

"This is the pre-peer reviewed version of the following article: Hässler, T., Uluğ, Ö. M., Kappmeier, M., & Travelgino, G. (2020). Intergroup Contact and Social Change: An Integrated Contact-Collective Action Model. Journal of Social Issues, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12412>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions."

Intergroup Contact and Social Change: An Integrated Contact-Collective Action Model

Authors:

Tabea Hässler (University of Zurich)

Özden Melis Uluğ (Clark University)

Mariska Kappmeier (University of Otago)

Giovanni A. Travaglino (University of Kent)

Corresponding author: Tabea Hässler (tabea.haessler@uzh.ch)

Tabea.haessler@uzh.ch

Word count: 7'326

Abstract

Previous research has shown that positive intergroup contact among disadvantaged group members may predict a so-called ‘sedative’ effect according to which positive contact is associated with reduced support for social change. Conversely, positive contact is associated with increased support for social change toward equality among advantaged group members. This raises the important question of under which circumstances intergroup contact can encourage support for social change among *both* disadvantaged and advantaged groups. In this theoretical article, we tackle this question by introducing a new Integrated Contact-Collective Action Model (ICCAM). We first provide an up-to-date review of how intergroup contact may promote or hinder social change for both disadvantaged and advantaged groups. We, then, use ICCAM to examine *when* the many forms of intergroup contact promote or hinder support for social change, proposing the existence of two different paths for disadvantaged and advantaged group members. Finally, we discuss the implications of the model for social intervention and make policy recommendations stemming from a review of available evidence.

Keywords: intergroup contact, collective action, social change, disadvantaged groups, advantaged groups, ICCAM.

Intergroup Contact and Social Change: An Integrated Contact-Collective Action Model

Despite a general social trend towards greater equality, discrimination based on sex, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, and other types of identities are still pervasive throughout the world (Mendos, 2019; United Nations DESA, 2016; United Nations Women, 2018). Importantly, inequality is not only a problem for members of disadvantaged groups, but also an issue for advantaged group members, to the extent that they are concerned with a just and fair society. Members of both disadvantaged and advantaged groups should, therefore, become involved in changing society towards greater social justice.

A way to promote support for social change beyond group divides may be to enable people from different social groups to interact together in positive ways. In social psychology, this is known as *positive contact* (Allport, 1954). Importantly, members of disadvantaged and advantaged groups often have different degrees of resources, power, and status. Bringing members of both groups into positive contact may therefore have different implications for social change, depending on the groups' relative positions in the social hierarchy (for a theoretical discussion, see Kteily & McClanahan, 2020). Members of advantaged groups may, sometimes, become more likely to embrace the plight of the disadvantaged, thus showing more support for social change (Hässler, Ullrich, Bernardino, et al., 2020). Perhaps ironically, members of disadvantaged groups may embrace the goal of more intergroup harmony, thus losing sight of their struggle towards equality (Hässler, Ullrich, Bernardino, et al., 2020; Saguy et al., 2016; Wright & Lubensky, 2009). This raises the important question of what the conditions are under which intergroup contact may promote support for social change toward greater equality among both disadvantaged and advantaged group members.

In this article, we tackle this question by synthesizing previous research into a theoretical model, the Integrated Contact-Collective Action Model (ICCAM). ICCAM's

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

objective is to synthesize previous research on intergroup contact and collective action, as well as propose some untested moderators of the link between intergroup contact and support for social change. Thus, ICCAM provides a framework for understanding *when* (i.e., moderators) intergroup contact may result in heightened or reduced support for social change toward greater equality among both disadvantaged and advantaged groups. ICCAM differentiates between paths relevant for disadvantaged (Figure 1) and advantaged (Figure 2) group members. The model is based on the assumption that intergroup contact is compatible with efforts to promote social change toward greater equality when group-specific needs of both groups are met and existing inequalities are openly addressed. We thus hope that this model will provide a useful theoretical framework for organizing future research and guiding practitioners that aim to promote stronger social justice in the relationships between different groups.

The Link Between Intergroup Contact and Support for Social Change

Previous research has already established the existence of an effect of intergroup contact on social change both for disadvantaged and advantaged groups (Wright & Lubensky, 2009). The present article extends this work by integrating the literature on (1) intergroup contact and (2) support for social change. When bringing both lines of research together, it is important to keep in mind that the literatures on intergroup contact and on support for social change have long been developing in isolation. Research on intergroup contact has mostly focused on reducing prejudice among advantaged groups (Lemmer & Wagner, 2015; Paluck et al., 2019; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). In contrast, research on social change has mainly addressed the precursors of disadvantaged groups' mobilization, such as ingroup identification, perceived injustice, and perceived efficacy (e.g., van Zomeren et al., 2008).

According to Allport's (1954) original contact hypothesis, contact between social groups is effective in reducing prejudice when members within the contact situation have

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

equal status, work on common goals, do so cooperatively, and are supported by authorities. In line with this idea, intergroup contact has been shown to reduce prejudice and foster positive relationships among multiple groups, in various contexts, in areas with marked conflicts, and even with other outgroups not involved in the encounter (Al Ramiah & Hewstone, 2013; Boin et al., in press; Lemmer & Wagner, 2015; Paluck et al., 2019; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Uluğ & Cohrs, 2017; White et al., in press). Research has also demonstrated that not all the conditions initially listed by Allport are necessary for the positive effects of contact to occur (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

More recent work has examined a host of different factors that may alter the impact and effectiveness of contact. For instance, more intimate intergroup contact may reduce prejudice to a larger extent than more superficial forms of intergroup contact (Davies et al., 2011). Importantly, intergroup contact can work through a cognitive route (e.g., by increasing knowledge about the other group and perspective-taking) and an affective route (e.g., by decreasing anxiety, threat, and fear as well as increasing empathy; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Although intergroup contact is successful in promoting positive attitudes among both advantaged and disadvantaged groups, the relationship between intergroup contact and prejudice reduction is smaller for disadvantaged groups compared to advantaged groups (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005).

While previous research on intergroup contact revolves around the objectives of prejudice reduction and increasing intergroup harmony, most of the work on support for social change has focused on collective action that aims to bring about social justice. Research on support for social change has mainly addressed the precursors of disadvantaged groups' mobilization (van Zomeren et al., 2008). A popular model of the psychological motivators of disadvantaged group members' support for social change is the Social Identity Model of Collective Action (SIMCA; van Zomeren et al., 2008), which integrates

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

assumptions based on Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986), Relative Deprivation Theory (Runciman & Runciman, 1966; Smith et al., 2012; Walker & Smith, 2002), and Resource Mobilization Theory (e.g., Klandermans, 1984; McCarthy & Zald, 1977) into a coherent theoretical framework. A large body of research supports SIMCA's predictions that identification, perceived illegitimacy of group disparities and anger about them, as well as group efficacy are 'core' predictors that drive collective support for social change among disadvantaged group members (e.g., Çakal et al., 2011; Eisner, Hässler, et al., 2020; Odağ et al., 2016; van Zomeren et al., 2008; for a theoretical review see also van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2013).

Many successful movements, however, have mobilized not only members of disadvantaged groups but also of advantaged groups. For example, the Black Lives Matter movement has mobilized thousands of Black people and White allies. Similarly, women and their allies have long been marching worldwide to demand progressive gender policies, greater inclusion, and representation of all people. In addition, large-scale demonstrations by the LGBTIQ+ movement – supported by cis-heterosexual allies – have paved the way for growing legal equality in many Western countries. Research has only recently begun to examine the predictors of support for social change among advantaged groups on behalf of the disadvantaged (for a theoretical framework see Radke et al., 2020). Intergroup contact fosters more inclusive identification (Di Bernardo et al., 2019; Reimer et al., 2017; Reimer et al., 2020), which promotes advantaged group members' support for social change on behalf of disadvantaged groups (Di Bernardo et al., 2019; Kunst et al., 2018; Reicher et al., 2006; Reimer et al., 2017). Moreover, emotion-based variables such as increased guilt and empathy toward the disadvantaged (Mallet et al., 2008; Selvanathan et al., 2018), decreased anxiety and prejudice (Turoy-Smith et al., 2013) and cognitive-based variables such as increased perspective-taking (Çakal et al., 2019) and increased awareness of privilege (Uluğ & Tropp,

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

in press) play an important role in advantaged group members' decisions to act on behalf of disadvantaged group members.

Research integrating intergroup contact and support for social change points out an asymmetrical effect of contact on disadvantaged and advantaged group members' support for social change. While positive intergroup contact seems to increase support for social change toward greater equality among advantaged group members (Hässler, Ullrich, Bernardino, et al., 2020), some scholars have cautioned that intergroup contact may directly affect and weaken core predictors of collective action among disadvantaged group members (Dixon et al., 2010). These scholars contend that intergroup contact reduces prejudice between groups but also alleviates disadvantaged groups' perception of inequality and, in turn, discourages them from supporting social change (Saguy et al., 2009; Wright & Lubensky, 2009). For instance, positive intergroup contact may hinder support for social change among members of disadvantaged groups by reducing awareness of existing inequalities, increasing expectations of fair treatment by advantaged group members (Saguy et al., 2009), and increasing the perceived permeability of the boundaries between advantaged and disadvantaged groups (Wright & Lubensky, 2009). In so doing, intergroup contact may limit opportunities for mobilization against deeply entrenched structural inequalities (Dixon et al., 2010; Halabi & Sonnenschein, 2004; Saguy et al., 2009; Thiessen & Darweish, 2018).

Recent experimental, cross-sectional, and longitudinal studies conducted in different settings and geographical areas, examining different social groups and various forms of support for social change to increase social equality, have provided empirical evidence that positive intergroup contact is in general negatively associated with the disadvantaged groups' support for social change (e.g., Çakal et al., 2011; Dixon et al., 2007; Hässler, Ullrich, Bernardino, et al., 2020; Kamberi et al., 2017; Saguy et al., 2009; Tausch & Becker, 2012; Tausch et al., 2015; Tropp et al., 2012). For instance, Reicher (2012, p. 43) argued that

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

“contact might make for a more civil society, but it maintains an unequal society.” Reaching harmony and reaching equality, however, do not have to be incompatible goals (e.g., Hässler, Ullrich, Sebben, et al., 2020). Consequently, interventions and policies that are grounded in intergroup contact and aim to improve relationships between groups, need to be carefully designed not to perpetuate structural inequalities (Dovidio et al., 2016; Thiessen & Darweish, 2018).

The goal of the present paper is to provide a roadmap for future research and applied interventions alike that aim to promote social justice. We hope that the Integrated Contact and Collective Action Model (ICCAM) contributes to the understanding of the circumstances under which intergroup contact can promote support for social change toward greater equality. Importantly, social change does not happen in a vacuum but needs the support of all groups involved. Therefore, we not only synthesize previous research in a theoretical framework for both disadvantaged (see Figure 1) and advantaged groups (see Figure 2) but also suggest new moderators that have not been tested yet. Below, we first discuss the model for the disadvantaged groups.

Intergroup Contact and Collective Action Model for Disadvantaged Groups

Although research suggests that intergroup contact is often negatively associated with disadvantaged group members' support for social change, a growing body of research suggests that this is not an inevitable outcome of contact. By formalizing and synthesizing moderators proposed by previous research as well as suggesting new ones, the ICCAM helps us to better understand when positive contact between groups is compatible with efforts to promote disadvantaged group members' support for social change. Below, we discuss several social-psychological constructs that are likely to moderate the contact-support for social change link. Figure 1 visualizes the moderators for disadvantaged group members. Since intergroup contact can dampen disadvantaged groups' support for social change, we postulate

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

a negative relationship between intergroup contact and collective action. The moderator above the direct path potentially mitigates the negative effect of intergroup contact, while the moderator below the path potentially reinforces it.

[Insert Figure 1 here]

Types of Contact and Support for Social Change

It is crucial to recognize that there are various forms, contents, and natures of intergroup contact and efforts for social change. For instance, contact may be *extended* (i.e., group members may merely know of people from their own group who have contact with people from another group; Wright et al., 1997), *vicarious* (i.e., when members observe an intergroup interaction; Gómez & Huici, 2008), or *imagined* (Crisp & Turner, 2009).

Alternatively, contact may involve either acquaintances, friends, or romantic partners (e.g., Pettigrew et al., 2007; Marinucci et al., in press). Moreover, contact may be *voluntary* or *non-voluntary* (Pettigrew et al., 2011). All of these different forms of contact may differ in their frequency (Hayward et al., 2017) and valence, ranging from *positive* to *negative* in contact experience (e.g., Barlow et al., 2012; Paolini et al., 2010; Reimer et al., 2017; Schäfer et al., in press). To establish *when* intergroup contact is associated with support for social change among disadvantaged groups, it is necessary to systematically assess different forms of intergroup contact.

The results of a large recent multi-national study (Hässler, Ullrich, Bernardino, et al., 2020) indicate that ethnic minorities and LGBTIQ+ groups show lower support for social change when they experience more positive and intimate contact (i.e., friendship) or lack negative contact experiences. However, solely increasing the quantity or frequency of direct and indirect contact with advantaged group members does not seem to dampen disadvantaged group members' support for social change to any significant degree. Other research indicates that negative contact with advantaged group members seems to be associated with more

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

support for social change (Graf & Sczesny, 2019; Hayward et al., 2018; Reimer et al., 2017; but see Bagci & Turnuklu, 2019). Considered simultaneously, these findings indicate that disadvantaged group members who engage in more positive and intimate contact with advantaged groups members are less likely to attend demonstrations, sign petitions, raise peers' awareness of inequality, or support empowering policies for their own groups – exhibiting the so-called 'sedative' effect (Çakal et al., 2011).

Engagement in protest action can also take multiple forms. These include raising peers' awareness of inequality, signing petitions, and sharing content on social media. They may also involve attending demonstrations, supporting policies that empower disadvantaged groups, or working in solidarity with other groups (e.g., Hässler, Ullrich, Bernardino, et al., 2020; Klandermans, 2004; Saab et al., 2017; Subašić et al., 2008). Furthermore, individuals might engage in violent collective action such as vandalism or terrorist acts, or express support for disruptive groups that attack the system (e.g., Tausch et al., 2011; Travaglino, 2019). To establish *when* intergroup contact is associated with support for social change among disadvantaged and advantaged groups, it is, therefore, necessary to systematically assess the relationship between all these different forms of intergroup contact and actions for social change (Hässler, Ullrich, Bernardino, et al., 2020). ICCAM suggests that more positive and intimate forms of intergroup contact, such as intergroup friendships, may reduce participation in particularly costly forms of support for social change such as participating in demonstrations and strikes. In contrast, positive and intimate forms of contact seem to have less impact on less costly forms of collective action – such as signing petitions or voting (see also Hässler, Ullrich, Bernardino, et al., 2020).

Perceived Illegitimacy of Group Differences

People need to be aware of group disparities and perceive them as illegitimate before they demand social change (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986; van Zomeren et al., 2008). Yet,

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

people may not always perceive group-based disparities to be illegitimate because structural inequalities are characterized by ambiguity concerning the advantaged group's culpability (Galtung, 1969). Indeed, disadvantaged group members may believe that they deserve their position in the social hierarchy (Jost et al., 2004; Jost et al., 2015; Major, 1994). Importantly, however, members of disadvantaged groups differ in the degree to which they perceive group differences as illegitimate (Leach et al., 2002) and the system as fair (Jost & Banaji, 1994). These differences in perception of illegitimacy, in turn, should shape their reaction to existing inequalities such as the emergence of group-specific needs (Hässler et al., 2019). While disadvantaged group members who believe that group differences are legitimate may defend the status quo, those who perceive group differences as illegitimate may challenge them (Hässler et al., 2019; Jost, Becker, et al., 2017; Jost et al., 2012).

ICCAM proposes that individual differences in perception of inequalities and the system in which people live in (i.e., the extent to which they justify current social arrangements; Jost et al., 2015) should also be crucial moderators that explain under which circumstances intergroup contact does (not) promote support for social change among disadvantaged group members. For instance, individuals who are more knowledgeable about group disparities and have lower system justification tendencies should be more eager to talk about power relations during intergroup encounters with the hope of ending injustice by promoting greater social equality (Saguy et al., 2008). In contrast, individuals who are less knowledgeable about group disparities or more likely to justify the system may abide by the preferences of advantaged group members to talk about similarities between groups (Saguy et al., 2008) and about shared hopes of achieving intergroup harmony instead. Both these latter topics may further divert disadvantaged individuals' attention away from existing group disparities (Hasan-Aslih et al., 2019; Osborne et al., 2019; Saguy et al., 2009). Consequently, the ICCAM suggests that perceptions of greater inequality and lower system justification

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

should attenuate the negative link between intergroup contact and support for social change toward greater equality among disadvantaged group members.

Satisfaction of the Group-Specific Need for Empowerment

A recent stream of research suggests that the content of intergroup contact (e.g., whether it is empowering or not) may be a crucial moderator that explains under which circumstances intergroup contact promotes support for social change among disadvantaged group members. For instance, evidence indicates that contact with advantaged group members who clearly describe the group disparity as illegitimate (Becker et al., 2013), communicate support for social change (Droogendyk, Louis, & Wright, 2016; Techakesari et al., 2017), convey status-based respect (Glasford & Johnston, 2018), or empower disadvantaged group members (Hässler, Ullrich, Sebben, et al., 2020) does not appear to undermine collective efforts for social change.

These findings are in line with the assumptions of the needs-based model (Nadler & Shnabel, 2015), which postulates that conflict threatens disadvantaged and advantaged group members' identities asymmetrically. People often judge themselves and others along two fundamental psychological dimensions (Abele & Wojciszke, 2013): 1) the *agency* dimension, representing constructs such as competence, respect, strength, influence, and self-determination and 2) the *moral-social* (or communion) dimension, representing constructs such as warmth, sociability, trustworthiness, and morality (see also the stereotype content model, which uses the terms "competence" and "warmth" to denote these dimensions; Fiske et al., 2007). The needs-based model proposes that members of victimized groups experience a threat to their agentic identity, namely, to their group's respect, perceived competence, and ability to control its outcomes. Therefore, they experience a heightened need for empowerment (i.e., they wish to restore their group's identity as agentic and competent). The satisfaction of the group-specific need for empowerment by advantaged group members

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

should promote support for greater equality among members of disadvantaged groups (see also Shnabel & Ullrich, 2013).

The problem with many contact interventions is that they do not address the need for empowerment because they focus on commonalities rather than group disparities, with the goal of establishing warmer relations between groups (e.g., Coexistence Model or the Joint Projects Model; see Maoz, 2011 for a discussion). Commonality-focused intergroup contact has been shown to draw attention away from group disparities (Saguy & Chernyak-Hai, 2012; Saguy et al., 2009; Thiessen & Darweish, 2018) or to lead to dissatisfaction and frustration on the side of the disadvantaged group (Halabi & Sonnenschein, 2004). Consequently, intergroup contact interventions aiming to promote social change should not only focus on commonalities between groups but also make existing group differences an active topic of the interaction between advantaged and disadvantaged group members (see also Vezzali et al., 2017; Tropp et al., 2021). ICCAM proposes that greater empowerment during intergroup contact, the ability of disadvantaged group members to express their perspective (see work on perspective giving, Bruneau & Saxe, 2012), and more discussion of existing inequalities would attenuate the negative link between intergroup contact and support for social change among disadvantaged group members.

Levels of Categorization

According to Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986) and Self-Categorization Theory (Turner, 1985), individuals' personal and collective identities are critical in determining their responses and reactions to others (see Hornsey, 2008 for an overview). A large body of research has examined the conditions that enable intergroup contact to alter the inclusiveness of individuals' processes of social categorization (Dovidio & Gartner, 2010; Pettigrew, 1998). This work suggests that intergroup contact may not only affect people's identification with their group, but also alter how people categorize others.

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Thus, we propose that a category's level of inclusiveness may be a relevant moderator of the association between intergroup contact and support for social change.

On the one hand, perceiving a sharp distinction between disadvantaged and advantaged groups ('us' versus 'them') may pose obstacles to disadvantaged group members' engagement in collective action with allies from advantaged groups. This is especially the case when groups have a history of conflict (Hasan-Aslih et al., 2020), where intergroup trust tends to be eroded (Kappmeier, 2016). In such situations, there may be little intergroup trust, and disadvantaged group members may perceive advantaged group members' support as ineffective or even damaging (see Droogendyk, Wright, et al., 2016 for a discussion). Conversely, perceiving the disadvantaged and advantaged groups as belonging to a common category (a shared 'we'; see Gartner et al., 1993) may undermine disadvantaged group members' support for social change. This is because a common identity makes earlier categorizations less salient (Brown & Turner, 1979), diverting attention away from intergroup disparities (Ufkes et al., 2016).

A solution to this dilemma may be to preserve differences between disadvantaged and advantaged groups in the context of a shared superordinate category (i.e., a dual identity; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone & Brown, 1986). A dual identity may foster positive attitudes toward allies while preserving awareness of intergroup disparities. It may, therefore, encourage support for social change among disadvantaged group members. In line with this reasoning, research indicates that intergroup contact does not necessarily entail a sedative effect when members of a disadvantaged group identify with both the superordinate category and the subordinate disadvantaged group (Pereira et al., 2017; Ufkes et al., 2016). Finally, individuals may also perceive themselves as unique individuals rather than group members during intergroup contact (deategorization; Brewer & Miller, 1984).

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

To summarize, ICCAM suggests that intergroup contact may promote social change most effectively when a disadvantaged group category (e.g., a religious minority identity) remains salient in the context of a superordinate category (e.g., a national identity).

Preserving a dual identity would enable disadvantaged group members to remain aware of intergroup inequalities while also promoting their willingness to work in solidarity with allies from advantaged groups. Thus, a dual identity may attenuate the sedative effect of intergroup contact on support for social change.

Intergroup Contact and Collective Action Model for Advantaged Groups

While it is fundamental that disadvantaged group members question the status quo and raise awareness of inequalities (Droogendyk, Wright, et al., 2016; Wright & Baray, 2012), social change often requires the active engagement of both disadvantaged and advantaged groups. Importantly, advantaged groups can (and often do) exert more power over the intergroup relationship based on their privileged position. Therefore, the action of disadvantaged groups alone may rarely be sufficient in achieving the desired social change, which is also reflected in the fact that many successful social movements have recruited not only members of the disadvantaged groups but also *allies* from advantaged groups. But when do members of advantaged groups support social change toward greater justice, even at the expense of their own privileges? In the next section, we will provide some initial answers to this question by discussing when intergroup contact may encourage stronger or weaker support for social change among advantaged group members. Figure 2 visualizes the proposed path for the advantaged group. We postulate a positive direct effect of intergroup contact on support for social change. The moderators above the path are hypothesized to amplify this effect, while the moderators below the path are hypothesized to dampen this effect.

[Insert Figure 2 here]

Types of Intergroup Contact and Support for Social Change

Since positive attitudes toward disadvantaged group members may increase individuals' engagement in solidarity-based collective action (e.g., Reimer et al., 2017), positive intergroup contact should be a key motivator for advantaged groups' support for social change toward greater equality. There is robust empirical evidence that various forms of positive intergroup contact, especially intimate forms of intergroup contact such as intergroup friendships, are positively associated with advantaged group members' support for social change (e.g., Çakal et al., 2019; Fingerhut, 2011; Hässler, Ullrich, Bernardino, et al., 2020; Hoskin et al., 2019; Kotzur et al., 2019; Lewis, 2011; Reimer et al., 2017; Selvanathan et al., 2018; Turoy-Smith et al., 2013). Furthermore, recent research suggests that advantaged group members' closeness to people targeted by prejudice is central to bridging the gap between intentions to support social change and actual behavior (Tropp & Uluğ, 2019).

Advantaged group members can also engage in an array of different behaviors to support social change toward greater equality. Results from a large-scale multi-national study (Hässler, Ullrich, Bernardino, et al., 2020) indicate that more and better intergroup contact seems to particularly increase advantaged group members' willingness to stand in solidarity with the disadvantaged group for social change and their engagement in low-cost collective action. However, intergroup contact seems less effective in increasing advantaged group members' willingness to raise ingroup-awareness about inequalities. This is problematic, considering that critical consciousness of existing inequalities is central to challenging them (Vollhardt & Twali, 2016). Therefore, advantaged groups' unwillingness to confront inequalities may contribute to masking existing privileges and may undermine a powerful way to change the hearts and minds of those advantaged group members who perceive group-based disparities as legitimate (see also Droogendyk, Louis, & Wright, 2016). In sum, ICCAM suggests that more frequent and more intimate positive intergroup contact

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

strengthens the positive effect of intergroup contact on advantaged group members' support for social change toward greater equality. Importantly, however, this positive effect could be attenuated for more costly forms of collective action (e.g., demonstrations) and for those actions that aim to increase awareness among advantaged group members.

Perceived Illegitimacy of Group Differences

According to Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986), members of advantaged groups should have a strong self-interest in maintaining a higher group status because it reflects on their self-esteem. Consequently, they may ignore group disparities or perceive them as legitimate to defend their privileges (Uluğ & Tropp, in press). However, actual behavior promoting social justice may be contingent on the perceived illegitimacy of group-disparities (Kende et al., 2020; Tropp & Uluğ, 2019). For instance, the recent debate on the #MeToo movement has led to a divide between men arguing that the #MeToo debate restricts what they could say/do and men standing up against the sexual harassment experienced by many women. This divide suggests that individuals perceiving group differences as legitimate should be less supportive of social change toward greater equality.

Differences in perceived illegitimacy should further moderate the link between intergroup contact and support for social change. Members of advantaged group members often wish to be liked by disadvantaged group members (Bergsieker et al., 2010). Therefore, they channel discussion toward commonalities and avoid discussing group differences in intergroup interactions (Saguy et al., 2008). When they are confronted with the existence of inequalities, however, members of advantaged groups who perceive group disparities as just may act defensively to preserve their privileges (Halabi & Sonnenschein, 2004; Hässler et al., 2019; Knowles et al., 2014). In contrast, advantaged group members who perceive group disparities as illegitimate experience a greater need to address power relations during intergroup encounters (Saguy et al., 2008) and greater willingness to give up existing

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

privileges to achieve greater equality for all (Hässler et al., 2019). Consequently, ICCAM proposes that greater perceived illegitimacy of group differences should heighten the positive effect of intergroup contact on advantaged group members' support for social change.

Satisfaction of the Group-specific Need for Acceptance

An increasing amount of evidence suggests that the satisfaction of group-specific needs during intergroup interactions may be a crucial moderator explaining under which circumstances intergroup contact promotes support for social change among advantaged group members as well. As discussed above, disadvantaged and advantaged group members experience conflict in an asymmetric manner (Kteily & McClanahan, 2020; Nadler & Shnabel, 2015). Advantaged group members' high status is often gained through the historical and/or present expropriation of disadvantaged groups (Jackman, 1994). Also, they are often blamed for discriminating against disadvantaged groups (i.e., 'stigma reversal'; Killian, 1985) and subjected to stereotypes that portray them as cold and bigoted (Fiske et al., 2007). As social exclusion is the sanction imposed upon those who violate the moral standards of their community (Tavuchis, 1991), advantaged group members experience a heightened need for moral-social acceptance (Nadler & Shnabel, 2015), as indicated by the desire to be seen as warm, sociable, trustworthy, and moral. The satisfaction of the group-specific need for acceptance by disadvantaged group members, in turn, should promote support for greater equality among members of advantaged groups (Shnabel & Ullrich, 2013).

Focusing on commonalities between groups is one way in which advantaged groups can satisfy their need for acceptance during intergroup encounters (Knowles et al., 2014). This satisfaction of advantaged group members' need for acceptance during intergroup contact should enhance their support for collective action and social change (Kteily &

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

McClanahan, 2020), as shown in a large multi-national study (Hässler, Ullrich, Sebben, et al., 2020).

Importantly, communication during real-life intergroup contact is complex. While advantaged group members prefer to discuss commonalities between groups, disadvantaged group members often have the desire to discuss experiences of discrimination, status differences, and power inequalities during intergroup encounters (Bergsieker et al., 2010; Saguy et al., 2008). Emerging discussions about inequalities, however, may make advantaged group members feel that they are blamed by members of disadvantaged groups for enjoying unearned privileges. Particularly among those with little contact experiences (see contact threshold; MacInnis & Hodson, 2019), discussions about inequalities may lead to defensive responses (e.g., competition over the victim status, Halabi & Sonnenschein, 2004; Sullivan et al., 2012) and reduced support for change toward equality among advantaged group members (Hässler et al., 2019; Vezzali et al., 2017). ICCAM posits that when advantaged group members feel accepted by disadvantaged group members, they will be less defensive and more oriented toward taking the perspective of the disadvantaged. ICCAM also suggests that the positive effect of intergroup contact on advantaged group members' support for change should therefore become more positive, the more advantaged group members experience the intergroup encounters as warm, sociable, trustworthy, and moral.

Intergroup Ideologies

Most theoretical models on collective action have focused on groups' involvement in actions that aim to achieve greater equality for all. However, some groups may engage in collective action that aims to preserve the status quo and intergroup disparities (Blee & Creasap, 2010). It is important to consider the groups' ideology to explain why some groups may oppose progressive social change (Becker, 2020; Choma et al., 2020; Stewart et al., 2016). Indeed, advantaged group members are more likely to approve of hierarchies (i.e.,

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

social dominance orientation; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) and endorse right-wing authoritarianism tendency (Altemeyer, 1998).

ICCAM argues that individuals' differences in endorsing various ideologies – such as their social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism – should also moderate advantaged group members' responses to intergroup encounters. To illustrate, positive intergroup contact increases the advantaged group's identification with (Reimer et al., 2017) and empathy toward disadvantaged group members' struggle (Selvanathan et al., 2018). However, people characterized by a strong social dominance orientation (i.e., a worldview that favors unequal relationships among social groups) tend to be motivated to maintain social hierarchies and are therefore less empathetic toward disadvantaged group members (Bäckström & Björklund, 2007; Choma et al., 2020). Consequently, interactions with disadvantaged group members may not increase their support for progressive social change or may even increase support for reactionary social change (Ho & Kteily, 2020; Hoskin et al., 2019). People who endorse traditional values (i.e., score high on right-wing authoritarianism) perceive the world as a dangerous (Perry et al., 2013) and threatening place (see Jost, Stern, et al., 2017 for meta-analytic results). Therefore, they may experience increased threat during intergroup encounters, particularly when contact is rare and superficial (MacInnis & Page-Gould, 2015). Consequently, ICCAM suggests that social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism should attenuate the positive effect between intergroup contact and support for social change toward greater equality among advantaged group members.

Levels of Categorization

Finally, our model proposes that the inclusiveness of identities is also a relevant moderator for advantaged group members. According to Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986), people strive to achieve and maintain positive social identities

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

associated with their group memberships. Therefore, identification with and salience of the respective social groups play a central role in promoting support for social change.

Members of advantaged groups perceiving the advantaged and the disadvantaged groups as clearly distinct and separate ('us' versus 'them') may not feel the necessity to support social change toward greater equality. They may instead be motivated to preserve the system that promotes their advantage (Dovidio et al., 2009). Consequently, stronger identification with the advantaged group (and low perceptions of inequalities) may promote collective action to manifest or improve the status of the *advantaged* groups (Çakal et al., 2011; Çakal et al., 2016; Hasbún López et al., 2019; Selvanathan et al., 2018, Study 1; Thomas et al., 2019).

For example, a study of eleven European countries found that national identity was positively associated with protests *against* refugees (Hasbún López et al., 2019). Conversely, those who psychologically identify with the disadvantaged groups (e.g., common identity, dual identity, or opinion-based identity) should feel some sense of closeness with disadvantaged group members, which should promote solidarity (e.g., Reicher et al., 2006). A dual identity (compared to a common identity) may be most successful in fostering support for social change because the common superordinate group identity causes people to empathize more strongly with members of both groups, while at the same time, the subgroup identities maintain the awareness of group disparities. These factors should increase advantaged group members' support for social change toward greater equality for all. ICCAM, therefore, proposes that greater identification with disadvantaged group members, particularly through a dual identity or identification with an opinion-based identity (McGarty et al., 2009) – such as people who support greater rights for People of Color – would strengthen the positive link between intergroup contact and support for social change among advantaged group members.

The Road Ahead – Suggestions for a Comprehensive Research Agenda on Intergroup Contact and Social Change

Future research and interventions aimed at fostering support for social change through intergroup contact will benefit by more closely considering the dynamic interplay of individual characteristics, group characteristics, and the social context (i.e., micro-, meso-, and macro-level processes; Pettigrew & Hewstone, 2017). This interplay has been overlooked by past research (but see Kauff et al., in press). On the micro-level, individual characteristics such as demographic variables, personality traits, and cultural values should affect the contact-social change link. For example, the age of the participants may affect both the type of contact (e.g., e-contact; White et al., in press) and support for social change (e.g., online collective action). Given that the effect of intergroup contact on support for social change varies based on the types of intergroup contact and the types of support for social change (Hässler, Ullrich, Bernadino, et al., 2020), age should be an important moderator to consider.

On the meso-level, group characteristics such as the group's social status and the group membership's salience should also be more closely considered. Importantly, both disadvantaged and advantaged groups are not homogenous. Instead, there are important within-group differences, and the identities of these groups should not be considered in isolation (Curtin et al., 2016). While some individuals belong to multiple advantaged groups, others may belong to both advantaged and disadvantaged groups or multiple disadvantaged groups (see, e.g., Uysal et al., 2020). In addition, a binary perspective on disadvantaged and advantaged groups alone may be limiting our understanding of the struggle for greater social justice. Social conflicts are seldom binary, but are often characterized by a dynamic interplay of multiple groups such as disadvantaged groups, advantaged groups, third-party groups, or the general public (Dixon et al., 2020; Simon & Klandermans, 2001; Subašić et al., 2008; Zagefka, 2019). Consequently, more work needs to examine how contact among groups that

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

cannot be easily framed using the disadvantaged vs. advantaged type of dynamics, such as allies or third-party supporters (Drury & Travaglino, 2019; Klavina & van Zomeren, 2020), affects individuals' support for social change.

Finally, while it is crucial to consider both individual and group characteristics, the social context (i.e., macro-level) may also play an important role in shaping individuals' support for social change. Thus, individual-level variables should be complemented with indicators of the social context such as culture (van Zomeren & Louis, 2017), norms (Adra et al., 2020), social policies, the form of conflict, the level of societal segregation (i.e., historical context), and forms of political regime (e.g., democratic vs. authoritarian). For example, migrant integration policies or institutionalized stigmatization of LGBTIQ+ individuals are likely to convey social norms about where disadvantaged groups stand in the respective society and have been shown to affect attitudes and experiences of both members of disadvantaged (e.g., Górska et al., 2017; Hatzenbuehler & McLaughlin, 2014) and advantaged groups (e.g., Kuntz et al., 2015; Visintin et al., 2018). The political system in which people live affects people's behavior (Ayanian & Tausch, 2016; Odağ et al., 2016). Furthermore, institutional policies are a strong signal of the direction in which a society is heading (Eisner, Turner-Zwinkels, & Spini, 2020; Tankard & Paluck, 2016). Thus, it seems plausible that more democratic political systems, with liberal and progressive orientations and more integrative policies, should strengthen the impact of intergroup contact on advantaged group members' support for social change toward greater social equality.

Implications of Contact Interventions Aiming to Foster Social Change for Policy and Practice - How to Inform Practitioners?

The ICCAM expands our understanding of the circumstances under which contact between groups can promote support for social change toward greater equality. As mentioned earlier, ICCAM suggests that more positive and intimate forms of intergroup contact may

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

reduce particularly costly forms of support for social change (e.g., participating in demonstrations and strikes) among disadvantaged group members, whereas positive and intimate forms of contact seem to have less impact on less costly forms of collective action (e.g., signing petitions or voting; see also Hässler, Ullrich, Bernardino, et al., 2020). Yet, many practitioners implementing structured contact interventions are not aware that interventions focusing solely on commonalities between groups (e.g., Coexistence Model, the Joint Projects Model; see Maoz, 2011 for a discussion) come at the cost of reducing disadvantaged group members' support for social change (Saguy, 2018). Therefore, it is important to translate the emerging empirical evidence into new approaches for structured contact interventions.

ICCAM can offer a clearer route for policy strategists and practitioners who seek to both enhance social cohesion and build support for positive social change. Intergroup contact seems compatible with efforts to promote social change when existing inequalities are openly addressed, and group-specific needs of both groups (i.e., empowerment among disadvantaged groups and acceptance among advantaged groups) are met. Consequently, if awareness of inequalities is raised, perceived illegitimacy of the system is increased, and disadvantaged group members are given a voice, reaching social harmony on the one hand, and social justice on the other, can be compatible goals.

A practical issue is, however, that advantaged groups may not spontaneously provide the kind of empowering contact that benefits support for social change. Advantaged group members may minimize the impact of disadvantaged group members' experiences of discrimination by attributing the discriminatory behavior of advantaged group members to other factors (e.g., "maybe this person just had a very bad day" or "I don't think this person acted this way because of your skin color/LGBTIQ+ identity/..."; see also Inman, 2001). Further, members of advantaged groups generally avoid discussions about group differences

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

in power and prefer to talk about what they have in common instead (Aydin et al., 2019; Bergsieker et al., 2010; Saguy & Dovidio, 2013; Saguy & Kteily, 2014).

However, contact that neglects the need for acceptance among advantaged-group members and exclusively focuses on existing inequalities may heighten ‘us’ versus ‘them’ mindsets and lead to heightened threat perceptions, anxiety, and outgroup avoidance (Halabi & Sonnenschein, 2014; MacInnis & Hodson, 2019). Threat perceptions, anxiety, and outgroup avoidance may be particularly pronounced during first interactions (MacInnis & Page-Gould, 2015) and among people scoring high on right-wing authoritarianism (Jost, Stern, et al., 2017). These processes may discourage support for social change among advantaged group members or even encourage action against the disadvantaged group (Çakal et al., 2016). Thus, a gradual shift from a *communality* focus to a *difference* focus may address the needs of both groups and foster identification as two groups within one superordinate group (i.e., dual identity).

Contact interventions that take the temporal stage (see O’Donnell in press, for a discussion of longitudinal analyses) of contact and the needs of both groups into consideration – by focusing on both the commonalities and differences between groups – should have the capacity to foster sustained support among both advantaged and disadvantaged group members. This process is not easy and will require some careful trust building first, a reciprocal strengthening of the relationship between disadvantaged and advantaged group members (e.g., Kappmeier & Mercy, 2019; Kelman, 2005; Rozich et al., 2018). Existing interventions that could achieve this are so-called mixed-model encounters (Maoz, 2011; Zúñiga et al., 2002). These structured contact interventions build a climate of trust first, followed by an open discussion of privileges enjoyed by some and deprivations faced by others (Shani & Boehnke, 2017). Importantly, an open discussion of inequalities is essential to achieving social change because focusing solely on commonalities may decrease

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

identification with the disadvantaged group (Dovidio et al., 2009; Ufkes et al., 2016) and draw attention away from group disparities (Dovidio et al., 2009; Saguy & Chernyak-Hai, 2012; Saguy et al., 2009; Thiessen & Darweish, 2018). Thus, contact situations should address both commonalities and existing inequalities simultaneously to increase support for social change beyond group lines by allowing dual identities to coexist (Hässler, Ullrich, Sebben, et al., 2020; Shani & Boehnke, 2017; Shnabel & Ullrich, 2013).

Conclusion

This theoretical article provided an up-to-date review of conditions under which intergroup contact may promote or hinder social change among both disadvantaged and advantaged groups. This article also presented an overview of which factors related to intergroup situations, group status, and contexts hinder or promote support for social change. Previous research has examined a large number of different variables that may potentially affect intergroup relationships. We have proposed a new model, ICCAM, and have used it to integrate these variables into a coherent theoretical framework.

We believe our theoretical model contributes to the discussion on when intergroup contact may facilitate greater social justice beyond group divides. The ICCAM draws attention to possible moderators such as perceived illegitimacy of group differences, the satisfaction of the group-specific need for empowerment, and level of categorization. For the *advantaged* groups, we also presented the role of intergroup ideologies such as social dominance orientation (SDO) and right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) in our model as possible moderators of the link between intergroup contact and social change. Finally, we discussed the implications of the model for social intervention and policy and made some policy recommendations stemming from the review of available evidence.

Based on our model, we suggested a solution to the dilemma of creating structured contact interventions while limiting any adverse effects for disadvantaged groups. We argued

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

that contact interventions should address both groups' needs by creating a mutual climate of trust between groups in the first stage before discussing existing inequalities in the second stage. This temporal approach may allow dual identities to coexist, extend principles of morality across group lines, and increase support for social change beyond group divides. We hope ICCAM stimulates discussions and novel research on how to use intergroup contact to bring about social change that benefits society.

References

- Abele, A. E., & Wojciszke, B. (2013). The big two in social judgment and behavior. *Social Psychology, 44*(2), 61-62. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000137>
- Adra, A., Li, M., & Baumert, A. (2020). What they think of us: Meta-beliefs and solidarity-based collective action among the advantaged. *European Journal of Social Psychology. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2675>*
- Al Ramiah, A., & Hewstone, M. (2013). Intergroup contact as a tool for reducing, resolving, and preventing intergroup conflict: Evidence, limitations, and potential. *American Psychologist, 68*(7), 527-542. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032603>
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.
- Altemeyer, R. A. (1998). The other “authoritarian personality.” In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 30, p. 47–91). Academic Press.
- Ayanian, A. H., & Tausch, N. (2016). How risk perception shapes collective action intentions in repressive contexts: A study of Egyptian activists during the 2013 post-coup uprising. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 55*(4), 700-721. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12164>
- Aydin, A. L., Ullrich, J., Siem, B., Locke, K. D., & Shnabel, N. (2019). Agentic and communal interaction goals in conflictual intergroup relations. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 7*, 144-171. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v7i1.746>
- Bäckström, M., & Björklund, F. (2007). Structural modeling of generalized prejudice: The role of social dominance, authoritarianism, and empathy. *Journal of Individual Differences, 28*(1), 10-17. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001.28.1.10>
- Bagci, S. C., & Turnuklu, A. (2019). Intended, unintended, and unknown consequences of contact: The role of positive–negative contact on outgroup attitudes, collective action

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

tendencies, and psychological well-being. *Social Psychology*, 50(1), 7-23.

<https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000355>

Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H. R., Harwood, J., ... & Sibley, C. G. (2012). The contact caveat: Negative contact predicts increased prejudice more than positive contact predicts reduced prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(12), 1629-1643.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212457953>

Becker, J. C. (2020). Ideology and the promotion of social change. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 34, 6-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2019.10.005>

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(4), 442-455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213477155>

Bergsieker, H. B., Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2010). To be liked versus respected: Divergent goals in interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(2), 248-264. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018474>

Blee, K. M., & Creasap, K. A. (2010). Conservative and right-wing movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 269-286.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102602>

Boin, J., Rupar, M., Graf, S., Neji, S., Spiegler, O., Swart, H., & Voci, A. (in press). The generalisation of intergroup contact effects: Emerging research, policy relevance, and future directions. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Brewer, M. B. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. *Groups in Contact: The Psychology of Desegregation*. In N. Miller &

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- M. B. Brewer (Eds.). *Groups in Contact: The Psychology of Desegregation* (p. 281-302). Academic Press.
- Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 255-343. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(05\)37005-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(05)37005-5)
- Brown, R. J., & Turner, J. C. (1979). The criss-cross categorization effect in intergroup discrimination. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18, 371-383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1979.tb00907.x>
- Bruneau, E. G., & Saxe, R. (2012). The power of being heard: The benefits of ‘perspective-giving’ in the context of intergroup conflict. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(4), 855-866. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.02.017>
- Çakal, H., Halabi, S., Cazan, A. M., & Eller, A. (2019). Intergroup contact and endorsement of social change motivations: The mediating role of intergroup trust, perspective-taking, and intergroup anxiety among three advantaged groups in Northern Cyprus, Romania, and Israel. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. Advanced online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430219885163>
- Çakal, H., Hewstone, M., Güler, M., & Heath, A. (2016). Predicting support for collective action in the conflict between Turks and Kurds: Perceived threats as a mediator of intergroup contact and social identity. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 19(6), 732-752. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430216641303>
- Çakal, H., Hewstone, M., Schwär, 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(4), 606-627. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02075.x>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- Choma, B., Hodson, G., Jagayat, A., & Hoffarth, M. R. (2020). Right-wing ideology as a predictor of collective action: A test across four political issue domains. *Political Psychology, 41*(2), 303-322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12615>
- Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist, 64*(4), 231-240. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014718>
- Curtin, N., Kende, A., & Kende, J. (2016). Navigating multiple identities: The simultaneous influence of advantaged and disadvantaged identities on politicization and activism. *Journal of Social Issues, 72*(2), 264-285. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12166>
- 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 Jones, S., Cocco, V. M., Saguy, T., & Dixon, J. (2019). Fostering social change among advantaged and disadvantaged group members: Integrating intergroup contact and social identity perspectives on collective action. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. Advanced online publication, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430219889134>
- Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2007). Intergroup contact and attitudes toward the principle and practice of racial equality. *Psychological Science, 18*(10), 867-872. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01993.x>
- Dixon, J., Elcheroth, G., Kerr, P., Drury, J., Al Bzour, M., Subašić, E., ... & Green, E. G. (2020). It's not just "us" versus "them": Moving beyond binary perspectives on intergroup processes. *European Review of Social Psychology, 31*(1), 40-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2020.1738767>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- Dixon, J., Tropp, L. R., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2010). "Let them eat harmony" prejudice-reduction strategies and attitudes of historically disadvantaged groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *19*(2), 76-80.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721410363366>
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2010). Intergroup bias. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (p. 1084-1121). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470561119.socpsy002029>
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Saguy, T. (2009). Commonality and the complexity of "we": Social attitudes and social change. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *13*(1), 3-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868308326751>
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Ufkes, E. G., Saguy, T., & Pearson, A. R. (2016). Included but invisible? Subtle bias, common identity, and the darker side of "we". *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *10*(1), 6-46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12017>
- Droogendyk, L., Louis, W. R., & Wright, S. C. (2016). Renewed promise for positive cross-group contact: The role of supportive contact in empowering collective action. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement*, *48*(4), 317-327. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/cbs0000058>
- Droogendyk, L., Wright, S. C., Lubensky, M., & Louis, W. R. (2016). Acting in solidarity: Cross-group contact between disadvantaged group members and advantaged group allies. *Journal of Social Issues*, *72*(2), 315-334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12168>
- Drury, L., & Travaglino, G. A. (2019). Demobilising by legitimising: Masculine honour, positive and negative contact, and social activism against criminal organisations. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *23*(3), 402-417.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430219842917>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Eisner, L., Hässler, T., Turner-Zwinkels, F., & Settersten, R. (2020). Perceptions of norms and collective action: An analysis of sexual minorities. Under review in *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*.

Eisner, L., Turner-Zwinkels, F., & Spini, D. (2020). The impact of laws on norms perceptions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*,
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167220959176>

Fingerhut, A. W. (2011). Straight allies: What predicts heterosexuals' alliance with the LGBT community? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *41*(9), 2230-2248.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00807.x>

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*(2), 77-83.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.11.005>

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, *6*(3), 167-191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002234336900600301>

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common ingroup identity model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *4*(1), 1-26.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496494252005>

Glasford, D. E., & Johnston, B. (2018). Respect the technique: Status-based respect increases minority group social cohesion with majority groups, while also increasing minority collective action tendencies. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *158*(2), 201-214.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2017.1324395>

Gómez, A., & Huici, C. (2008). Vicarious intergroup contact and the role of authorities in prejudice reduction. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, *11*(1), 103-114.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1138741600004169>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- Górska, P., Bilewicz, M., Winiewski, M., & Waszkiewicz, A. (2017). On old-fashioned versus modern homonegativity distinction: Evidence from Poland. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 64(2), 256-272. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2016.1179029>
- Graf, S., & Sczesny, S. (2019). Intergroup contact with migrants is linked to support for migrants through attitudes, especially in people who are politically right wing. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 73, 102-106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2019.09.001>
- Halabi, R., & Sonnenschein, N. (2004). The Jewish-Palestinian encounter in a time of crisis. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(2), 373-387. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00117.x>
- Hasan-Aslih, S., Pliskin, R., van Zomeren, M., Halperin, E., & Saguy, T. (2019). A darker side of hope: Harmony-focused hope decreases collective action intentions among the disadvantaged. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 45(2), 209-223. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218783190>
- Hasan-Aslih, S., Shuman, E., Pliskin, R., van Zomeren, M., Saguy, T., & Halperin, E. (2020). With or without you: The paradoxical role of identification in predicting joint and ingroup collective action in intergroup conflict. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. Advanced Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2677>
- Hasbún López, P., Martinović, B., Bobowik, M., Chrysochoou, X., Cichocka, A., Ernst-Vintila, A., ... & Lamberty, P. (2019). Support for collective action against refugees: The role of national, European, and global identifications, and autochthony beliefs. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 49(7), 1439-1455. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2608>
- Hässler, T., Shnabel, N., Ullrich, J., Arditti-Vogel, A., & SimanTov-Nachlieli, I. (2019). Individual differences in system justification predict power and morality-related needs

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

in advantaged and disadvantaged groups in response to group disparity. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 22(5), 746-766.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430218773403>

Hässler, T., Ullrich, J., Bernadino, M., Shnabel, N., Van Laar, C., Valdenegro, D., Sebben, S., Tropp, L. R., Visintin, E. P., González, R., Dittmann, R. K., Abrams, D., Selvanathan, H. P., Branković, M., Wright, S., von Zimmermann, J., Pasek, M., Aydin, A. L., Žeželj, I., Pereira, A. ... & Ugarte, L. M. (2020). A large-scale test of the link between intergroup contact and support for social change. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4(4), 380-386. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0815-z>

Hässler, T., Ullrich, J., Sebben, S., Shnabel, N., Bernadino, M., Valdenegro, D. Van Laar, C., González, R., Visintin, E. P., Tropp, L. R., Dittmann, R. K., Abrams, D., Aydin, A. L., Pereira, A., Selvanathan, H. P., von Zimmermann, J., Lantos, N., Sainz, M., Glenz, A., Kende, A. ... & Pistella, J. (2020). Needs satisfaction in intergroup contact: A multi-national study of pathways toward social change. Preprint available here: <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/f9mwv>

Hatzenbuehler, M. L., & McLaughlin, K. A. (2014). Structural stigma and hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenocortical axis reactivity in lesbian, gay, and bisexual young adults. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 47(1), 39-47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-013-9556-9>

Hayward, L. E., Tropp, L. R., Hornsey, M. J., & Barlow, F. K. (2017). Toward a comprehensive understanding of intergroup contact: Descriptions and mediators of positive and negative contact among majority and minority groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(3), 347-364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167216685291>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- Hayward, L. E., Tropp, L. R., Hornsey, M. J., & Barlow, F. K. (2018). How negative contact and positive contact with Whites predict collective action among racial and ethnic minorities. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *57*(1), 1-20.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12220>
- Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the 'Contact Hypothesis.' In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and Conflict in Intergroup Encounters* (p. 1-44). Blackwell.
- Ho, A. K., & Kteily, N. S. (2020). The role of group-based egalitarianism in collective action. *Current Opinion in Psychology*. Advanced Online Publication.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2020.05.009>
- Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *2*(1), 204-222.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00066.x>
- Hoskin, R. E., Thomas, E. F., & McGarty, C. (2019). Transnational contact and challenging global poverty: Intergroup contact intensifies (the right kind of) social identities to promote solidarity-based collective action for those low in social dominance. *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology*, *3*(1), 23-34. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts5.24>
- Inman, M. L. (2001). Do you see what I see?: Similarities and differences in victims' and observers' perceptions of discrimination. *Social Cognition*, *19*(5), 521-546.
<https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.19.5.521.19912>
- Jackman, M. R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class and race relations*. University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520337794>
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*(1), 1-27.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008.x>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory:

Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo.

Political Psychology, 25, 881-919. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00402.x>

Jost, J. T., Becker, J., Osborne, D., & Badaan, V. (2017). Missing in (collective) action:

Ideology, system justification, and the motivational antecedents of two types of protest behavior. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26(2), 99-108.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417690633>

Jost, J. T., Chaikalis-Petrtsis, V., Abrams, D., Sidanius, J., Van Der Toorn, J., & Bratt, C.

(2012). Why men (and women) do and don't rebel: Effects of system justification on willingness to protest. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(2), 197-208.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211422544>

Jost, J. T., Gaucher, D., & Stern, C. (2015). "The world isn't fair": A system justification

perspective on social stratification and inequality. In M. Mikulincer, P. R. Shaver, J. F. Dovidio, & J. A. Simpson (Eds.), *APA handbook of personality and social psychology*. Volume 2: Group processes (p. 317–340). American Psychological Association.

Jost, J. T., Stern, C., Rule, N. O., & Sterling, J. (2017). The politics of fear: Is there an

ideological asymmetry in existential motivation? *Social Cognition*, 35(4), 324-353.

<https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2017.35.4.324>

Kamberi, E., Martinovic, B., & Verkuyten, M. (2017). Intergroup contact and minority group

empowerment: The perspective of Roma and non-Roma adolescents in Macedonia.

Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 27(5), 424-434.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2320>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- Kappmeier, M. (2016). Trusting the Enemy—Towards a Comprehensive Understanding of Trust in Intergroup Conflict. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 22*(2), 134-144. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000159>
- Kappmeier, M., & Mercy, A. (2019). The long road from cold war to warm peace: Building shared collective memory through trust. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 7*(1), 525-555. <https://10.5964/jspp.v7i1.328>
- Kauff, M., Beneda, M., Paolini, S., Bilewicz, M., Kotzur, P., O'Donnell, A., Stevenson, C., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (in press). How do we get people into contact? Predictors of intergroup contact and drivers of contact seeking. *Journal of Social Issues*.
- Kelman, H. C. (2005). Building trust among enemies: The central challenge for international conflict resolution. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*(6), 639-650. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.07.011>
- Kende, A., Nyúl, B., Lantos, N. A., Hadarics, M., Petlitski, D., Kehl, J., & Shnabel, N. (2020). A Needs-Based Support for# MeToo: Power and Morality Needs Shape Women's and Men's Support of the Campaign. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 593. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00593>
- Killian, L. M. (1985). The stigma of race: Who now bears the mark of Cain? *Symbolic Interaction, 8*(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1525/si.1985.8.1.1>
- Klandermans, B. (1984). Mobilization and participation: Social-psychological expansions of resource mobilization theory. *American Sociological Review, 49*(5), 583-600. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095417>
- Klandermans, B. (2004). The demand and supply of participation: Socialpsychological correlates of participation in social movements. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Saule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (p. 360-379). Oxford: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470999103.ch16>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- Klavina, L., & van Zomeren, M. (2020). Protesting to protect “us” and/or “them”? Explaining why members of third groups are willing to engage in collective action. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 23(1), 140-160.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430218796930>
- Knowles, E. D., Lowery, B. S., Chow, R. M., & Unzueta, M. M. (2014). Deny, distance, or dismantle? How white Americans manage a privileged identity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9(6), 594-609. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614554658>
- Kotzur, P. F., Schäfer, S. J., & Wagner, U. (2019). Meeting a nice asylum seeker: Intergroup contact changes stereotype content perceptions and associated emotional prejudices, and encourages solidarity-based collective action intentions. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 58(3), 668-690. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12304>
- Kteily, N. S., & McClanahan, K. J. (2020). Incorporating insights about intergroup power and dominance to help increase harmony and equality between groups in conflict. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 33, 80-85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.06.030>
- Kunst, J. R., Boos, B., Kimel, S. Y., Obaidi, M., Shani, M., & Thomsen, L. (2018). Engaging in extreme activism in support of others’ political struggles: The role of politically motivated fusion with out-groups. *PloS one*, 13(1), e0190639.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0190639>
- Kuntz, A., Davidov, E., Schwartz, S. H., & Schmidt, P. (2015). Human values, legal regulation, and approval of homosexuality in Europe: A cross-country comparison. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 45(1), 120-134.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2068>
- Leach, C. W., Snider, N., & Iyer, A. (2002). “Poisoning the consciences of the fortunate”: The experience of relative advantage and support for social equality. In I. Walker

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- (Ed.), *Relative deprivation: Specification, development, and integration* (p. 136-163). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511527753.007>
- Lemmer, G., & Wagner, U. (2015). Can we really reduce ethnic prejudice outside the lab? A meta-analysis of direct and indirect contact interventions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 45*(2), 152-168. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2079>
- Lewis, G. B. (2011). The friends and family plan: Contact with gays and support for gay rights. *Policy Studies Journal, 39*(2), 217-238. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2011.00405.x>
- 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*(1), 11-22. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts5.23>
- MacInnis, C. C., & Page-Gould, E. (2015). How can intergroup interaction be bad if intergroup contact is good? Exploring and reconciling an apparent paradox in the science of intergroup relations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 10*(3), 307-327. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614568482>
- Major, B. (1994). From social inequality to personal entitlement: The role of social comparisons, legitimacy appraisals, and group membership. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 26*, 293-355. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601\(08\)60156-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601(08)60156-2)
- 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 & Intergroup Relations, 11*(4), 451-470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430208095400>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- Maoz, I. (2011). Does contact work in protracted asymmetrical conflict? Appraising 20 years of reconciliation-aimed encounters between Israeli Jews and Palestinians. *Journal of Peace Research*, 48(1), 115-125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343310389506>
- Marinucci, M., Maunder, R., Sanchez, K., Thai, M., McKeown, S., Turner, R. N., & Stevenson, C. (in press). Intimate intergroup contact across the lifespan. *Journal of Social Issues*.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6), 1212-1241. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226464>
- McGarty, C., Bliuc, A. M., Thomas, E. F., & Bongiorno, R. (2009). Collective action as the material expression of opinion-based group membership. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65(4), 839-857. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01627.x>
- Mendos, L. R. (2019). State-sponsored homophobia. ILGA, Geneva.
- Nadler, A., & Shnabel, N. (2015). Intergroup reconciliation: Instrumental and socio-emotional processes and the needs-based model. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 26(1), 93-125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2015.1106712>
- O'Donnell, A., Friehs, M-T., Bracegirdle, C., Watt, S., Zúñiga Rivas, C., & Barlow, F. K. (in press). Technological and analytical advancements in intergroup contact research. *Journal of Social Issues*.
- Odağ, Ö., Uluğ, Ö. M., & Solak, N. (2016). "Everyday I'm çapulung": Identity and collective action through social network sites in the Gezi Park protests in Turkey. *Journal of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications*, 28(3), 148-159. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000202>
- Osborne, D., Jost, J. T., Becker, J. C., Badaan, V., & Sibley, C. G. (2019). Protesting to challenge or defend the system? A system justification perspective on collective

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

action. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 49(2), 244-269.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2522>

Paluck, E. L., Green, S. A., & Green, D. P. (2019). The contact hypothesis re-evaluated.

Behavioural Public Policy, 3(2), 129-158. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2018.25>

Paolini, S., Harwood, J., & Rubin, M. (2010). Negative intergroup contact makes group memberships salient: Explaining why intergroup conflict endures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(12), 1723-1738.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167210388667>

Pereira, A., Green, E. G., & Visintin, E. P. (2017). National identification counteracts the sedative effect of positive intergroup contact on ethnic activism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1-10.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00477>

Perry, R., Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2013). Dangerous and competitive worldviews: A meta-analysis of their associations with social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(1), 116-127.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.10.004>

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., & Hewstone, M. (2017). The single factor fallacy: Implications of missing critical variables from an analysis of intergroup contact theory. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 11(1), 8-37.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12026>

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751-783.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice?

Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(6), 922-934. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.504>

Pettigrew, T. F., Christ, O., Wagner, U., & Stellmacher, J. (2007). Direct and indirect intergroup contact effects on prejudice: A normative interpretation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 31(4), 411-425.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.11.003>

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(3),

271-280. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.001>

Radke, H. R., 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*,

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868320918698>

Reicher, S., Cassidy, C., Wolpert, I., Hopkins, N., & Levine, M. (2006). Saving Bulgaria's Jews: An analysis of social identity and the mobilisation of social solidarity.

European Journal of Social Psychology, 36(1), 49-72.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.291>

Reicher, S. (2012). From perception to mobilization: The shifting paradigm of prejudice. In J.

Dixon & M. Levine (Eds.), *Beyond prejudice: Extending the social psychology of conflict, inequality and social change* (p. 27–47). Cambridge University Press.

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

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- advantaged and disadvantaged groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(1), 121-136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167216676478>
- Reimer, N. K., Kamble, S. V., Schmid, K., & Hewstone, M. (in press). Intergroup contact fosters more inclusive social identities. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*.
- Rozich, B. C., Kenworthy, J. B., Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2018). What's past is prologue: Intergroup emotions and trust as mediating the links between prior intergroup contact and future behavioral tendencies. *TPM. Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 25(2), 179-191. <https://10.4473/TPM25.2.2>
- Runciman, W. G., & Runciman, B. (1966). *Relative deprivation and social justice: A study of attitudes to social inequality in twentieth-century England* (Vol. 13). University of California Press.
- Saab, R., Harb, C., & Moughalian, C. (2017). Intergroup contact as a predictor of violent and nonviolent collective action: Evidence from Syrian refugees and Lebanese nationals. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 23(3), 297-306. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000234>
- Saguy, T. (2018). Downside of intergroup harmony? When reconciliation might backfire and what to do. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 5(1), 75-81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732217747085>
- Saguy, T., & Chernyak-Hai, L. (2012). Intergroup contact can undermine disadvantaged group members' attributions to discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(3), 714-720. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.01.003>
- Saguy, T., & Dovidio, J. F. (2013). Insecure status relations shape preferences for the content of intergroup contact. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(8), 1030-1042. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213487078>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- Saguy, T., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2008). Beyond contact: Intergroup contact in the context of power relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(3), 432-445. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207311200>
- Saguy, T., & Kteily, N. (2014). Power, negotiations, and the anticipation of intergroup encounters. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 25(1), 107-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2014.957579>
- Saguy, T., Shchori-Eyal, N., Hasan-Aslih, S., Sobol, D., & Dovidio, J. F. (2016). In Vezzali, L., Stathi, S. (Eds.), *Intergroup contact theory: Recent developments and future directions*, (p. 53-71). Routledge.
- 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(1), 114–121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02261.x>
- Schäfer S., Prati, F., Kros, M., Lang, T., Kauff, M., & Christ, O. (in press). Understanding negative intergroup contact. *Journal of Social Issues*.
- Selvanathan, H. P., Techakesari, P., Tropp, L. R., & Barlow, F. K. (2018). Whites for racial justice: How contact with Black Americans predicts support for collective action among White Americans. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 21(6), 893-912. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217690908>
- Shani, M., & Boehnke, K. (2017). The effect of Jewish–Palestinian mixed-model encounters on readiness for contact and policy support. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 23(3), 219-227. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000220>
- Shnabel, N., & Ullrich, J. (2013). Increasing intergroup cooperation toward social change by restoring advantaged and disadvantaged groups' positive identities. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 1(1), 216-238. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v1i1.187>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, B., & Klandermans, B. (2001). Politicized collective identity: A social psychological analysis. *American Psychologist*, 56(4), 319-331. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.4.319>
- Smith, H. J., Pettigrew, T. F., Pippin, G. M., & Bialosiewicz, S. (2012). Relative deprivation: A theoretical and meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(3), 203-232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868311430825>
- Stewart, A. L., Pratto, F., Bou Zeineddine, F., Sweetman, J., Eicher, V., Licata, L., ... & Cichocka, A. (2016). International support for the Arab uprisings: Understanding sympathetic collective action using theories of social dominance and social identity. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 19(1), 6-26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430214558310>
- Subašić, E., Reynolds, K. J., & 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(4), 330-352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868308323223>
- Sullivan, D., Landau, M. J., Branscombe, N. R., & Rothschild, Z. K. (2012). Competitive victimhood as a response to accusations of ingroup harm doing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(4), 778-795. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026573>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (p. 33-47). Brooks/Cole.

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *The psychology of intergroup relations* (p. 7–24). Nelson-Hall.
- Tankard, M. E., & Paluck, E. L. (2016). Norm perception as a vehicle for social change. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *10*(1), 181-211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12022>
- Tausch, N., & Becker, J. C. (2012). Understanding the psychological processes involved in the demobilizing effects of positive cross-group contact. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *35*(6), 447-448. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X12001446>
- Tausch, N., Becker, J. C., Spears, R., Christ, O., Saab, R., Singh, P., & Siddiqui, R. N. (2011). Explaining radical group behavior: Developing emotion and efficacy routes to normative and nonnormative collective action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(1), 129-148. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022728>
- 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>
- Tavuchis, N. (1991). *Mea culpa: A sociology of apology and reconciliation*. Stanford University Press.
- Techakesari, P., Droogendyk, L., Wright, S. C., Louis, W. R., & Barlow, F. K. (2017). Supportive contact and LGBT collective action: The moderating role of membership in specific groups. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *23*(3), 307-316. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000240>
- Thiessen, C., & Darweish, M. (2018). Conflict resolution and asymmetric conflict: The contradictions of planned contact interventions in Israel and Palestine. *International*

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Journal of Intercultural Relations, 66, 73-84.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.06.006>

Thomas, E. F., Zubielevitch, E., Sibley, C. G., & Osborne, D. (2019). Testing the social identity model of collective action longitudinally and across structurally disadvantaged and advantaged groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 46(6), 823-838. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219879111>

Travaglino, G. A. (2019). Support for anonymous as vicarious dissent: Testing the social banditry framework. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 22(2), 163-181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217722037>

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(2), 257-272. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02050.x>

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science*, 16(12), 951-957. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01643.x>

Tropp, L. R., & Uluğ, Ö. M. (2019). Are White women showing up for racial justice? Intergroup contact, closeness to people targeted by prejudice, and collective action. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 43(3), 335-347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684319840269>

Tropp, L. R., Uluğ, Ö. M. & Uysal, M. S. (2021). How intergroup contact and communication about group differences predict collective action intentions among advantaged groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 80, 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2020.10.012>

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- Turner, J. C. (1985) Social categorization and the self-concept: a social cognitive theory of group behaviour. In E. J. Lawler (ed.), *Advances in Group Processes* (p. 77-122). JAI Press.
- Turoy-Smith, K. M., Kane, R., & Pedersen, A. (2013). The willingness of a society to act on behalf of Indigenous Australians and refugees: The role of contact, intergroup anxiety, prejudice, and support for legislative change. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(2), 179–195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12017>
- Ufkes, E. G., Calcagno, J., Glasford, D. E., & Dovidio, J. F. (2016). Understanding how common ingroup identity undermines collective action among disadvantaged-group members. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 63, 26-35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.11.006>
- Uluğ, Ö. M., & Cohrs, J. C. (2017). “If we become friends, maybe I can change my perspective:” Intergroup contact, endorsement of conflict narratives, and peace-related attitudes in Turkey. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 23(3), 278-287. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000216>
- Uluğ, Ö. M. & Tropp, L. R. (in press). Witnessing racial discrimination shapes collective action for racial justice: Enhancing awareness of privilege among advantaged groups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*.
- United Nations DESA (2016). Report on the World Social Situation: Leaving no one behind. <https://10.18356/5aa151e0-en>
- United Nations DESA. (2017). *International Migration Report 2017: Highlights*. New York, U.S. <https://10.18356/5e2626a2-en>
- Uysal, M. S., Uluğ, Ö. M., Kanık, B., & Aydemir, A. (2020). “The liberation of LGBTQ+ will liberate heterosexuals”: Predictors of heterosexual feminist women’s

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

participation in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights. Under review in *European Journal of Social Psychology*.

Van Stekelenburg, J., & Klandermans, B. (2013). The social psychology of protest. *Current Sociology*, 61(5-6), 886-905. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392113479314>

van Zomeren, M., & Louis, W. R. (2017). Culture meets collective action: Exciting synergies and some lessons to learn for the future. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 20(3), 277-284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217690238>

van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2008). Toward an integrative social identity model of collective action: A quantitative research synthesis of three socio-psychological perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(4), 504-535. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.4.504>

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(2), 52-59. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts5.12>

Visintin, E. P., Green, E. G. T., & Sarrasin, O. (2018). Inclusive normative climates strengthen the relationship between identification with Europe and tolerant immigration attitudes: Evidence from 22 countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 49, 908-923. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022117731092>

Vollhardt, J. R., & Sinayobye Twali, M. (2016). Emotion-based reconciliation requires attention to power differences, critical consciousness, and structural change. *Psychological Inquiry*, 27(2), 136-143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2016.1160762>

Walker, I., & Smith, H. J. (Eds.). (2002). *Relative deprivation: Specification, development, and integration*. Cambridge University Press.

INTERGROUP CONTACT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

- White, A. F., Borinca, I., Vezzali, L., Reynolds, K. J., Blomster Lyshol, J. K., Verrelli, S. & Falomir-Pichastor, J. M. (in press). Beyond direct contact: The theoretical and societal relevance of indirect contact for improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*.
- 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 conflict, inequality and social change* (p. 225-247). Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, S. C., & Lubensky, M. E. (2009). The struggle for social equality: Collective action versus prejudice reduction. In S. Demoulin, J.-P. Leyens, & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Intergroup misunderstandings: Impact of divergent social realities* (p. 291-310). Psychology Press.
- Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(1), 73-90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.73>
- Zagefka, H. (2019). Triadic intergroup relations: Studying situations with an observer, an actor, and a recipient of behavior. *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology*, 3(1), 62-74. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts5.26>
- Zúñiga, X., Nagda, B. R. A., & Sevig, T. D. (2002). Intergroup dialogues: An educational model for cultivating engagement across differences. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 35, 7-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713845248>

One-paragraph Biography of Each Author

Tabea Hässler, PhD, is a Postdoctoral Researcher at the University of Zurich. Her research focuses on responses to inequalities among members of diverse advantaged and disadvantaged groups and their support for collective action toward greater social equality.

Özden Melis Uluğ, PhD, is a Visiting Assistant Professor at Clark University. She completed her post-doctoral fellowship in the Psychology of Peace and Violence Program at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst in 2019. She received her PhD in Psychology from Jacobs University Bremen, Germany in 2016. Her areas of research interest include intergroup conflict, intergroup contact, collective action, and solidarity between groups.

Mariska Kappmeier, PhD, is a Lecturer at the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Otago. Her research focuses on intergroup conflict, identity and trust, addressing how intergroup conflicts can be overcome through quantified methods for trust building.

Giovanni A. Travaglino, PhD, is an Assistant Professor at the University of Kent. His research interests are in the social psychology of collective action, opposition to criminal organizations, political behavior and culture. He founded and is co-editor of *Contention: The Multidisciplinary Journal of Social Protest* (Berghahn Press).