TPM®

CAN CROSS-GROUP CONTACT PREDICT ADVANTAGED GROUP MEMBER'S WILLINGNESS TO ENGAGE IN COSTLY SOLIDARITY-BASED ACTION? YES, IF THE CONTACT IS POLITICIZED

JULIA C. BECKER
UNIVERSITY OF OSNABRUECK, GERMANY

STEPHEN C. WRIGHT
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY, CANADA

BIRTE SIEM
LEUPHANA UNIVERSITY LUENEBURG, GERMANY

Positive cross-group contact with disadvantaged group members can reduce prejudice, and, under certain conditions, increase solidarity-based action intentions among advantaged group members. In the present work, we distinguish between positive contact (friendly, cooperative) versus politicized contact (where group-based injustice is discussed) as well as between benevolent helping offered to the disadvantaged group versus costly solidarity-based actions. We predict that positive contact is related to benevolent helping, whereas politicized contact is related to willingness to engage in costly solidarity-based activism. In two studies (N = 257, N = 329), results support these hypotheses: for nonmigrants in Germany and the United Kingdom, positive contact with migrants, mediated by empathy, positive emotions, and movement identification, was a better predictor of benevolent helping, whereas politicized contact with migrants, mediated by anger and/or movement identification was a better predictor of endorsement of costly solidarity-based activism.

Keywords: Intergroup contact; Solidarity-based action; Social change; Allyship behavior; Politicized contact.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Julia Becker, Department of Psychology, Osnabrueck University, Seminarstr. 20, 49074 Osnabrueck, Germany. Email: julia.becker@uni-osnabrueck.de

Ayla, a migrant from Turkey has two nonmigrant friends: Maggie and Karen. When they spend time together, Ayla and Maggie have close, pleasant, and cooperative interactions, whereas Ayla's and Karen's contact is marked by regular discussions about racism and intergroup inequalities. Now, imagine there are protests against racism that are time-consuming, might involve direct struggles with the police, or if successful, might end in nonmigrants losing some of their privileges. Which of Ayla's friends would be more willing to participate in this costly solidarity-based activism? Maggie or Karen? In the present work, we examine the relation between positive and politicized cross-group contact and advantaged group member's willingness to engage in actions ranging from benevolent helping to costly solidarity-based activism.

Prior research illustrated that positive cross-group contact with disadvantaged group members can reduce prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), and, under certain conditions, can increase actions in support of the disadvantaged group and its members among advantaged group members (Hässler et al., 2020). These advantaged group members, who engage in solidarity-based actions, can be called allies: they do not

belong to the disadvantaged group but support disadvantaged group actions to improve their situation (e.g., Iyer & Ryan, 2009; Kutlaca et al., 2020; Mallett et al., 2008; Radke et al., 2020; Subašić et al., 2008). For instance, it has been shown that heterosexual people who report having positive cross-group contacts with lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer or questioning (LGBTQ) community members, are more likely to support egalitarian policies for this group (Hässler et al., 2020; see also, e.g., Cakal et al., 2011; Di Bernardo et al., 2021; Dixon et al., 2017; Pittinsky & Montoya, 2009; Reimer et al., 2017).

However, the relation between cross-group contact with disadvantaged groups and solidarity-based actions of advantaged groups is not necessarily positive (e.g., Becker & Wright, 2021; Saguy, Tausch, et al., 2009). We propose two previously neglected yet essential qualifiers to this relationship: the form of cross-group contact that is being engaged in; and the type of supportive social action the advantaged group member is being asked to engaged in.

Actions in Support of the Disadvantaged Groups

Recent research has distinguished between two forms of outgroup solidarity that advantaged group members can take (Louis et al., 2019; Thomas & McGarty, 2017, 2018). One is "benevolence," which aims at compassionately alleviating the suffering of others. The other is "activism," which aims to create greater equality by changing current structures and laws (Louis et al., 2019). Although these two forms of outgroup solidarity can co-occur, they appear to be driven by different philosophies and directed at different targets (Thomas & McGarty, 2017). Specifically, individuals who engage in benevolence aim to help individual victims. They transfer money or provide goods to members of the disadvantaged group, but are less interested in changing the structures that cause or maintain group-based inequality and injustice. Individuals who engage in activism, in contrast, aim to change the root structures that create and maintain group-based inequality and are less interested in helping individual victims. Thomas and McGarty (2017) empirically distinguished a benevolent helper profile from an activist supporter profile using latent profile analysis. Benevolent help was predicted primarily by feelings of sympathy, whereas activist support was predicted by social change beliefs, identification with an anti-poverty group, and feelings of outrage.

A New Focus: Activism involving Personal and Ingroup Costs

The existing research shows that activists seem more likely than benevolent helpers to endorse the need for social change to create a more equal society. However, in addition to this helper/activist distinction it is useful to consider whether all activists are the same. Recent research suggests that they are not. There appear to be different motives for activism that correspond with different levels of support for structural social change (Radke et al., 2020). To reach a more equal society, the disadvantaged group needs a greater share of resources and privileges. In many situations, this requires that the advantaged group must surrender some of their resources and privileges. In recent discussions of advantaged group activists, researchers have argued that "true" allies show unconditional solidarity, meaning that they engage in solidarity-based activism even when their ingroup will likely lose privileges as a result of social change. In contrast, advantaged group members who engage in outgroup support, but would not accept a loss of ingroup privileges, would not be considered "true" allies (Radke et al., 2020). However, when assessing advantaged group member's activism, most current measures of solidarity-based actions do not consider motivation and include actions that are ambiguous, at best, about whether they would lead to a loss of ingroup privilege.

In addition to threats to ingroup privilege, it is also useful to consider whether a particular solidarity-based action will have direct personal costs in terms of time, money (or other tangible resources), or the possibility of conflict and physical harm. These costs might also lead some advantaged group members to think twice before agreeing to participate. In a large-scale study conducted by Hässler et al. (2020) there were stronger positive effects of cross-group contact on support for actions like "working in solidarity" (e.g., "How willing are you to unite with (outgroup) to work for justice for (outgroup)?"), and low-cost actions (e.g., signing a petition). However, these positive effects of contact were weaker for measures of efforts to raise ingroup awareness (e.g., "when I come into contact with ingroup members, we talk about injustices in society regarding (outgroup)"). These findings suggest that contact may more easily inspire support for "low-cost actions" that are unlikely to undermine the advantaged group's privileged position or include significant personal costs. Moreover, experimental research (Saguy, Tausch, et al., 2009) illustrated that following cross-group contact that focuses on commonalities between advantaged and disadvantaged group members, despite the disadvantaged group member's expectations that the advantaged group members would behave more fairly, advantaged group members seemed unwilling to give up their privilege and continued to distribute resources in a way that strongly favored their own group (Saguy, Tausch, et al., 2009). In a nutshell, in order to evaluate the impact of cross-group contact on actions in support of the disadvantaged outgroup, it is essential to distinguish between benevolent helping, low-cost solidarity-based activism, and high-cost solidarity-based activism.

Positive versus Politicized Cross-Group Contact

Further, we argue that it is important to distinguish between positive contact as commonly understood in the contact literature and politicized cross-group contact. Positive contact should include at least some of Allport's (1954) four conditions — equal status, common goals, cooperation, support of authorities — and must provide the opportunity for building friendships (Pettigrew, 1998; Wright et al., 2005). Positive contact of this kind has many benefits in terms of reducing prejudice (e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), but it has also been implicated in undermining disadvantaged group members' interest in collective action for social change (e.g., Cakal et al., 2011; Dixon et al., 2010; MacInnis & Hodson, 2019; Reicher, 2007; Tausch et al., 2015; Tropp et al., 2012; Vezzali et al., 2017; Wright & Baray, 2012, Wright & Lubensky, 2009).

Politicized contact can also happen within close relationships (e.g., friends) and can be enjoyable. However, in contrast to what most other contact work describes as positive contact (i.e., friendly, affectively positive, harmonious), politicized contact requires that people talk with their contact partners about group-based injustices such as White privilege, the disadvantaged group member's experiences with discrimination, or the extent and causes of structural inequalities (Becker & Wright, 2021; Becker, et al., 2013; Zuniga et al., 2002). Zuniga and colleagues (2002) developed an example of a politicized cross-group contact program that aim to foster conversations about controversial issues so that people could develop a self-awareness of one's group membership in the context of systems of power and privilege and also develop alliances and other strategies of collaboration across differences (Zuniga et al., 2002). Prior work examined politicized contact, for instance, when analyzing the preferred content of intergroup encounters: do people prefer talk about power and social inequality between advantaged and disadvantaged groups, or about commonalities between the groups (Saguy, Pratto, et al., 2009). This work illustrated that advantaged group members have a stronger preference for talk about commonalities than about power dif-

ferences, whereas disadvantaged group members show the opposite preference (Saguy, Pratto, et al., 2009). In addition, it has been demonstrated that if people prioritize talk about differences between groups over commonalities in cross-group contact situations, the motivation for social change is higher in advantaged group members (Vezzali et al., 2017). Further, it has been shown that politicized contact does not undermine disadvantaged group members' interest in collective action (Becker et al., 2013), and, more important for the present work, it can, under certain conditions, increase the engagement in solidarity-based actions among members of the advantaged group. Research by Becker and Wright (2021) revealed that first-time positive cross-group contact alone did not increase advantaged group member's solidarity-based actions to reduce inequality even when it resulted in feelings of interpersonal connection. However, when the advantaged group member experienced a strong interpersonal connection with a disadvantaged group member who explicitly described the existing intergroup inequality as illegitimate, that is, when the contact was politicized, then contact was associated with increased endorsement of solidarity-based activism.

PRESENT RESEARCH

In two studies, we bring together work on actions in support of the disadvantaged group (distinguishing between benevolent helping, low-cost solidarity-based activism, and costly solidarity-based activism) with work contrasting positive with politicized cross-group contact. First, we expect that positive contact (compared to politicized contact) is more likely to predict benevolent helping for the following reasons. First, research shows that positive contact can heighten people's empathic responses (including both empathic concern and perspective taking), which, in turn, increased the likelihood of outgroup helping (e.g., Johnston & Glasford, 2018; Koschate et al., 2012). Beyond empathy, other positive emotions might also be important in explaining positive contact associations with benevolent helping. Pettigrew (1998) argues that positive contact creates positive affective ties, which in turn, explain reductions in prejudice. Moreover, people who are in a good mood are more likely to help others because it allows them to prolong their good feelings (Carlson et al., 1988). Therefore, we expect that positive cross-group contact leads to benevolent helping, because it inspires empathy and other positive emotions.

In contrast, we predict that politicized contact (compared to positive contact) is more likely to predict costly solidarity-based activism, because cross-group discussions about social inequalities are likely to develop and maintain social change goals and foster unconditional support for the outgroup. These, in turn, will supersede concerns about personal costs (in terms of time, finances, or a conflict potential) or ingroup costs (potential loss of ingroup privilege). Furthermore, research illustrated that feelings of anger/outrage (directed at the source of the problem, not the victim group) are central to inspire solidarity-based activism (Thomas et al., 2009, 2012). In fact, Thomas and colleagues label outrage the "social change emotion." Therefore, we expect that anger/outrage mediates the effects of politicized contact on solidarity-based activism, and that this will be especially true for costly forms of solidarity-based activism.

In addition, when people engage in solidarity-based activism, they need to experience a shared social identity as a supporter of the cause (e.g., Thomas et al., 2012). Thus, identification, particularly a politicized social identity (Simon & Klandermans, 2001), which involves identification with a social movement, seems relevant to inspiring solidarity-based activism and especially its costly forms. Indeed, research illustrated that social identification was a more important predictor of solidarity-based activism than of benevolent helping (e.g., Thomas & McGarty, 2017). Therefore, both identification with the relevant social movement and anger/outrage should be important for explaining the effect of politicized contact on solidar-

ity-based activism and especially on its costly forms. On the other hand, these particular variables should not be relevant in explaining the effect of positive contact on benevolent helping.

We conducted two correlational studies in the context of migration, one in Germany and the other in the United Kingdom. Participants were nonimmigrants and were asked for their positive and politicized contact with immigrants, for benevolent help, and different forms of activism to support immigrants. In order to assess costly solidarity-based activism, we included a range of activities, including activism that is time-consuming, financially costly, that can involve a potential intergroup conflict, and could lead to privilege loss. We also examine predictors of low-cost solidarity-based activism, because these actions "fall between" benevolent helping and costly-activism. They are not benevolent help toward an individual, because they seek group-level change. At the same time, they do not involve ingroup costs (privilege loss) and involve only minor personal costs (e.g., time to go to a demonstration, being seen in public and by the media).

STUDY 1

Method

Participants

A power analyses using a Monte-Carlo simulation revealed a need for 323 participants to find a medium-sized effect with 95% power when running a regression analyses with two parallel mediators (Schoemann et al., 2017).

Data were collected via Prolific Academic using the inclusion criteria: Germany as current country of residence, German nationality, and being White. Participants were paid 2.56 pounds for participating (this equals an average reward of £10.26/hr). Of the 323 participants, 66 had a migration background (they or one of their parents were born in another country) and were excluded from the sample. All participants correctly answered the attention check. The final sample consisted of 257 Germans (42% female), ranging in age from 18 to 65 years (M = 29.5, SD = 8.35). Data and material are uploaded at OSF: https://osf.io/3z4ge/

Design and Procedure

Participants completed a questionnaire including the following measures — additional measures are provided in the supplementary online material (SOM) at OSF: https://osf.io/3z4ge/.

Measures

Unless otherwise indicated, all items were measured on 7-point rating scales (1 = *not at all*, 7= *very much*).

Politicized contact was measured using five self-developed items, that all began with the stem, "Think about your closest contacts with immigrants (if you have only loose contacts, think about your loose contacts). When I have contact with immigrants, …": "We talk about White privilege," "We talk about xenophobia and racism," "We talk about the ways that nonimmigrants have privileges," "We talk about inequality between our groups," "We talk about the ways that immigrants are disadvantaged" (α =.90).

Positive contact was measured using the six items from Islam and Hewstone (1993) that began with the stem, "Think about your closest immigrant acquaintances and indicate the extent that contact with that person is …" "close," "equal," "voluntary," "intimate," "pleasant," and "cooperative" (α =.91).

We included one question as an *attention check*, "If you read this, please click on "very unlikely."

Mediators

Anger was measured using two items, both beginning with "When I have contact with immigrants, …," "I feel anger because of discrimination against immigrants," "I am angry because of the social injustice immigrants experience" (r = .88, p < .001).

Movement identification was measured with four items: "I identify with the movement against discrimination toward immigrants," "I identify with the Black Lives Matter Movement," "I identify with the movement for racial justice," "I identify with activists working to end racism" (α = .92).

Empathy was measured using two items, both beginning with "When I have contact with immigrants, …" "I feel empathy," "I try to take their perspective" (r = .68, p < .001).

Positive emotions were measured using two items, beginning with "When I have contact with immigrants, … "I feel happy," "I feel good" (r = .89, p < .001).

Dependent Variables

Solidarity-based activism intentions were measured with five subscales: one assessed low-cost activism and four assessed aspects of costly activism (the full measures can be seen in the SOM). Participants indicated how likely they were to take each action to protest together with immigrants for immigrant's rights and against racism on 7-point rating scales (1 = *very unlikely*, 7= *very likely*).

Low-cost solidarity-based activism subscale included eight items (e.g., "Participate in a demonstration that is peaceful).

Costly solidarity-based activism. Four subscales assessed different forms of costly activism. *Time-consuming activism* was measured with six items (e.g., "Participate in a demonstration in another city that involves a three-hour train ride." *Financially-costly activism* was assessed with two items (e.g., "Making a donation to an immigrant organization that would put a burden on my personal finances"). *Activism with conflict potential* was assessed with four items (e.g., "Participate in a demonstration that could involve a struggle with the police"). *Privilege-loss activism* was introduced by explaining that immigrants are underrepresented in journalism and positions of power in Germany. Participants were asked six items that explicitly indicated that they could involve a loss of power or position for the ingroup (e.g., "I would attend a demonstration demanding that immigrants receive more positions of power even if this means that nonimmigrants will lose these positions of power").

A factor analysis (principal axis analysis with promax rotation) using all costly and low-cost solidarity-based activism items resulted in four eigenvalues greater than 1 (13.70, 2.28, 1.82, 1.18). The items of three scales loaded on their respective factors (factor loadings: time-consuming activism > .42; financially-costly activism > .80; activism with conflict potential > .59), except two time-consuming activism items (Items 4 and 6; see SOM), which were deleted from the scale. However, the items assessing low-cost activism and the items assessing privilege-loss activism loaded together on one factor (factor loadings > .56). Therefore, we kept the eight original low-cost activism items, but did not create a separate scale for privilege-loss activism, because these items appeared to have more in common with low-cost than high-

cost activism. We will consider this finding further in the discussion. All four scales were reliable (low-cost activism, α = .93; time-consuming activism, α = .88; financially-costly activism, r = .88, p < .001; activism with conflict potential, α =.93).

Benevolent helping as measured with six items (e.g., "I would be willing to volunteer to help immigrants learn English," "When I see an immigrant person suffering, I would try to help them," α = .90).

Results

Descriptive statistics and correlations are displayed in Table 1. We tested our hypothesis that politicized contact would be a stronger predictor of costly solidarity-based activism, whereas positive contact would be a stronger predictor of benevolent helping using regression analyses, with positive and politicized contact as predictors for each dependent variable. Our examination of predictors of low-cost activism was exploratory.

TABLE 1
Means, standard deviations, and correlations of the all measures, Study 1

	M (*SD*)	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Politicized contact	3.42 (1.58)	.35**	.44**	.37**	.33**	.35**	.29**
2 Positive contact	5.72 (1.21)	1	.33**	.17*	.22**	.16*	.46**
3 Low-cost activism	4.08 (1.71)		1	.65**	.40**	.62**	.53**
4 Time-consuming activism	2.09 (1.28)			1	.39**	.71**	.23**
5 Financially-costly activism	1.69 (1.05)				1	.34**	.24**
6 Activism with conflict potential	2.31 (1.59)					1	.22**
7 Benevolent helping	5.82 (1.20)						1

Note. **p < .01. *p < .05.

The regression coefficients are displayed in Table 2. Both, politicized and positive contact, predicted willingness to engage in low-cost activism. A test for differences of the regression weights[1] showed that the strength of the two predictors did not differ, b = .07, SE = .07, t(256) = 1.09, p = .276.

In line with hypotheses, only politicized, but not positive contact significantly predicted all three forms of costly solidarity-based activism (time-consuming activism, financially-costly activism, and activism with conflict potential). The tests for differences of the regression weights were significant for time-consuming activism, b = .12, SE = .05, t(256) = 2.52, p = .012, and activism with conflict potential, b = .14, SE = .06, t(256) = 2.26, p = .025, but not for financially-costly activism, b = .05, SE = .04, t(256) = 1.31, p = .259.

In terms of benevolent helping, results show that both, positive and politicized contact positively predicted benevolent helping, but, as expected, the effect for positive contact was larger, (b = –.15, SE = .04, t(256) = –3.43, p = .001).

TABLE 2
Predictors of solidarity-based activism and benevolent helping (Study 1 to the left of the slash, Study 2 to the right of the slash)

Dependent variables	*Predictors*	*B*	*SE*	*t (256/328)*	*p*
Low-cost activism	Politicized contact	.41/.58	.06/.05	6.39/11.22	< .001
	Positive contact	.28/.29	.08/.07	3.30/4.41	.001/<.001
Time-consuming activism	Politicized contact	.29/.38	.05/.04	5.70/8.65	< .001
	Positive contact	.05/.11	.07/.06	0.69/1.88	.49/.062
Financially-costly activism	Politicized contact	.19/.39	.04/.05	4.57/8.70	< .001
	Positive contact	.10/.09	.06/.06	1.85/1.62	.07/.11
Activism with conflict potential	Politicized contact	.33/.43	.06/.05	5.24/8.61	< .001
	Positive contact	.06/.09	.08/.06	0.72/1.38	.473/.170
Privilege-loss activism	Politicized contact	-/.60	-/.05	-/11.86	-/< .001
	Positive contact	-/.17	-/.07	-/2.68	-/.008
Benvolent helping	Politicized contact	.11/.21	.05/.04	2.49/4.87	.01/< .001
	Positive contact	.40/.45	.06/.06	6.90/8.21	< .001

Mediations

In a second step, we tested the predicted mediation of the relation between politicized contact and costly solidarity-based activism by anger and movement identification, and the predicted mediation of the relation between positive contact and benevolent helping by empathy and positive emotions, using PROCESS (Hayes, 2018; Model 4, bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals [CI], 10,000 bootstrap samples).[2]

In the first three regressions, we used politicized contact as the predictor, positive contact as covariate, anger, movement identification, empathy, and positive emotions as potential mediators, and time-consuming activism (Regression 1), Financially-costly activism (Regression 2), and activism with conflict potential (Regression 3) as the outcome. The relations between the independent variable, mediators, and outcome are displayed in the SOM.

Time-consuming activism. When all variables were entered into the model, the total effects of politicized contact on time-consuming activism was reduced but the direct effect remained significant, b = .16, SE = .06, $t(256)$ = 2.98, p = .003, 95% CI [.06, .27]. The effect of politicized contact on time-consuming activism was mediated by movement identification, B = .07, SE = .03, 95% CI [.03, .13], but inconsistent with expectations, not by anger, B = .04, SE = .03, 95% CI [–.02, .10]. Time-consuming activism was not mediated by empathy, B = .01, SE = .01, 95% CI [–.01, .03], or positive emotions, B = .01, SE = .01, 95% CI [–.01, .02].

Financially-costly activism. When all variables were entered into the model, the total effect of politicized contact on financially-costly activism was reduced but the direct effect remained significant, b = .09, SE = .05, $t(256)$ = 2.02, p = .045, 95% CI [.002, .18]. The effect of politicized contact on financially-costly activism was mediated by anger, B = .10, SE = .02, 95% CI [.05, .15], but contrary to predictions, not by movement identification, B = .003, SE = .01, 95% CI [–.02, .03]. Financially-costly activism was not mediated by empathy, B = –.004, SE = .01, 95% CI [–.02, .01], or positive emotions, B = .002, SE = .01, 95% CI [–.01, .01].

Activism with conflict potential. When all variables were entered into the model, the total effect of politicized contact on activism with conflict potential was reduced but the direct effect remained significant, $b = .14$, $SE = .07$, $t(256) = 2.11$, $p = .036$, 95% CI [.01, .28]. The effect of politicized contact on activism with conflict potential was mediated by anger, $B = .08$, $SE = .04$, 95% CI [.01, .16], and movement identification, $B = .10$, $SE = .03$, 95% CI [.05, .16], but, as expected, not by empathy, $B = –.001$, $SE = .01$, 95% CI [–.02, .02], or positive emotions, $B = .001$, $SE = .01$, 95% CI [–.01, .03].[3]

Positive Contact and Benevolent Helping

We conducted a fourth mediation analysis with positive contact as the predictor, politicized contact as covariate, empathy, positive emotions, anger, and movement identification as potential mediators, and benevolent helping as outcome. When all variables were entered into the model, the total effect of positive contact on benevolent helping was reduced but the direct effect remained significant, $b = .16$, $SE = .07$, $t(256) = 2.27$, $p = .024$, 95% CI [.02, .28]. The effect of positive contact on benevolent helping was mediated by empathy, $B = .15$, $SE = .05$, 95% CI [.06, .25], and movement identification, $B = .05$, $SE = .02$, 95% CI [.01, .09], but not by anger, $B = .01$, $SE = .01$, 95% CI [–.002, .03], or positive emotions, $B = .04$, $SE = .05$, 95% CI [–.05, .13].

Discussion

We distinguished actions in support of migrants ranging from benevolent helping of a specific person to non-costly activism and to more costly forms of solidarity-based activism (that require time or finances, or involve a potential intergroup conflict) and tested whether these were predicted by positive versus politicized contact with migrants. Study 1 provides initial evidence that positive contact with disadvantaged group members per se does not lead advantaged group members to engage in solidarity-based activism that is costly. Instead, it was politicized contact that predicted intentions to engage in these potentially costly actions. On the other hand, positive contact was the better predictor of willingness to engage in benevolent helping.

We also found initial evidence for different mediators. Politicized contact's connection to costly activism was mediated by anger and/or movement identification, while positive contact's relationship with benevolent helping was mediated by empathy and movement identification. Only movement identification seems to be a relevant psychological process for both forms of outgroup solidarity.

A limitation of Study 1 was the measure assessing activism that could result in a loss of privileges. These items did not appear to be understood as costly, instead loading on a factor with the low-cost activism (e.g., peaceful demonstrations, signing a petition). Therefore, in Study 2, we attempted to increase the salience of privilege loss for these items. Moreover, although only politicized, but not positive, contact predicted the intention to engage in financially-costly activism, the regression weights for these two predictors did not differ significantly. Therefore, in Study 2, we add new items to the measure of financially-costly activism. Finally, in order to test the generalizability of the findings, we used a different cultural context. Thus, Study 2 offers a replication of Study 1 in the United Kingdom including several scale improvements.

STUDY 2

Method

Participants

The same power analysis used in Study 1 suggested 323 participants. Data were collected via Prolific Academic using the inclusion criteria: United Kingdom as current country of residence, British nationality, and being White. Participants were paid 2.56 pounds (this equals an average reward of £10.11/hr). Of the initial 350 participants, 11 had a migration background and 10 failed the attention check (which was the same as in Study 1) and were excluded. The final sample consisted of 329 British people (68% female), ranging in age from 18 to 79 years (M = 26.18, SD = 13.36). The study was pre-registered at *AsPredicted*: https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=xc8z95. Data and material are uploaded at OSF: https://osf.io/3z4ge/

Procedures and Measures

The procedure was almost identical to Study 1 with several improved measures. Unless otherwise indicated, all items were measured on 7-point rating scales (1 = *not at all*, 7= *very much*).

We used the same measures for politicized contact (α = .95), positive contact (α = .85), anger (r = .93), movement identification (α = .94), empathy (r = .74), positive emotions (r = .96), low-cost activism (α = .96), the four-item time-consuming activism scale (α = .92), activism with conflict potential (α = .96), and benevolent helping, (α = .93). We added two new items to create a four-item financially-costly activism scale (see SOM, α = .90).[4]

Privilege-loss activism. We used the items from the scale measuring actions that might result in loss of privileges used in Study 1, but slightly modified the wording and the instructions to increase the focus on privilege loss (see SOM). In addition, we developed three new items (e.g., "I would attend a protest claiming that nonimmigrants like me should pay more taxes so that there are more resources for immigrants").

A factor analysis using all costly and low-cost solidarity-based activism items resulted in four eigenvalues greater than 1 (18.02, 2.52, 1.42, 1.06). The items of three scales loaded on their respective factors (low-cost activism, financially-costly activism, and privilege-loss activism), except for three items in the privilege-loss scale (Items 1, 2, 4; see SOM), which were deleted, leaving a six-item scale (α = .96). However, time-consuming activism and activism with conflict potential loaded together. When a two-factor solution was forced in a separate factor analysis, the time-consuming activism items and the activism with conflict potential items loaded on their respective factors. We decided to leave these two as separate scales to be consistent with Study 1 (α = .92 and α = .96, respectively).

Results and Discussion

Descriptive statistics and correlations are displayed in Table 3. We conducted the same analyses as in Study 1. The regression coefficients are displayed in Table 2 to the right of the slash. As in Study 1, both politicized and positive contact, predicted willingness to engage in low-cost activism, but in Study 2 the effect for politicized contact was significantly larger, b = .14, SE = .05, $t(328)$ = 2.90, p = .004.

Similarly, both politicized and positive contact predicted willingness to engage in privilege-loss activism, but again the effect for politicized contact was significantly larger, b = .21, SE = .05, $t(328)$ = 4.40, p < .001.

Importantly, only politicized, and not positive contact predicted all others forms of costly solidarity-based activism (i.e., time-consuming, financially-costly activism, activism with conflict potential), and in all cases the differences in regression weights were significant, b = .14, SE = .04, $t(328)$ = 3.26, p = .001; b = .15, SE = .04, $t(328)$ = 3.46, p = .001; b = .17, SE = .05, $t(328)$ = 3.57, p < .001, respectively.

In terms of benevolent helping, as in Study 1, both, positive and politicized contact positively predicted benevolent helping, but, as predicted, the effect for positive contact was significantly larger, b = –.12, SE = .04, $t(328)$ = –2.98, p = .003.

TABLE 3
Means, standard deviations, and correlations of the measures, Study 2

	M (*SD*)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Politicized contact	3.36 (1.71)	.39**	.60**	.49**	.49**	.48**	.61**	.40**
2. Positive contact	4.93 (1.33)	1	.41**	.27**	.26**	.25**	.34**	.51**
3. Low-cost activism	4.01 (1.89)		1	.71**	.64**	.65**	.82**	.62**
4. Time-consuming activism	2.07 (1.46)			1	.70**	.85**	.75**	.40**
5. Financially-costly activism	2.34 (1.46)				1	.63**	.69**	.45**
6. Activism with conflict potential	2.14 (1.62)					1	.71**	.38**
7. Privilege-loss activism	2.87 (1.82)						1	.54**
8. Benevolent helping	5.42 (1.45)							1

Note. **p < .01.

Mediations

We repeated the mediation analyses conducted in Study 1.[5] In the first four regressions, we used politicized contact as the predictor, positive contact as covariate, anger, movement identification, empathy, and positive emotions as mediators, and time-consuming activism (Regression 1), financially-costly activism (Regression 2), activism with conflict potential (Regression 3), privilege-loss activism (Regression 4) as the outcome. The relations between the independent variable, mediators, and outcome are displayed in the SOM.

Time-consuming activism. When all variables were entered into the model, the total effect of politicized contact on time-consuming activism was reduced but still had a significant direct effect, b = .25, SE = .05, $t(328)$ = 5.22, p < .001, 95% CI [.15, .34]. As expected, the effect of politicized contact on time-consuming activism was mediated by anger, B = .05, SE = .02, 95% CI [.02, .10], and movement identification, B = .09, SE = .03, 95% CI [.05, .14], but not by empathy, B = .01, SE = .02, 95% CI [–.02, .04], or positive emotions, B = –.004, SE = .01, 95% CI [–.02, .01].

Financially-costly activism. When all variables were entered into the model, the total effect of politicized contact on financially-costly activism was reduced but still had a significant direct effect, b = .25, SE = .05, $t(328) = 5.12$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.15, .34]. The effect of politicized contact on financially-costly activism was mediated by anger, B = .05, SE = .02, 95% CI [.01, .10], and movement identification, B = .09, SE = .02, 95% CI [.05, .14], but not by empathy, B = –.01, SE = .02, 95% CI [–.42, .02], or positive emotions, B = .00, SE = .01, 95% CI [–.01, .01].

Activism with conflict potential. When all variables were entered into the model, the total effect of politicized contact on activism with conflict potential was reduced but still had a significant direct effect, b = .27, SE = .05, $t(328) = 5.07$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.17, .38]. The effect of politicized contact on activism with conflict potential was mediated by anger, B = .07, SE = .02, 95% CI [.02, .11], and movement identification, B = .09, SE = .02, 95% CI [.05, .14], but not by empathy, B = .004, SE = .02, 95% CI [–.03, .03], or positive emotions, B = –.01, SE = .01, 95% CI [–.03, .01].

Privilege-loss activism. When all variables were entered into the model, the total effect of politicized contact on privilege-loss activism was reduced but still had a significant direct effect, b = .39, SE = .05, $t(328) = 7.58$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.29, .49]. The effect of politicized contact on privilege-loss activism was mediated by anger, B = .09, SE = .02, 95% CI [.04, .14], and movement identification, B = .11, SE = .03, 95% CI [.07, .17], but not by empathy, B = .01, SE = .02, 95% CI [–.02, .04], or positive emotions, B = –.002, SE = .01, 95% CI [–.025, .01].[6]

Positive contact and benevolent helping. We conducted a further mediation analysis with positive contact as the predictor, politicized contact as covariate, empathy, positive emotions, anger, and movement identification as potential mediators, and benevolent helping as outcome. The total effect of positive contact on benevolent helping, was reduced but the direct effect remained significant, b = .18, SE = .05, $t(328) = 3.83$, p = .002, 95% CI [.09, .27]. The effect of positive contact on benevolent helping was mediated by empathy, b = .11, SE = .04, 95% CI [.05, .19], positive emotions, b = .05, SE = .03, 95% CI [.01, .11], and movement identification, b = .07, SE = .03, 95% CI [.03, .13], but not by anger, b = .03, SE = .02, 95% CI [–.002, .07].

In sum, the effects of Study 1 were largely replicated. Politicized contact was the better predictor of solidarity-based actions that included costs for the ingroup (privilege-loss activism) and costs for the individual activist (in terms of time, finances, and the potential for conflict) and this was explained in part by anger and identification with the movement. In contrast, positive contact was the better predictor of an interest in benevolent helping of individuals because people reported more positive emotions, empathy for the outgroup, and (against expectations but replicating findings of Study 1) because they identified with the movement. Overall, compared to Study 1, the effects in Study 2 were somewhat stronger. Presumably this was the result of the improved measures used in Study 2. Alternatively, it might be that the UK's current situation of leaving the EU made the topic of immigration highly salient and thus lead to stronger opinions regarding immigration-related topics (e.g., Meleady et al., 2017). Either, or both, of these could explain the more pronounced effects in Study 2.

General Discussion

Are advantaged group members who have contact with people from a disadvantaged group willing to support their contact partner's group even if their actions could result in a loss of ingroup privileges, or in substantial personal costs in terms of time, finances, or conflicts with the police implying potential physical harm, and arrest? Results of the present research suggest: yes, they can, but only when the contact is

politicized, meaning that they talk about group-based inequalities and discrimination that members of the outgroup face and reflect group-based privilege and disadvantage. In contrast, the typical form of positive and friendly cross-group contact that people often engage in is not enough to motivate engagement in actions that entail personal and ingroup costs.

Specifically, results of two studies conducted in Germany and the United Kingdom illustrate that nonimmigrants who have politicized contact (compared to positive contact) with immigrants are more willing to engage in activism that is time-consuming, financially costly, involves potential conflicts with the police, or a loss of ingroup privileges. This relation between politicized contact and costly solidarity-based actions was explained by feelings of anger because of discrimination against immigrants and the social injustice immigrants experience and/or a strong identification with the movement against the discrimination toward immigrants (for instance, Black Lives Matter).

In contrast, positive contact (compared to politicized contact) with immigrants was related to benevolent help (e.g., offering to help immigrants learn English) among nonimmigrant Germans and Britons. This relation was mediated by differences in empathy (in both studies) and positive emotions such as feeling happy and good (in Study 2). Against expectations, movement identification also mediated this effect in both studies. Two ideas might explain this effect. First, research illustrated that positive cross-group contact can lead to including the outgroup friend in the self (Davies et al., 2011), which can be conceptualized as a form of shared identity (Tropp & Wright, 2001). Furthermore, it is likely that people who have positive contact experiences and possibly close friendships with immigrants are likely to identify with people working to end racism (which was part of our measures), and are therefore, open to engage in benevolent helping behaviors. Other research also found that benevolent individual behaviors were also related to identification with people engaging in similar behaviors. For instance, in a study investigating motives for self- and group-protection in the context of the Coronavirus pandemic, identifying with the effort to stop the virus and to protect vulnerable groups in society was expected to predict solidarity-based group protection (complying with governmental restrictions to protect those in high-risk groups) but not personal self-protection. However, identification was related to both group-protection *and* personal self-protection (Liekefett & Becker, 2021). Thus, it seems that in order for people to become active even by engaging in individual behaviors (engaging in self-protection to avoid a virus, or by engaging in individual-directed benevolent helping), they may need to identify with other people taking similar actions.

We explored the predictors of low-cost activism, because these actions are neither individual benevolent helping, nor do they threaten the actor or their ingroup. In Study 1, both positive and politicized contact predicted low-cost activism to the same extent, whereas politicized contact was the more important predictor in Study 2. Interestingly, as reported in Notes 2 and 5, anger and movement identification mediated the relation between politicized contact and low-cost activism. These results are similar to the results for costly activism. This is also in line with the finding that in Study 1, a factor analysis did not distinguish between low-cost activism and privilege-loss activism, presumably because both types of activism included participation in demonstrations and public gatherings. Going to a demonstration, for instance, can be perceived as somewhat costly (because this takes time and people are publicly seen expressing their opinion). This might explain the similar mediation effects for low-cost and costly activism.

Strength, Limitations, and Social Implications

It is a strength of the present research that we used multiple scales to measure costly solidarity-based activism. As reported in the notes, the results remain stable when a single indicator of costly activism

is created, but it is valuable to see that these effects are stable across different kinds of personal, as well as, ingroup costs.

An important limitation is that the data is correlational, and does not allow for causal conclusions. It is very reasonable that politicized contact increases anger as advantaged group members learn about discrimination and injustice toward immigrants and heighten the identification with a movement, and that this, in turn, motivates participation in costly solidarity-based actions. However, the reverse causal direction is also possible. People who engage in costly solidarity-based actions might be more likely to have politicized contact with disadvantaged group members. Similarly, although positive cross-group contact can lead to benevolent behaviors (e.g., Koschate et al. 2012), it is also possible that engaging in individual helping behaviors offers people opportunities for positive contact with disadvantaged group members. Thus, future research should include experimental designs. A further limitation is that we do not consider the possibly that benevolent helping might in some cases involve potential personal costs. Acts of moral courage would be one example of benevolent helping that can be costly (Baumert et al., 2013). It is likely that acts of moral courage against racism is not only predicted by empathy, but also by feelings of moral obligation and anger (Halmburger et al., 2015). Thus, future research should connect with research on moral courage to examine the predictors and mechanisms associated with both low-cost and costly benevolent helping.

Based on the present work, we would add one addition to Allport's four "optimal" conditions for cross-group contact. Equal status, common goals, cooperation, and support of authorities provide the opportunity for cross-group friendships (Pettigrew, 1998; Wright et al., 2005), but it is also important to acknowledge differences between the groups, highlight the problems the disadvantaged group faces and for advantaged group members to acknowledge their privilege (Saguy, Pratto, et al. 2009). This kind of politicized contact can be very helpful in creating social change by: 1) avoiding possible undermining of disadvantaged group members interest in collective action (e.g., Becker et al., 2013); 2) motivating advantaged group members to take solidarity-based action (Vezzali et al., 2017), even for cases of first-time contact (Becker & Wright, 2021); and 3) motivating advantaged group members to risk personal and ingroup costs when engaging in solidarity-based activism. In line with this, Nagda and Gurin (2006) suggested that having an advantaged group member who is "just a friend" is not helpful in terms of social change — but connecting through politicized contact with someone who becomes "a just friend" who will take real risks to support disadvantaged groups in their fight may be very helpful in creating social change. Thus, we would add "politicized communication" as a further criterion for optimal cross-group contact.

NOTES

1. In order to calculate differences between regression weights, we included the sum of both predictors and the difference between both predictors in the regression equation (Regorz, 2021; Wheeler, 2016).
2. For exploratory purposes, we also tested a mediation to predict low-cost solidarity-based activism. The results show that the effect of politicized contact on low-cost activism was also mediated by anger and movement identification, but not empathy and positive emotions (see SOM).
3. For the purpose of simplicity, we also collapsed all three scales assessing costly solidarity-based activism into one scale and conducted a mediation analysis with this single dependent variable. The relation between politicized contact and costly solidarity-based activism was mediated by anger and movement identification (see SOM).
4. We also included a measure of harmony-seeking contact (e.g., "We try to be sure that nothing disturbs our harmony," "We try to feel good and avoid uncomfortable issues"; $\alpha = .80$), which was negatively related to the activism scales and unrelated to benevolent helping.

5. As in Study 1, we also tested the mediation model for low-cost activism. The results show that the effect of politicized contact on low-cost activism was also mediated by anger and movement identification, but not empathy and positive emotions (see SOM).
6. As in Study 1, we also collapsed all three scales assessing costly solidarity-based activism into one scale and conducted a mediation analysis with this single dependent variable. The relation between politicized contact and costly solidarity-based activism was mediated by anger and movement identification (see SOM).

Funding

This research was funded by the German Research Foundation (BE4648/4-2).

Acknowledgements

We thank Kim Terkuhlen and Kerstin Gerke for their help to finalize the surveys.

References

Baumert, A., Halmburger, A., & Schmitt, M. (2013). Interventions against norm violations: Dispositional determinants of self-reported and real moral courage. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39*, 1053-1068. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213490032

Becker, J. C., & Wright, S. C. (2021). Can cross-group contact turn advantaged group members into allies? The role of inequality-delegitimizing contact and interpersonal connection. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations.* https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302211015273

Becker, J. C., Wright S. C., Lubensky, M. E. & Zhou, S. (2013). Friend or Ally: Whether cross-group contact undermines collective action depends on what advantaged group members say (or don't say). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*, 442-455. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0146167213477155

Cakal, H., Hewstone, M., Schwar, G., & Heath, A. (2011). An investigation of the social identity model of collective action and the "sedative" effect of intergroup contact among Black and White students in South Africa. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 50*, 606-627. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219879111

Carlson, M., Charlin, V., & Miller, N. (1988). Positive mood and helping behavior: A test of six hypotheses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*(2), 211-229. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.55.2.211

Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Cross-group friendships and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 15*(4), 332-351. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868311411103

Di Bernardo, G. A., Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., McKeown, S., Cocco, V. M., Saguy, T., & Dixon, J. (2021). Fostering social change among advantaged and disadvantaged group members: Integrating intergroup contact and social identity perspectives on collective action. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *24*, 26-47. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430219889134

Dixon, J., Cakal, H., Khan, W., Osmany, M., Majumdar, S., & Hassan, M. (2017). Contact, political solidarity and collective action: An Indian case study of relations between historically disadvantaged communities. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 27*, 83-95. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2296

Dixon, J., Tropp, L. R., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2010). Let them eat harmony: Prejudice-reduction strategies and attitudes of historically disadvantaged groups. *Psychological Science, 19*, 76-80. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721410363366

Halmburger, A., Baumert, A., & Schmitt, M. (2015). Anger as driving factor of moral courage in comparison to guilt, and global mood: A multimethod approach. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *45*, 39-51. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2071

Hässler, T., Ullrich., J., Bernardino, M., Shnabel N., Van Laar C., Valdenegro, D., Sebben, S., Tropp, L. R., Visintin, E.-P., González, R., Ditlmann, R., Abrams, D., Selvanathan, H.-P., Brankovic, M., Wright, S. C., von Zimmerman, J., Pasek, M., Aydin, A. L., Žeželj, I., Pereira, A., Lantos, N. A., Sainz, M., Glenzl. A., Oberpfalzerová, H., Bilewicz, M., Kende, A., Kuzawinska, O., Otten, S., Maloku, E., Noor, M., Gul, P., Pistella, J., Baiocco, R., Jelic, M., Osin, E., Bareket, O., Biruski, D. C., Cook, J., Dawood. M., Droogendyk. L., Herrera Loyo, A., Kelmendi, K., & Ugarte, L. M. (2020). A large-scale test of the link between intergroup contact and support for social change. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *4*, 380-386. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0815-z

Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Islam, M. R., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Intergroup attributions and affective consequences in majority and minority groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(6), 936-950. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.64.6.936

Iyer, A., & Ryan, M. K. (2009). Why do men and women challenge gender discrimination in the workplace? The role of group status and in-group identification in predicting pathways to collective action. *Journal of Social Issues*, *65*, 791-814. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01625.x

Johnston, B. M., & Glasford, D. E. (2018). Intergroup contact and helping: How quality contact and empathy shape outgroup helping. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *21*(8), 1185-1201. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217711770

Koschate, M., Oethinger, S., Kuchenbrandt, D., & van Dick, R. (2012). Is an outgroup member in need a friend indeed? Personal and task-oriented contact as predictors of intergroup prosocial behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *42*(6), 717-728. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1879

Kutlaca, M., Radke, H. R. M., Iyer, A., Becker, J. C. (2020). Understanding allies' participation in social change: A multiple perspectives approach. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*, 1248-1258. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2720

Liekefett, L., & Becker, J. C. (2021). Compliance with governmental restrictions during the coronavirus pandemic – A matter of 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

Louis, W. R., Thomas, E., Chapman, C. M., Achia, T., Wibisono, S., Mirnajafi, Z., & Droogendyk L. (2019). Emerging research on intergroup prosociality: Group members' charitable giving, positive contact, allyship, and solidarity with others. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *13*(3), e12436. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12436

MacInnis, C. C., & Hodson, G. (2019). Extending the benefits of intergroup contact beyond attitudes: When does intergroup contact predict greater collective action support? *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology*, *3*, 11-22. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts5.23

Mallett, R. K., Huntsinger, J. R., Sinclair, S., & Swim, J. K. (2008). Seeing through their eyes: When majority group members take collective action on behalf of an outgroup. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *11*, 451-470. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430208095400

Meleady, R., Seger, C. R., & Vermue, M. (2017). Examining the role of positive and negative intergroup contact and anti-immigrant prejudice in Brexit. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *56*, 799-808. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12203

Nagda, B., & Gurin, P. (2006, June). Just a friend? Or a just friend? Paper presented at the 6th Biennial Convention of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues: Social Justice: Research, Action and Policy, Long Beach, CA.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*, 65-85. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 751-783. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Pittinsky, T. L. & Montoya, R. (2009). Sympathy and symhedonia in intergroup relations: The relationship of empathic sorrow and empathic joy to prejudice and allophilia. *Psicologia Sociale*, *4*, 347-364. https://doi.org/10.1482/30689

Radke, H. R. M., Kutlaca, M., Siem, B., Wright, S. C., & Becker, J. C. (2020). Beyond allyship: Motivations for advantaged group members to engage in action for disadvantaged groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *24*(4), 291-315. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868320918698

Regorz, A. (2021). *Vergleich Regressionsgewichte. Welcher Prädiktor hat den stärkeren Einfluss* [Comparison of regression weights. Which predictor has the stronger effect]. http://www.regorz-statistik.de/inhalte/vergleich_regressionsgewichte.html

Reicher, S. (2007). Rethinking the paradigm of prejudice. *South African Journal Psychology*, *35*, 412-432. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630703700410

Reimer, N. K., Becker, J. C., Benz, A., Christ, O., Dhont, K., Klocke, U., Neji, S., Rychlowska, M., Schmid, K., & Hewstone, M. (2017). Intergroup contact and social change: Implications of negative and positive contact for collective action in advantaged and disadvantaged groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *43*(1), 121-136. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167216676478

Saguy, T., Pratto, F., Dovidio, J. F., & Nadler, A. (2009). Talking about power: Group power and the desired content of intergroup interactions. In S. Demoulin, J.-P. Leyens, & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Intergroup misunderstandings: Impact of divergent social realities* (pp. 213-232). Psychology Press.

Saguy, T., Tausch, N., Dovidio, J. F., Pratto, F. (2009). The irony of harmony: Intergroup contact can produce false expectations for equality. *Psychological Science*, *20*, 114-121. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02261.x

Schoemann, A. M., Boulton, A. J., & Short, S. D. (2017). Determining power and sample size for simple and complex mediation models. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *8*(4), 379-386. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617715068

Simon, B., & Klandermans B. (2001). Politicized collective identity: A social psychological analysis. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 319-331. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.4.319

Subašić, E., Reynolds, K., & Turner, J. C. (2008). The political solidarity model of social change: Dynamics of self-categorization in intergroup power relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *12*, 330-352. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.4.319

Tausch, N., Saguy, T., & Bryson, J. (2015). How does intergroup contact affect social change? Its impact on collective action and individual mobility intentions among members of a disadvantaged group. *Journal of Social Issues*, *71*(3), 536-553. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12127

Thomas, E. F., & McGarty, C. (2009). The role of efficacy and moral outrage norms in creating the potential for international development activism through groupbased interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *48*, 115-134. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466608x313774

Thomas, E., & McGarty, C. (2017). When giving isn't enough: Responding to humanitarian emergencies through benevolent and activist support. In E. van Leeuwen & H. Zagefka (Eds). *Intergroup Helping* (pp. 369-388). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53026-0_18

Thomas, E. F., & McGarty, C. (2018), Giving versus acting: Using latent profile analysis to distinguish between benevolent and activist support for global poverty reduction. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *57*(1), 189-209. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12228

Thomas, E. F., Mavor, K. I., & McGarty, C. (2012). Social identities facilitate and encapsulate action-relevant constructs: A test of the social identity model of collective action. Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 15, 75–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430211413619

Tropp L. R., Hawi D. R., Van Laar C., & Levin, S. (2012). Cross-ethnic friendships, perceived discrimination, and their effects on ethnic activism over time: A longitudinal investigation of three ethnic minority groups. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *51*, 257-72. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02050.x

Tropp, L. R., & Wright, S. C. (2001). Ingroup identification as the inclusion of ingroup in the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*(5), 585-600. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201275007

Vezzali, L., Andrighetto, L., Capozza, D., Di Bernardo, G. A., & Saguy, T. (2017). Discussing differences between groups: The content of intergroup encounters and motivation for social change among members of advantaged groups. *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology*, *1*, 52-59. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts5.12

Wheeler, A. P. (2016). *Testing the equality of two regression coefficients*. https://andrewpwheeler.com/2016/10/19/testing-the-equality-of-two-regression-coefficients/

Wright, S. C., & Baray, G. (2012). Models of social change in social psychology: Collective action or prejudice reduction, conflict or harmony. In J. Dixon & M. Levine (Eds.), *Beyond Prejudice: Extending the social psychology of intergroup conflict, inequality and social change* (pp. 225-247). Cambridge University Press.

Wright, S. C., Brody, S. M., & Aron, A. (2005). Intergroup contact: Still our best hope for improving intergroup relations. In C. S. Crandall, & M. Schaller (Eds.), *Social psychology of prejudice: Historical and contemporary issues* (pp. 115-142). Lewinian Press.

Wright, S. C., & Lubensky, M., E. (2009). The struggle for equality: Collective action versus prejudice reduction. In S. Demoulin, J. P. Leyens, & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Intergroup misunderstandings: Impact of divergent social realities* (pp. 291-310). Psychology Press.

Zuniga, X., Nagda, B. A., & Sevig, T. D. (2002). Intergroup dialogues: An Educational model for cultivating engagement across differences. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *35*, 7-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/713845248