Variables	Operationalization	
Gender	Female	70.6%
	Male	29.4%
Age	-	Min = 18 Max = 74 $M = 30.93$ $SD = 13.367$
Education	Completed primary	0.3%
	Incomplete secondary	5.4%
	Completed secondary	0.3%
	Incomplete tertiary education	6.6%
	Completed tertiary education	2.0%
	Incomplete university	55.5%
	Completed university	29.9%
Total Income	Total household income for the last month	Min = \$4,000 (USD 49) Max = \$750,000 (USD 9105) $M = \$106,505$ (USD 1293) Median = 100,000 (USD 1214) $SD = 93923$ (USD 1145)

Note. SD = Standard Deviation. The values presented are in Argentine Pesos (ARS). The equivalent in USD was calculated according to the official price, informed by the National Bank of Argentina (*Banco Nación*) on the first day of data collection (15 December 2020): USD 1 = ARS 82.37.

Procedure

Participants were contacted through social media and mailing lists and invited to participate in the research. The invitation included a link to a secure web server, where information about the study and an informed consent form were provided for respondents to review and agree to before starting the questionnaire. Participants were also informed about the confidential treatment of their responses and the transparent and ethical use of the data collected, in accordance with the American Psychological Association [APA] ethical guidelines (APA, 2017), and were protected under Argentina's National Personal Data Protection Law No. 25,326. The Committee of the Bioethics Institute at the Catholic University of Cuyo approved the study (No. 0901-CS-2020) in April 2020.

Measures

For the sociodemographic variables, participants reported their gender, age, education, and household income.

Solidarity behaviours

To measure participation in different forms of solidarity, respondents were asked: “Since March 2020, how often have you taken the following actions to help those economically affected during the pandemic?” March 2020 was used as the reference point because it marked the onset of the pandemic in Argentina, and the data collection was conducted in December 2020 to capture solidarity behaviours during the first year of the pandemic. Following this question, 13 actions were listed as items on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = never to 5 = very frequently. Five items captured social solidarity, reflecting engagement in helping behaviours such as donating money, goods, or time through voluntary work. Another five items captured political solidarity, ranging from private acts, such as expressions of concern for family and friends, to more public acts, such as signing petitions or participating in protests. Finally, three items captured welfare solidarity, reflecting participants’ support for governmental COVID-19 policies, including lockdown measures, price caps, and the “Emergency Family Income” relief package (IFE).

Poverty attributions

A 20-item scale, the Poverty Attributions Scale during the COVID-19 Pandemic (PAS-COVID-19), was developed for the purposes of this study. The scale comprised 11 items adapted from previous scales (Bullock et al., 2003; Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Harper et al., 1990; Smith & Stone, 1989; Vázquez & Panadero, 2009; Weiner et al., 2011) and nine items developed ad hoc. The main novel aspect of the scale was the inclusion of items assessing the COVID-19 pandemic as a cause of poverty. Prior to the items, participants were presented with the following instruction: “Think for a moment about the causes of poverty in your society. Below is a list of possible causes; please rate the

importance of each one as a cause of poverty (1 = not important at all; 5 = very important).”

Community identification

Identification with the local community was measured using a 12-item scale rated on a five-point Likert scale, covering the cognitive, evaluative, and affective aspects of identification. It was based on previously validated scales measuring community identification (Stevenson et al., 2020) and identification with a team, career, school, and occupation (Van Dick et al., 2004). Internal consistency was adequate ($\alpha = .86$).

Personal and vicarious economic affectedness during the pandemic

This variable was measured using two items: “To what extent have you been economically affected by the pandemic?” and “Do you know anyone who has been economically affected by the pandemic?”

Results

This section presents the main findings of the study, organised in three parts. First, we report the validation of the poverty attributions scale developed for the COVID-19 context. Second, we examine patterns of solidarity through latent profile analysis, identifying distinct profiles based on participants’ reported behaviours. Third, we analyse the associations between these profiles and theoretically relevant antecedents, including community identification, economic hardship, and poverty attributions.

Measuring poverty attributions during the pandemic

To assess the structure and validity of the PAS-COVID-19, we first calculated skewness and kurtosis values, retaining items within the acceptable range of ± 1.5 (George & Mallery, 2001). Then, we conducted the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) test, along with Bartlett’s test

of sphericity, to verify the adequacy of the sample for exploratory factor analysis. The KMO value was .88, well above the .70 criterion, and Bartlett's test was significant ($p < .001$).

The exploratory factor analysis revealed four factors, following Kaiser's (1960) criterion, whereby the number of factors retained corresponds to eigenvalues greater than one. The first factor accounted for 24.12% of the total variance and was associated with the internal control dimension. The second factor accounted for 11.58% of the total variance and was associated with the external control – socio-economic system dimension (hereafter, External Control SE-System). The third factor accounted for 10.23% of the total variance and was associated with the uncontrollable dimension. The fourth factor accounted for 10.07% of the total variance and was associated with the external control – government dimension. Together, the four factors explained 56.01% of the total variance. As shown in Table 2, all item loadings were above .40. The last item, "Because of poor government decisions in regard to the pandemic" (Item 20), showed loadings on both the first (.44) and the fourth factor (.68). We decided to retain the item because the cross-loading did not exceed .50 (Costello & Osborne, 2005).

Table 2

Rotated component matrix of the PAS-COVID-19

Variables	Int.	Ext. SE-Sys.	Uncont.	Ext. Gov.
1. Lack of effort and laziness by the poor (Falta de esfuerzo y vagancia) (5)	.83			
2. Lack of will and perseverance (Falta de voluntad y perseverancia) (6)	.82			
3. Are not willing to work (No quieren trabajar) (6)	.80			
4. Anti-work mentality among the poor (Las personas no tienen incorporada la cultura del trabajo) (6)	.80			
5. A lack of motivation that results from being on public assistance (Falta de motivación por depender de planes sociales) (3)	.75			

Variables	Int.	Ext. SE-Sys.	Uncont.	Ext. Gov.
6. No attempts at self-improvement (Falta de iniciativa para el desarrollo personal y la autosuperación) (5)	.71			
7. Loose morals among poor people (Falta de moral y de valores de las personas pobres) (5)	.64			
8. The inability to save, spend and manage money wisely (Incapacidad para ahorrar, gastar y manejar el dinero de forma inteligente) (3)	.62			
9. Are victims of discrimination in promotions and wages (La discriminación reflejada en el salario y los ascensos) (1)		.73		
10. Unregistered employment and poor working conditions (Trabajos informales o en negro, de malas condiciones laborales) (6)		.72		
11. Lack of opportunities (Falta de oportunidades) (2)		.69		
12. Lack of employment (Falta de trabajo) (6)		.65		
13. Bad luck (Mala suerte) (3)			.67	
14. Sickness and disability (Por discapacidad física) (3)			.64	
15. Because of natural disasters -such as earthquakes, floods and hurricanes- (Por causa de desastres naturales -terremotos, inundaciones, huracanes, etc.-) (6)			.64	
16. Unfortunate circumstances (Circunstancias desafortunadas) (3)			.61	
17. Because of a pandemic and the way it affects the economy (Por fenómenos como una pandemia y sus efectos en la economía) (6)			.42	
18. Because of an incompetent government administration with bad decisions (Por culpa de un gobierno incompetente y con malas decisiones) (6)				.80
19. Their governments are corrupt (Por la corrupción) (4)				.73
20. Because of poor government decisions regarding the pandemic (Por malas decisiones del gobierno frente a la pandemia) (6)	.44			.69

Note. Int. = Internal control, Ext. SE-Sys. = External Control – Socio-economic System, Uncont. = Uncontrollable and Ext. Gov. = External Control – Government. b. Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. c. Rotation converged in 6 iterations. d. Numbers in parentheses indicate the source study from which each item was adapted: (1) Smith & Stone (1989); (2) Weiner et al. (2011); (3) Bullock et al. (2003); (4) Harper et al. (1990); (5) Cozzarelli et al. (2001); (6) ad-hoc.

As shown in Table 3, the corrected item–total correlations ranged from .48 to .79 for Internal Control, from .49 to .58 for External Control – Government, from .43 to .53 for External Control – Socio-economic system, and from .32 to .45 for the uncontrollable dimension. In most cases, corrected item–total correlations were adequate ($r_{jx} > .35$), except for the items “Bad luck” (Item 20) and “Unfortunate circumstances” (Item 16). Both belong to the uncontrollable factor and showed values of .32 and .34, respectively. Nonetheless, these items were retained, as their removal would have reduced the Cronbach’s alpha of the dimension below .60.

Table 3

Psychometric properties of the PAS-COVID-19

	Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>r_{jx}</i>	<i>α-x</i>
Internal Control	1. Are not willing to work (No quieren trabajar)	3.57	1.47	.76	.88
	2. Anti-work mentality among the poor (Las personas no tienen incorporada la cultura del trabajo)	3.58	1.35	.79	.88
	3. Lack of will and perseverance (Falta de voluntad y perseverancia)	3.49	1.32	.77	.88
	4. Lack of effort and laziness by the poor (Falta de esfuerzo y vagancia)	3.41	1.45	.79	.87
	5. No attempts at self-improvement (Falta de iniciativa para el desarrollo personal y la autosuperación)	3.60	1.30	.61	.89
	6. Loose morals among poor people (Falta de moral y de valores de las personas pobres)	2.32	1.33	.53	.90
	7. A lack of motivation that results from being on public assistance (Falta de motivación por depender de planes sociales)	3.66	1.45	.74	.88
	8. The inability to save, spend and manage money wisely (Incapacidad para ahorrar, gastar y manejar el dinero de forma inteligente)	3.47	1.19	.48	.90

	Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>rjx</i>	<i>α-x</i>
External Control – Government	9. Because of an incompetent government administration with bad decisions (Por culpa de un gobierno incompetente y con malas decisiones)	4.25	1.03	.58	.58
	10. Their governments are corrupt (Por la corrupción)	4.22	1.08	.49	.69
	11. Because of poor government decisions regarding the pandemic (Por malas decisiones del gobierno frente a la pandemia)	3.93	1.17	.56	.61
External Control – SE-System	12. Unregistered employment and poor working conditions (Trabajos informales o en negro, de malas condiciones laborales)	4.10	1.06	.52	.62
	13. Lack of employment (Falta de trabajo)	4.11	1.09	.43	.67
	14. Lack of opportunities (Falta de oportunidades)	3.83	1.23	.53	.61
	15. Are victims of discrimination in promotions and wages (La discriminación reflejada en el salario y los ascensos)	3.55	1.20	.47	.65
	16. Sickiness and disability (Por discapacidad física)	2.78	1.22	.37	.56
Uncontrollable	17. Unfortunate circumstances (Circunstancias desafortunadas)	2.90	1.28	.34	.58
	18. Because of a pandemic and the way it affects the economy (Por fenómenos como una pandemia y sus efectos en la economía)	3.66	1.13	.36	.57
	19. Because of natural disasters -such as earthquakes, floods and hurricanes- (Por causa de desastres naturales -terremotos, inundaciones, huracanes, etc.-)	2.38	1.24	.45	.51
	20. Bad luck (Mala suerte)	1.73	1.02	.32	.58

To evaluate the internal consistency of the scale, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for each of the four dimensions. The values were .90 for Internal Control, .71 for External Control – Government, .70 for External Control – Socio-economic System, and .65 for the Uncontrollable dimension. The means of each dimension were 3.40

($SD = 1.03$) for Internal Control, 3.91 ($SD = 0.83$) for External control – Socio-economic system, 4.13 ($SD = 0.88$) for External Control – Government, and 2.69 ($SD = 0.74$) for the Uncontrollable dimension.

Solidarity profiles during COVID-19

To examine patterns of solidarity in a holistic manner, we conducted a latent profile analysis (LPA) of these 13 items. LPA partitions a sample into groups of respondents (latent profiles) with similar response patterns across a range of items. We determined the appropriate number of profiles based on a suite of statistical indicators and the interpretability of the different solutions. As statistical indicators, we examined the adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion (aBIC), the Vuong–Lo–Mendell–Rubin (VLMR) test, which compares each k -profile solution against the $k-1$ -profile solution, the entropy of each solution, and the relative size of the smallest profiles (Nylund-Gibson & Choi, 2018; see Table 4).

Table 4

Model fit statistics for latent profile solutions (1-4 profiles)

k	aBIC	p (VLMR)	Entropy	Profile size (%)
1	17276.728			
2	16704.377	<.001	.986	326 (83), 69 (17)
3	16305.69	<.001	.896	226 (57), 68 (17), 101 (26)
4	16051.796	.09	.924	44 (11), 225 (57), 44 (11), 82 (21)

The three-profile solution showed the most desirable statistical properties among the tested solutions. The VLMR test indicated that the three-profile solution provided a significantly better fit than the two-profile solution, whereas the four-profile solution did not significantly improve model fit relative to the three-profile solution. Although the four-profile solution showed slightly higher entropy (.924 vs. .896), it included smaller profiles (as low as 11% of the sample), which

raised concerns about their stability and interpretability. In contrast, the three-profile solution showed adequate entropy (.896) and more balanced profile sizes (57%, 17%, and 26%). Taken together, these results supported the retention of the three-profile solution.

Low solidarity (blue line, $n = 226$)

Participants in this largest profile reported the lowest levels of COVID-related social and political solidarity, as evidenced by low endorsement of actions referred to in items 1 through 10 (with profile means between 1.28 and 3.67, with a scale midpoint of 3). Meanwhile, their agreement with the government's COVID policies was moderate (between 3.02 and 3.65). This profile is characterized by low personal commitment and involvement with others in need, alongside relative support for interventions that do not involve personal effort, such as public policies.

High solidarity in dissent with government actions (orange line, $n = 68$)

Participants in this profile reported medium-to-high levels of social and political solidarity (with means ranging from 2.03 to 4.27 on these items). Notably, they were the only profile with high participation in political demonstrations for those economically affected by the pandemic ($M = 4.03$; $SD = .85$). In addition, their support for government policies was consistently lower than that of participants in other profiles and below the scale midpoint of three (between 2.45 and 2.91).

High solidarity in consent with government actions (grey line, $n = 101$)

Participants in this profile reported medium-to-high levels of social and political solidarity (with profile means ranging from 1.84 to 4.66). However, they showed very low participation in political protests ($M = 1.12$; $SD = .33$). In contrast, their support for government policies was consistently higher than that of participants in other profiles and above the scale midpoint of 3 (between 3.34 and 3.99).




Figure 1. Solidarity profiles of the k = 3 profile solution

Motivations for solidarity

To explore how the three solidarity patterns described above were related to theoretically important antecedent variables, we followed up the latent profile analysis with a multinomial logistic regression. Specifically, we regressed membership in the three solidarity profiles on a set of predictor variables: community identification, personal and vicarious economic affectedness, and poverty attributions. The latter variable was further disaggregated into the four factors identified in the exploratory factor analysis, resulting in four predictors: (i) attributions of internal controllability of poverty, blaming individuals experiencing

poverty; (ii) attributions of external controllability of poverty, blaming the socio-economic system; (iii) attributions of external controllability of poverty, blaming government mismanagement; and (iv) attributions of uncontrollability of poverty, referring to factors beyond human control. In the following section, we report the extent to which each variable predicts membership in each profile relative to the other profiles.

Community identification

Unlike the low-solidarity profile, the two high-solidarity profiles, both in support of and in opposition to the government's actions, showed high identification with the local community (OR = 2.08, 95% CI [1.46, 2.95]; and OR = 1.46, 95% CI [.99, 2.15], respectively). This variable served as a predictor of solidarity actions, regardless of their form of expression.

Personal and vicarious economic affectedness

Whether people reported that their economic situation was affected during the COVID-19 pandemic was not associated with solidarity. However, vicarious affectedness (i.e., knowing others whose economic situation was affected during the pandemic) served to differentiate people who remained uninvolved or showed low solidarity from those who showed high solidarity in support of or in opposition to government actions (OR = 1.79, 95% CI [1.33, 2.42]; and OR = 1.70, 95% CI [1.16, 2.50], respectively).

Poverty attributions

Just as the above predictors help to distinguish between the low- and high-solidarity profiles, poverty attributions primarily contributed to the differentiation between the two high-solidarity profiles. Attributing the causes of poverty to the workings of the socio-economic system increased the likelihood of displaying high solidarity in support of the government's actions (OR = 2.13, 95% CI [1.33, 3.41]) rather than in opposition to the government. In contrast, attributing

the causes of poverty to government failure increased the likelihood of displaying solidarity in opposition to government actions (OR = 2.01, 95% CI [1.18, 3.44]) rather than in support of them. On the other hand, whether participants attributed poverty to internal or uncontrollable factors did not affect the likelihood of membership in any of the solidarity profiles.

Discussion

In the first phase of this study, we analyzed the validity of a novel scale to measure poverty attributions during the COVID-19 pandemic. Previous research has shown that, under normal circumstances, there is a tendency to explain poverty either by blaming people experiencing poverty or by attributing it to external socio-structural factors, while uncontrollable factors or fatalistic explanations—in Feagin's (1972) terms—are not rated as important (Bastias et al., 2019; Furnham, 1982; Gatica et al., 2017; Tagler & Cozzarelli, 2013). However, the prominence and ubiquity of the pandemic, framed as a natural disaster causing poverty, led us to reconsider these conclusions and to reintroduce uncontrollable factors into the discussion. In the context of the evolving pandemic, it seemed increasingly inappropriate to focus on individual shortcomings to explain why a person fell into poverty. Instead, people may have tended to explain poverty by emphasizing uncontrollable factors, such as the emergence of a deadly virus, thereby exculpating individuals experiencing poverty. Therefore, a new scale was developed to measure causal attributions of poverty in this historically unprecedented context, explicitly considering the pandemic as a causal factor.

Descriptive results from this phase were somewhat surprising, as attributions to uncontrollable factors—similarly to non-pandemic contexts—once again showed the lowest levels of endorsement, and this subscale also exhibited low reliability. That is, participants in our study appeared to consider that, even in this context—after nine

months of the pandemic—poverty was not primarily explained by factors beyond human control. Rather, poverty remained a phenomenon perceived as shaped by human decisions, with responsibility attributed less to individuals experiencing poverty and more to the government and the broader socio-economic system. Nevertheless, an important finding emerged from the exploratory factor analysis, which differentiated external controllability into two distinct dimensions: factors attributable to the socio-economic system and those attributable to the government. As discussed below, this distinction proved key to understanding differences in the expression of solidarity across profiles.

Building on these findings, we next turn to the analysis of solidarity expressions. The LPA revealed three solidarity profiles, representing groups of individuals who differed both in the extent and in the ways in which they expressed solidarity during the COVID-19 pandemic. The largest subgroup in our sample, the low-solidarity profile, showed the lowest levels of social and political solidarity, while exhibiting moderate welfare solidarity through the endorsement of public policies in response to the pandemic. In contrast, two smaller subgroups displayed higher levels of social and political solidarity but differed crucially in their engagement in political protests and, correspondingly, in their support for government policies.

We then examined the associations between membership in solidarity profiles and the antecedent variables using multinomial logistic regression analysis. Participants with stronger community identification were more likely to belong to the high-solidarity profiles relative to the low-solidarity profiles. In addition, knowing others who were economically affected during the pandemic, but not being personally affected, also predicted membership in both high-solidarity profiles. These results are consistent with previous studies in which high community identification is associated with the expression of solidarity after a natural disaster (Maki et al., 2019) and during the COVID-19 pandemic (Stevenson et al., 2020). The findings are also in line with the theoretical conceptualization of social solidarity, from the seminal

work of Durkheim (1893) to more recent authors (e.g., Koos, 2019; Melucci & Lyyra, 1998), confirming that the origin and motivation for this kind of solidarity lie in the bonds between members of a group or community. A feeling of belonging or a common identity can then lead to solidarity when necessary.

However, in our study, identification and identity processes do not appear to be sufficient to explain differences in political and welfare solidarity among the two high-solidarity profiles. Expressions of political and welfare solidarity appear to be partially grounded in attributional processes, i.e., evaluations of who is responsible for the economic crisis and who has control over it.

The profile of *high solidarity in consent with government actions* explains poverty during the pandemic in terms of long-standing structural causes within a failing socio-economic system. Accordingly, these individuals manifest social, welfare, and political solidarity, but without participating in public demonstrations, in line with government recommendations. On the other hand, the profile labelled *high solidarity in dissent with government actions* blames the government for the economic crisis and expresses low welfare solidarity by opposing its social policies. However, it shows strong engagement in social and political solidarity, including participation in demonstrations, even though participants potentially put themselves and others' health at risk due to increased contagion in crowded settings. Participants in this profile appear to be motivated by concerns for the economic needs of others, since, according to the results, one of their motivations was not their own economic hardship but that of people they know. On the other hand, while they expressed disagreement with the direct transfer policies of the government, they engaged in monetary donations. Here, donations represent a direct form of action, whereas government transfers constitute a mediated form, highlighting that the key distinction between donating money and having the government distribute it lies, once again, in the role of the government.

The belief that the pandemic crisis could have been aggravated by political failures may have further increased citizens' motivation to engage in solidarity actions while rejecting government strategies to deal with the crisis. A similar pattern is observed in the experiment conducted by Abel and Brown (2020), where exposure to videos of public figures mishandling the pandemic crisis increased prosocial behaviour, as it strengthened people's sense of responsibility to act. Likewise, in the opposite direction, individual solidarity among citizens tends to be weaker in nations with higher levels of social protection spending (Van Oorschot et al., 2005). This suggests that individual and institutional solidarity are not simply separate levels of analysis but are likely interconnected and mutually influential (Starke, 2021).

To conclude, our findings suggest that social solidarity may be the most basic form of solidarity, since membership at least to some extent delineates the scope of all other types of solidarity, including both political and welfare solidarity (Koos, 2019). However, membership does not seem to be the fundamental motivation for all forms of solidarity. As Scholz (2008) points out, individuals expressing political solidarity need not belong to the same community or group, insofar as their motivation is a shared social justice cause aimed at challenging oppressive social structures and relationships. Furthermore, first-person experience of injustice is not a necessary condition for this kind of solidarity, as people who are comparatively advantaged are capable of participating in political solidarity alongside participants who are oppressed (Scholz, 2008). Consequently, our results show that being economically affected during the pandemic was not associated with participation in solidarity movements or other forms of political solidarity. Yet, community identification and knowing people who were economically affected were linked to higher levels of solidarity; however, what explained differences in political and welfare solidarity was attributions of controllability concerning factors causing or aggravating the crisis.

References

- Abel, M., & Brown, W. (2022). Prosocial behavior in the time of COVID-19: The effect of private and public role models. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 101, Article 101942. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socrec.2022.101942>
- American Psychological Association. (2017). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. <https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index>
- Ayalon, L., Chasteen, A., Diehl, M., Levy, B. R., Neupert, S. D., Rothermund, K., Tesch-Römer, C., & Wahl, H. W. (2021). Aging in times of the COVID-19 pandemic: Avoiding ageism and fostering intergenerational solidarity. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, 76(2), e49-e52. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbaa051>
- Bastias, F., Cañadas, B., Figueroa, M. C., Sosa, V., & Moya, M. J. (2019). Explanations about Poverty Origin According to the Professional Training Area. *Journal of Educational Psychology-Propósitos y Representaciones*, 7(2), 121-133. <https://doi.org/10.20511/pyr2019.v7n2.282>
- Bastias, F., Peter, N., Goldstein, A., Sánchez-Montañez, S., Rohmann, A., & Landmann, H. (2024). Measuring attributions 50 years on: From within-country poverty to global inequality. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(3), Article 186. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14030186>
- Bertogg, A., & Koos, S. (2021). Social inequality and local solidarity in times of crises. The Covid-19 Pandemic and the emergence of informal helping arrangements in Germany. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 74, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2021.100612>
- Bertogg, A., & Koos, S. (2022). Who received informal social support during the first COVID-19 lockdown in Germany, and who did not? The role of social networks, life course, and pandemic-specific risks. *Social Indicators Research*, 163(2), 585-607. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-022-02890-0>
- Bucari, E. (2020, December 20). Voluntariado. ¿Por qué el 2020 fue un año récord? *La Nación*. <https://www.lanacion.com.ar/comunidad/voluntariado-estar-donde-y-cuando-hace-falta-nid20122020/>

- Bullock, H. E., Williams, W. R., & Limbert, W. M. (2003). Predicting support for welfare policies: The impact of attributions and beliefs about inequality. *Journal of Poverty*, 7(3), 35-56. https://doi.org/10.1300/J134v07n03_03
- Cassar, A., Healy, A., & Von Kessler, C. (2017). Trust, risk, and time preferences after a natural disaster: experimental evidence from Thailand. *World Development*, 94, 90-105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2016.12.042>
- Chantararat, S., Oum, S., Samphantharak, K., & Sann, V. (2019). Natural disasters, preferences, and behaviors: evidence from the 2011 mega flood in Cambodia. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 63, 44-74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asieco.2019.05.001>
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 10(7), 1-9. <https://openpublishing.library.umass.edu/pare/article/id/1650/>
- Cozzarelli, C., Wilkinson, A. V., & Tagler, M. J. (2001). Attitudes towards the poor and attributions for poverty. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(2), 207-227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00209>
- D'Angelo, J. (2020). The strategic value of “purpose” in companies and enterprises, in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. *La Revista Argentina de Investigación en Negocios (RAIN)*, 6(2), 65-92. <http://rain.ean.edu.ar:8085/rain/index.php/RAIN/article/view/108>
- Drury, J., Brown, R., González, R., & Miranda, D. (2016). Emergent social identity and observing social support predict social support provided by survivors in a disaster: Solidarity in the 2010 Chile earthquake. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(2), 209-223. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2146>
- Durkheim, E. (1893). *De la division du travail social*. Puf.
- Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. (2020). *El desafío social en tiempos del COVID-19*. ECLAC. <https://doi.org/10.18356/9789210054744>
- Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. (2021). Pandemia provoca aumento en los niveles de pobreza sin precedentes en las últimas décadas e impacta fuertemente en la

- desigualdad y el empleo. ECLAC. <https://www.cepal.org/es/comunicados/pandemia-provoca-aumento-niveles-pobreza-sin-precedentes-ultimas-decadas-impacta>
- Erikson, K. (1976). *Everything in its path*. Simon and Schuster.
- Feagin, J. R. (1972). Poverty: We still believe that God helps those who help themselves. *Psychology Today*, 6(6), 101-110. <http://hdl.handle.net/10822/764308>
- Fischer, F., Raiber, L., Boscher, C., & Winter, M. H. J. (2020). COVID-19 and the elderly: who cares?. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 8, 151. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00151>
- Friehe, M. T., Kotzur, P. F., Kraus, C., Schemmerling, M., Herzig, J. A., Stanciu, A., Dilly, S., Hellert, L., Hübner, D., Rückwardt, A., Ulizcay, V., Christ, O., Brambilla, M., De keersmaecker, J., Durante, F., Gale, J., Grigoryev, J., Igou, E., Javakhishvili, N., Kienmoser, D., Nicolas, G., ... Yzerbyt, V. (2022). Warmth and competence perceptions of key protagonists are associated with containment measures during the COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from 35 countries. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1), 21277. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-25228-9>
- Furnham, A. (1982). Why are the poor always with us? Explanations for poverty in Britain. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 21(4), 311-322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1982.tb00553.x>
- Gatica, L., Martini, J. P., Dreizik, M., & Imhoff, D. (2017). Predictores psicosociales y psicopolíticos de la justificación de la desigualdad social. *Revista de Psicología*, 35(1), 279-310. <https://doi.org/10.18800/psico.201701.010>
- Gauthier, G. R., Smith, J. A., & Garcia, C. (2021). Exacerbating inequalities: Social networks, racial/ethnic disparities, and the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States. *Journal of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Science and Social Science*, 76(3), e88-e92. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbaa117>
- Genschel, P., & Hemerijck, A. (2018). *Solidarity in Europe*. European University Institute. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2870/70589>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2001). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (3rd ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

- Harper, D. J., Wagstaff, G. F., Newton, J. T., & Harrison, K. R. (1990). Lay causal perceptions of third world poverty and the just world. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 18(2), 235-238. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.1990.18.2.235>
- Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20, 141-151. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000116>
- Karić, T., & Mededović, J. (2021). Covid-19 conspiracy beliefs and containment-related behaviour: The role of political trust. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 175, 110697. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110697>
- Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1986). Beliefs about inequality: Americans' views of what is and what ought to be. Aldine De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351329002>
- Koos, S. (2019). Crises and the reconfiguration of solidarities in Europe-origins, scope, variations. *European Societies*, 21(5), 629-648. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2019.1616797>
- Koos, S., & Leuffen, D. (2020). Beds or bonds? Conditional solidarity in the coronavirus crisis. *Policy paper*, (1). <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/232084>
- Kutak, R. I. (1938). The sociology of crises: the Louisville Flood of 1937. *Social Forces*, 17(1), 66-72. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2571151>
- Liekefett, L., & Becker, J. (2021). Compliance with governmental restrictions during the coronavirus pandemic: A matter of personal self-protection or solidarity with people in risk groups?. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 60(3), 924-946. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12439>
- Maki, A., Dwyer, P. C., Blazek, S., Snyder, M., González, R., & Lay, S. (2019). Responding to natural disasters: Examining identity and prosociality in the context of a major earthquake. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 58(1), 66-87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12281>
- Melucci, A., & Lyyra, T. (1998). Collective action, change, and democracy. In M. Giugni, D. McAdam, & C. Tilly (Eds.), *From contention to democracy* (pp. 203-228). Rowman & Littlefield.

- Meuleman, B. (2019). The economic context of solidarity. Period vs. cohort differences in support for income redistribution in Britain and the United States. *European Societies*, 21(5), 774-801. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2019.1616792>
- Nylund-Gibson, K., & Choi, A. Y. (2018). Ten frequently asked questions about latent class analysis. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science*, 4(4), 440-461. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tps0000176>
- Observatorio de la Deuda Social Argentina. (2020). *Deudas sociales y desigualdades estructurales en la argentina 2010-2019. Aportes para una Agenda Sustentable de Desarrollo Humano Integral* [Diapositivas de PowerPoint]. Universidad Católica Argentina (UCA). <http://wadmin.uca.edu.ar/public/ckeditor/Observatorio%20Deuda%20Social/Presentaciones/2019/2019-Observatorio-Informe-Avance-5D.pdf>
- Perry, B. L., Aronson, B., & Pescosolido, B. A. (2021). Pandemic precarity: COVID-19 is exposing and exacerbating inequalities in the American heartland. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(8), Article e2020685118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2020685118>
- Piven, F. F., & Cloward, R. A. (1971). The relief of welfare. *Transaction*, 8(7), 31-39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02804129>
- Rao, L. L., Han, R., Ren, X. P., Bai, X. W., Zheng, R., Liu, H., Wang, Z., Li, J., Zhang, K., & Li, S. (2011). Disadvantage and prosocial behavior: The effects of the Wenchuan earthquake. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 32(1), 63-69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.07.002>
- Sachweh, P. (2016). Social justice and the welfare state: Institutions, outcomes, and attitudes in comparative perspective. In C. Sabagh & M. Schmitt (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice theory and research* (pp. 293-313). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3216-0_16
- Scholz, S. J. (2008). *Political Solidarity*. Penn State Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780271056609>
- Smith, K. B., & Stone, L. (1989). Rags, riches, and bootstraps: Beliefs about the causes of wealth and poverty. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 30(1), 93-107. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1989.tb01513.x>

- Starke, C. (2021). *European Solidarity Under Scrutiny*. Springer International Publishing.
- Stevenson, C., Costa, S., Easterbrook, M. J., McNamara, N., & Kellezi, B. (2020). Social cure processes help lower intergroup anxiety among neighborhood residents. *Political Psychology*, 41(6), 1093-1111. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12667>
- Svallfors, S. (2010). Public attitudes. In F. G. Castles, S. Leibfried, J. Lewis, H. Obinger, & C. Pierson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of the welfare state* (pp. 241-251). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199579396.003.0016>
- Tagler, M. J., & Cozzarelli, C. (2013). Feelings toward the poor and beliefs about the causes of poverty: The role of affective-cognitive consistency in help-giving. *The Journal of Psychology*, 147, 517-539. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2012.718721>
- Tekin, S., Sager, M., Bushey, A., Deng, Y., & Uluğ, Ö. M. (2021). How do people support each other in emergencies? A qualitative exploration of altruistic and prosocial behaviours during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 21(1), 1113-1140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12277>
- Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., Stellmacher, J., & Christ, O. (2004). The utility of a broader conceptualization of organizational identification: Which aspects really matter?. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(2), 171-191. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904774202135>
- Van Oorschot, W. (2000). Who should get what, and why? On deservingness criteria and the conditionality of solidarity among the public. *Policy & Politics*, 28(1), 33-48. <https://doi.org/10.1332/0305573002500811>
- Van Oorschot, W., Arts, W., & Halman, L. (2005). Welfare state effects on social capital and informal solidarity in the European Union: evidence from the 1999/2000 European Values Study. *Policy & Politics*, 33(1), 33-54. <https://pure.uvt.nl/ws/files/625796/welfare.pdf>
- Van Oorschot, W., & Komter, A. (1998). 'What is it that ties...? Theoretical perspectives on social bond'. *Sociale Wetenschappen* 41(3), 4-24. <https://research.tilburguniversity.edu/en/publications/what-is-that-ties-theoretical-perspectives-on-social-bond/>

- Vázquez, J. J., & Panadero, S. (2009). Atribuciones causales de la pobreza en los países menos desarrollados. *Perfiles latinoamericanos*, 17(34), 125-140.
- Wang, Z., Jetten, J., Steffens, N. K., Álvarez, B., Bentley, S. V., Salvador, B. G., Ionescu, O., Krug, H., Selvanathan, H., Tanjitpiyanond, P., Wibisono, S., Chen, S., Wang, J., Zhang, X., & Sun, S. (2023). A world together: Global citizen identification as a basis for prosociality in the face of COVID-19. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 26(1), 71-95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302211051619>
- Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92(4), 548-573. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.92.4.548>
- Weiner, B., Osborne, D., & Rudolph, U. (2011). An attributional analysis of reactions to poverty: The political ideology of the giver and the perceived morality of the receiver. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15(2), 199-213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868310387615>
- Wiwad, D., Mercier, B., Piff, P. K., Shariff, A., & Aknin, L. B. (2021). Recognizing the impact of COVID-19 on the poor alters attitudes towards poverty and inequality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 93, 104083. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2020.104083>
- Yúdica, L., Bastias, F., & Etchezahar, E. (2021). Poverty attributions and emotions associated with willingness to help and Government aid. *Psihologijske Teme*, 30(3), 509-524. <https://doi.org/10.31820/pt.30.3.6>
- Zucker, G. S., & Weiner, B. (1993). Conservatism and perceptions of poverty: An attributional analysis 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23(12), 925-943. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1993.tb01014.x>

Recibido: 30/12/2024

Revisado: 11/04/2025

Aceptado: 04/04/2026