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Abstract

The current studies aim to examine the underlying predictors of heterosexual feminist women’s willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights. We hypothesized that feminist identification, perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+, and strategic intra-minority alliance between feminists and LGBTQ+ would predict willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Study 1 ($N = 141$) showed that higher feminist identification and more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance predicted more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action among heterosexual feminist women in Turkey. Study 2 ($N = 644$) replicated and extended the findings of Study 1 with a larger sample by showing higher awareness of sexual orientation privilege predicts more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. By following the intersectional multi-identity approach in Study 3 ($N = 280$), we showed that higher feminist identification predicted more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action whereas higher heterosexual identification predicted less willingness.
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“The liberation of LGBTQ+ will also liberate heterosexuals”: Heterosexual feminist women’s participation in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights

Social psychological research on intergroup relations has overwhelmingly focused on interactions between majority and minority groups (e.g., Saguy, Dovidio, & Pratto, 2008; Saguy, Tausch, Dovidio, & Pratto, 2009; Shnabel, Halabi, & Noor, 2013; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006). Even though research on intra-minority relations is a growing field, little is known about the antecedents of intra-minority solidarity (see Burson & Godfrey, 2020). Social psychologists define solidarity as one’s desire to work with other individuals or groups for social change with a sense of common cause or social change commitment (Neufeld, Starzyk, & Gaucher, 2019; Subašić, Reynolds, & Turner, 2008). Moreover, current approaches classify motivations for solidarity as ingroup focused, outgroup focused, personal, and morality motivations (see Radke, Kutrula, Siem, Wright, & Becker, 2020). Based on this, we argue that endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance as an ingroup focused motivation—individuals’ beliefs about whether they should work together with another disadvantaged group—should be related to their behavioral intentions to engage in actions on behalf of those disadvantaged groups (i.e., solidarity-based collective action).

Across three studies, we aim to examine the role of a) perceived discrimination against another disadvantaged group (i.e., LGBTQ+ community) among a politicized disadvantaged group (i.e., feminists), b) feminist identification and c) endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance in heterosexual feminist women’s participation in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights. Moreover, we aim to test whether awareness of sexual orientation privilege (Studies 2 and 3) is associated with willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Last, we also aim to examine the role of advantaged (i.e., heterosexual), politicized (i.e., feminist), and disadvantaged (i.e., woman) identities of heterosexual feminist women in participation in solidarity-based collective action in Study 3 by following multi-
identity intersectional approach (see Greenwood, 2012). We examine these relationships in Turkey, in a context where both women and LGBTQ+ community have been targeted for a long time by the current government. In recent years, the government in Turkey has banned both pride marches and feminist marches. In addition, crimes against trans people have remained unpunished, femicides are on the extreme rise, and the president of religious affairs has made the LGBTQ+ community a scapegoat during the COVID-19 pandemic. On the other hand, feminist and LGBTQ+ activists have shown increasing solidarity with each other, especially after the Gezi Park Protests in 2013, and remained politicized even though the pressure against both groups have been increasing.

**Politicized Ingroup Identity and Solidarity-Based Collective Action**

Collective action is defined as any action enacted as a representative of the group members who aim at improving the position of the group’s condition (Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990). An extensive body of research in social psychology has examined the factors that motivate people to engage in collective action (see Thomas, McGarty, & Mavor, 2009; van Zomeren, 2016; van Zomeren, Postmes, & Spears, 2008). Most social psychology models of collective action suggest that feelings of injustice, social identity, and group efficacy are key triggers for collective action (Thomas, Mavor, & McGarty, 2012; van Zomeren et al., 2008). The well-known approaches of the psychological dynamics of collective action consistently showed that ingroup identity is either the strongest predictor of collective action or plays an essential role in mobilizing people (e.g., Drury & Reicher, 2009; Klandermans, 1997; Stürmer & Simon, 2004; van Zomeren et al., 2008).

Furthermore, van Zomeren and colleagues (2008) showed that politicized ingroup identity is an even stronger predictor of collective action participation (e.g., being an LGBTQ+ activist vs. being LGBTQ+; see Simon & Klandermans, 2001). However, collective action research broadly examines the impact of disadvantaged groups’ politicized identity on
participating in collective action for ingroup causes (see van Zomeren et al., 2008), not for outgroup causes. For example, it has been shown that feminist identity as a politicized identity predicts feminists or women’s participation in collective action for gender justice (Girerd & Bonnot, 2020; Radke, Hornsey, & Barlow, 2018; Subašić et al., 2018; van Breen, Spears, Kuppens, & de Lemus, 2017; Yoder, Tobias, & Snell, 2011). However, feminist identity, which is an identity that is usually associated with activism and solidarity with other marginalized groups (see, e.g., Painia, 2018), should be addressed as an important antecedent of solidarity-based collective action. We, therefore, expect that higher feminist identification among heterosexual feminist women would predict more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights.

**Perceived Discrimination and Intra-Minority Solidarity**

Recent theorizing of Craig, Richeson, and colleagues (Craig & Richeson, 2012, 2014, 2016; Craig, Rucker, & Brown, 2020; Richeson & Craig, 2011) moves the arguments of the Common Ingroup Identity Model about perceived discrimination (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993) one step further. This recent approach examines how individuals’ perception of their own group’s discrimination may influence their attitudes toward other minority groups. For instance, Craig and Richeson (2012) showed that perceived discrimination against Latinos influences Latinos’ attitudes towards Blacks through activating a common ingroup identity, such as a disadvantaged racial minority group identity. Similarly, Acar and Uluğ (2016) show that discrimination experiences of different minority groups (e.g., feminists, LGBTQ+, Kurds) create cooperation among these groups to work against a shared goal. Facing discrimination due to being a minority group member may help people perceive commonalities among different types of discrimination and support the coalition of their group with other minority groups (Craig & Richeson, 2016; for discussion about inclusive victim consciousness, see Vollhardt, Nair, & Tropp, 2016).
Craig and Richeson (2016) address some optimal conditions to increase perceived commonalities and coalitional attitudes through perceived discrimination. Perceived discrimination against one’s ingroup can elicit coalitional attitudes towards other minority groups if they share similar disadvantaged identities, such as disadvantaged racial identities. Otherwise, perceived discrimination against one’s ingroup may even evoke negative attitudes towards other stigmatized outgroups (for an exception, see Cortland et al., 2017). For instance, perceived sexism may lead to more negative racial attitudes towards Blacks and Latinos among White women (Craig, DeHart, Richeson, & Fiedorowicz, 2012) because perceived discrimination across identity dimensions, such as between a racial minority identity and a sexual minority identity, may trigger social identity threat and spurs the derogation of other minority groups (Craig & Richeson, 2016). Hence, there are contradictory findings in the relationship between perceived discrimination against one’s own group and intra-minority solidarity. In this paper, we argue that heterosexual feminist women’s perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ predicts their willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights.

Solidarity and Strategic Alliance Between Disadvantaged Groups

Although ingroup-led activism has mostly mobilized social movements to challenge the status quo, outgroup members sometimes support this activism as well. Social psychologists have focused on the term of political solidarity to understand solidarity-based activism (e.g., behavior or intention). Leach and colleagues (2008) define political solidarity as a component of identification; Subašić et al. (2008) as a process; Neufeld et al. (2019) as a psychological state (i.e., attitudes) and Glasford and Calcagno (2012) as an outcome (i.e., collective action). Nonetheless, solidarity can be defined as the degree to which a person is committed to stand with the outgroup and work with them for social change (see Neufeld et
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al., 2019; Smith, McGarty, & Thomas, 2018; Starzyk, Neufeld, El-Gabalawy, & Boese, 2019; Subašić et al., 2008).

Solidarity has important outcomes for intergroup relations, including intra-minority relations. For instance, Starzyk and colleagues (2019) showed that a sense of solidarity among Canadians predicted support for Indigenous people’s rights in Canada. Similarly, in another study conducted by Neufeld et al. (2019) with Canadians, it has been shown that political solidarity with Syrian refugees correlated with support for redistribution of resources and power as well as collective action behaviors such as donations. Subašić and colleagues (2018) also illustrated that a sense of common cause between men and women elicits higher solidarity-based collective action intentions among men. In doing so, this finding highlights the role of solidarity on solidarity-based collective action for outgroups in the same identity categories (i.e., men and women in the gender category). In the current study, we aim to move these previous findings one step further and test whether strategic intra-minority alliance between groups might predict solidarity-based collective in an inter-category (here heterosexuals and LGBTQ+). Moreover, Radke et al. (2020) argue that behavioral outcomes of solidarity such as intergroup helping and collective action may be fueled by both ingroup- and outgroup-focused motivations. As both heterosexual feminist women and LGBTQ+ in Turkey have faced oppression from the current conservative government, we hypothesize that heterosexual feminist women who endorse strategic intra-minority alliance—their ingroup should stand in solidarity with LGBTQ+—would be more inclined to challenge the status quo in a broader sense through participation in solidarity-based collective action. Specifically, we hypothesize that higher endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance would predict more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights among heterosexual feminist women.

Privilege Awareness
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While Case, Iuzzini, and Hopkins (2012, p. 3) define privilege as “uneared benefits afforded to powerful social groups within systems oppression,” McIntosh (1988, p. 1) describes it as social structures that are constructed with “an invisible package of unearned assets.” Even though privilege is defined as a relational, contextual, or structural term in general, it is fair to argue that individuals who are members of advantaged groups such as men, Whites, or heterosexuals are often perceived as privileged.

Some prior research has focused on how awareness of racial privilege may shift advantaged group members’ attitudes toward greater acceptance of the disadvantaged. For example, heightened privilege awareness among White Americans has been shown to predict more positive attitudes toward African Americans (Stewart, Latu, Branscombe, Philips, & Denney, 2012; see also Powell, Branscombe, & Schmitt, 2005). Relatedly, among heterosexuals, greater acknowledgment of heterosexual privilege has been linked to more positive attitudes toward same-sex marriage and marriage equality as well as ally behavior in lesbian and gay rights activism (Case & Stewart, 2010; Montgomery & Stewart, 2012). As evidenced by these examples, the research conducted thus far has looked at how greater awareness of privilege among advantaged groups predicts attitudes toward the disadvantaged. Although the role of privilege awareness on affirmative action is addressed in previous research (Case, 2007, 2012; Case, Hensley, & Anderson, 2014), less is known about how privilege awareness plays a critical role in taking action on behalf of disadvantaged group members. One exception is the study by Uluğ and Tropp (2021), which showed that awareness of White privilege predicted White Americans’ willingness to participate in collective action for racial justice. Even though these studies show the importance of awareness of ingroup privilege on collective action, no single study has focused on how privilege awareness of a politicized group (i.e., feminists) who have both disadvantaged (i.e.,
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woman identity) and advantaged identities (i.e., heterosexual identity) may be associated with their willingness to take action to promote intergroup equality.

Recognition of discrimination and privilege are linked, yet they are different social-psychological concepts and have different behavioral outcomes (see Iyer, Leach, & Crosby, 2003; Leach, Snider, & Iyer, 2002; Uluğ & Tropp, 2021). Privileges of the relatively more advantaged groups make perceived discrimination of stigmatized groups invisible or insignificant (see Bettinsoli, Napier, & Carnaghi, 2021; Case, 2012; Case et al., 2014). Other research has examined how advantaged group members respond when racial inequalities are framed either in terms of outgroup disadvantage or ingroup privilege (see, e.g., Iyer et al., 2003; Leach et al., 2002; Lowery, Chow, Knowles, & Unzueta, 2012). This body of work suggests that recognition of outgroup discrimination and recognition of ingroup privilege are related, yet distinct, concepts (Iyer et al., 2003), which predict different emotional and motivational responses to inequality (Lowery et al., 2012; Lowery, Knowles, & Unzueta, 2007). For instance, focusing on how disadvantaged racial groups are discriminated against may lead members of advantaged racial groups to feel sympathy for the disadvantaged, whereas focusing on Whites’ advantage may lead Whites to feel guilty (Iyer et al., 2003). As Reimer et al. (2017; Study 1b) showed that heterosexual participants’ perceptions of discrimination against non-heterosexuals do not predict their collective action participation to promote the interests of LGBTQ+ communities, we first aimed to examine to what extent we would replicate their findings among heterosexual women who have both an advantaged and disadvantaged identity. Moreover, we focused not only on the perceived discrimination against the outgroup (i.e., LGBTQ+) but also awareness of ingroup privilege as predictors of solidarity-based collective action.

Overview of Studies
In three studies, we aim to examine how heterosexual feminist women take action on behalf of LGBTQ+ in Turkey. In particular, we investigate the role of a) feminist identification, b) perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+, and c) endorsement of strategic intra-minority alliance in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights among heterosexual feminist women (i.e., a group who has advantaged, politicized, and disadvantaged identities).

Across three studies, we hypothesize that stronger feminist identification would predict more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action (Hypothesis 1). We also hypothesize that higher perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ would predict more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action (Hypothesis 2). Last, we expect that more endorsement of strategic intra-minority alliance between feminists and LGBTQ+ would also predict more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action (Hypothesis 3).

Study 1

Method

Participants and Procedure

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Clark University. The anonymized raw data is publicly available via the Open Society Framework (OSF) webpage: https://osf.io/jup87/?view_only=df828303e92f40418a686954ec82fa9

We aimed to collect data from participants who self-identify as woman, feminist, and heterosexual. We distributed the link to the survey on Facebook, Twitter, and WhatsApp and used snowball sampling. Data were collected in Turkey right before the International Women’s Day (March 8) in 2019. All participants completed the online questionnaire voluntarily. A total of 188 self-identified women participated in the study. However, one
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participant who did not complete the key study variables, three participants who did not self-identify as feminists, and 43 participants who did not identify as heterosexuals were excluded from the data. The final sample was composed of 141 participants.\(^2\) Participants’ ages ranged from 18 to 52 years \((M = 30.33, SD = 8.12)\). Fifteen participants had completed a PhD degree, 30 an MSc degree, 80 a university degree, and 16 had graduated from high school.

**Measures**

We used 5-point response scales \((1 = \text{strongly disagree}; 5 = \text{strongly agree})\) with the exception of the demographic variables mentioned above.

**Feminist identification.** Feminist identification was measured by six items that adapted from centrality, solidarity, satisfaction, and in-group homogeneity subscales of Leach and colleagues (2008). These items were “Being a feminist is something that reflects who I am,” “Being a feminist is important to me,” “I have a lot in common with other feminists,” “I have a strong bond with other feminists,” “Being a feminist is an important part of myself,” and “I am glad to be a feminist” \((\alpha = .88)\).

**Perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+.** Perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ was assessed by adopting three items from Verkuyten and Yildiz (2006). These items were “Discrimination against LGBTQ+ has increased in recent times,” “In Turkey, intolerance towards LGBTQ+ is increasing,” and “LGBTQ+ are under threat in Turkey” \((\alpha = .75)\).

**Endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance.** Participants’ beliefs about whether feminists should stand in solidarity with LGBTQ+ were assessed by adopting four items from Glasford and Calcagno (2012). These items were “Feminists and LGBTQ+ should work together to improve their position of both groups,” “Feminists should support the
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\(^2\) A priori power analysis conducted with G*Power 3.1 showed that we need at least 119 participants to attain a power of .95 with an \(\alpha\) error probability level of .05 and \(f^2 = .15\), to perform linear regression analysis with three predictors (i.e., feminist identification, perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+, and endorsement of strategic intra-minority alliance).
LGBTQ+ movement as best they can,” “Feminists and LGBTQ+ should unite and fight together,” and “Feminists and LGBTQ+ can achieve their goals only if they work together” ($\alpha = .81$).

**Willingness to engage in solidarity-based collective action.** We used four items to measure participants’ willingness to participate in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights by adopting items from Odağ, Uluğ, and Solak (2016): *I would be willing to “attend meetings, forums, or discussion groups of an LGBTQ+ organization,” “participate in a protest related to the LGBTQ+ movement over the Internet, through social media networks,” “add my name to the signature page for a collective protest related to the LGBTQ movement by e-mail or other ways,” and “participate in LGBTQ marches or actions” ($\alpha = .78$).*

**Results and Discussion**

Preliminary analyses examined relations between the variables. Correlations among the variables and descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. Inspection of the means showed that, on average, participants were highly identified with their ingroup ($M = 4.45$), perceived high discrimination against LGBTQ+ ($M = 4.64$), largely endorsed the strategic intra-minority alliance ($M = 4.30$) and showed greater willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights ($M = 4.50$). Moreover, bivariate correlations indicated that higher feminist identification correlated with higher perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+, more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance, and higher willingness to engage in solidarity-based collective action. At the same time, perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ positively correlated with both more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance and willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Lastly, endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance positively correlated with willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action (see Table 1).

[Insert Table 1]
A linear regression analysis was carried out in SPSS version 24 (IBM, 2017) to examine the degree to which a) feminist identification, b) perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+, and c) endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance would predict willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights. As summarized in Table 2, feminist identification ($\beta = .24$, $p = .004$) was a significant predictor of willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Specifically, higher feminist identification predicted higher willingness to engage in solidarity-based collective action, supporting our first hypothesis. However, perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ ($\beta = .12$, $p = .137$) did not predict willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Lastly, endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance ($\beta = .25$, $p = .003$) was a significant predictor of willingness to engage in solidarity-based collective action, confirming our third hypothesis. The higher endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance was associated with the higher willingness to engage in solidarity-based collective action.

Study 1 offers initial support for the first hypothesis that politicized ingroup identity (i.e., feminist identity) would predict willingness to participate in collective action for outgroup causes. Findings demonstrated that higher feminist identification predicted more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights. Previous research showed that politicized ingroup identity is a strong predictor for participating in collective action (Radke et al., 2018; Simon & Klandermans, 2001). However, our study shows that politicized ingroup identity also predicts solidarity-based collective action for outgroup causes and thus extends the previous studies by indicating the role of politicized ingroup identity in solidarity-based collective action for outgroup causes.

Study 1 did not find support for our second hypothesis that perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ would predict more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective
action. One can ask why *Hypothesis 2* is not supported in Study 1. Perceived discrimination across identity dimensions, such as between a racial minority identity and a sexual minority identity, may trigger social identity threat and spurs the derogation of other minority groups (Craig et al., 2012; Craig & Richeson, 2016). These results may also be related to our sample size and characteristics. In Study 1, we tested our hypotheses among a relatively small sample. Therefore, we conducted the second study to replicate the findings of Study 1 with a larger sample.

Lastly, Study 1 also found support for the third hypothesis that more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance would predict more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Given how a sense of common cause (Subašić et al., 2018) and social change commitment (Neufeld et al., 2019) predicted solidarity-based collective action in previous studies, our findings complement these findings by illustrating the role of the strategic alliance in solidarity-based collective action in particular and intra-minority solidarity in general.

**Study 2**

Study 2 aimed to replicate the findings of Study 1 (*Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3*) and sought to extend the previous findings by examining how awareness of sexual orientation privilege plays a role in heterosexual feminist women’s willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action (*Hypothesis 4*). As the sample size was relatively small in Study 1, Study 2 also aimed to test these hypotheses with a larger sample.

**Method**

**Participants and Procedure**

This study approved by the Institutional Review Board of Clark University. As in Study 1, we aimed to collect data from participants who self-identified as woman, feminist, and heterosexual. We collected data from Facebook, Twitter, and WhatsApp using snowball
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sampling. To improve the recruitment strategy in Study 1, we also contacted online feminist
groups in Turkey, such as Women are Strong Together (Kadınlar Birlikte Güçlü) and
Women’s Assembly of Education and Science Workers’ Union (Eğitim ve Bilim Emekçileri
Sendikası Kadın Meclisi). Data were collected in Turkey during the International LGBTQ+
Pride Month in June 2020.

All participants completed the online questionnaire voluntarily. A total of 958 self-
identified women participated in the study. Two participants who did not complete the key
study variables, three participants who did not self-identify as feminist and 289 participants
who did not self-identify as heterosexual were excluded from the sample. The final sample,
therefore, was composed of 664 participants. Participants’ ages ranged from 18 to 63 years (M
= 28.61, SD = 7.76). Forty-six participants had completed a PhD degree, 140 an MSc degree,
332 a university degree, 145 high school, and one secondary school.

Measures

We used the same measures as those used in Study 1 to assess feminist identification
(Leach et al., 2008; \( \alpha = .80 \)), perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ (Verkuyten & Yildiz,
2006; \( \alpha = .74 \)), endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance (Glasford & Calcagno,
2012; \( \alpha = .88 \)), and willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action (Odağ et al.,
2016; \( \alpha = .88 \)). We again used 5-point response scales (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly
agree) with the exception of the demographic variables.

Awareness of sexual orientation privilege. We used four items developed by Case
(2007) to assess participants’ awareness of sexual orientation privilege. These items were
“Heterosexuals have privileges that LGBTQ+ do not have in this country,” “Heterosexuals
have more opportunities than LGBTQ+ in employment and education,” “LGBTQ+ are
disadvantaged in society and heterosexuals are at an advantage,” and “Heterosexuals are at
an advantage because they hold most of the positions of power in this society” (\( \alpha = .88 \)).
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Results and Discussion

Preliminary analyses examined relations between the variables. Correlations among the variables, means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 3. As in Study 1, inspection of the means showed that, on average, participants were highly identified with their ingroup \((M = 4.40)\), perceived high discrimination against LGBTQ+ \((M = 4.61)\), largely endorsed the strategic intra-minority alliance that feminists should stand in solidarity with LGBTQ+ \((M = 4.23)\), and showed high willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights \((M = 4.07)\). In addition, in Study 2, participants displayed high awareness of sexual orientation privilege \((M = 4.73)\).

Bivariate correlations indicated that higher feminist identification correlated with more perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+, more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance, higher awareness of sexual orientation privilege, and higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. At the same time, higher perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ correlated with higher awareness of sexual orientation privilege, more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance correlated, and higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. In addition, higher awareness of sexual orientation privilege positively correlated with more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance and higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Lastly, endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance positively correlated with higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action (see Table 3).

[Insert Table 3]

As in Study 1, a linear regression analysis was carried out in SPSS version 24 (IBM, 2017) to examine the degree to which a) feminist identification, b) perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+, c) awareness of sexual orientation privilege, and d) endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance predict willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action.
action. The standardized and unstandardized coefficients of our analyses are presented in Table 4.

As in Study 1, feminist identification ($\beta = .21, p < .001$) was a significant predictor of willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Specifically, higher feminist identification predicted higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Different from the findings of Study 1, higher perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ ($\beta = .11, p = .001$) predicted more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights. Moreover, higher awareness of sexual orientation privilege ($\beta = .11, p = .001$) predicted more willingness to participate in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights among heterosexual feminist women. Lastly, endorsing the strategic intra-minority alliance predicted willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action ($\beta = .44, p < .001$). In other words, more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance predicted higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action.

As in Study 1, Study 2 found support for Hypothesis 1 that politicized ingroup identity would predict willingness to participate in collective action for the outgroup cause. Our findings indicated that higher feminist identification predicted more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Study 2 found support for Hypothesis 2 that perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ would predict willingness to participate in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights, on the contrary of Study 1. Study 2 also found support for Hypothesis 3 as in Study 1. Findings demonstrated that more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance predicted greater willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Our results also extended the findings of Study 1 by showing sexual orientation privilege awareness predicts willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. In other words, higher awareness of sexual orientation privilege is related to a greater willingness to
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engage in solidarity-based collective action. Thus, the results of Study 2 supported Hypothesis 4 and extended previous findings by shedding lights on the role of privilege awareness in solidarity based collective action (e.g., Case et al., 2014; Stewart et al., 2012).

Study 3

Collective action research overwhelmingly addresses a single identity and investigates the impact of this particular identity on collective action. Greenwood (2012) criticized these singular approaches and pointed out the intersectional and multiple real-world identities (see also Anderson & Koc, 2020; Koc & Vignoles, 2016, 2018). In recent years, researchers have paid increasing attention to how and why people who have both advantaged and disadvantaged identities, such as being a White woman, engage in collective action for racial justice and become allies to outgroup members (Ostrove & Brown, 2018; Tropp & Uluğ, 2019). However, little is known about how and why politicized disadvantaged group members decide to participate in solidarity-based collective action for other disadvantaged groups.

Although allyship studies in social psychology (e.g., Tropp & Uluğ, 2019; Uluğ & Uysal, in press) partly challenged the singular approaches by examining how and why group members who have both advantaged and disadvantaged or ally identities engage in collective action for disadvantaged group members (e.g., White women’s collective action participation in a Women’s March), how and why disadvantaged ingroup identity impacts participation in collective action for another disadvantaged group remained unanswered (e.g., women’s collective action participation for LGBTQ+ rights). We believe that we need to consider multiple identities and the positions of these identities in society to unpack the dynamics behind intra-group solidarity. For example, a feminist woman may be in a disadvantaged position because of her gender and political identity in society. However, her sexual orientation identity may create an advantaged position for her compared to her LGBTQ+ counterparts. In this study, we aim to examine the role of advantaged (i.e., heterosexual),
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politicized (i.e., feminist), and disadvantaged (i.e., woman) identities of heterosexual feminist women in participation in solidarity-based collective action for another disadvantaged group (i.e., LGBTQ+). Thus, we aim to take multiple identities of our participants into account (i.e., advantaged, disadvantaged, and politicized identities) in Study 3. As in Studies 1 and 2, our first hypothesis is that feminist identification would predict more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Van Breen et al. (2017) have shown that it is not woman identity, but feminist identity, that reflects attitudes towards collective action. Based on their findings, we also hypothesize that woman identification would not predict more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action (Hypothesis 5). However, as identification with the advantaged identity is usually associated with more negative attitudes toward the disadvantaged as well as motivation to protect the interests of the advantaged (Lowery et al., 2006; Stewart et al., 2012), we hypothesized that higher identification with heterosexual identity would predict lower willingness to participate in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights (Hypothesis 6).

Although we tested and discussed the relationship between perceived discrimination against outgroup (i.e., LGBTQ+) and heterosexual feminist women’s willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action, recent studies have also shown the role of perceived discrimination against ingroup in intra-minority solidarity (e.g., Acar & Uluğ, 2016; Craig & Richeson, 2012). In this study, we aim to examine the role of perceived discrimination against both ingroup and outgroup in willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Therefore, we hypothesize that perceived discrimination against outgroup (i.e., LGBTQ+; Hypothesis 2) and ingroup (i.e., women; Hypothesis 7) would predict higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action.

Last, we believe that not only one’s awareness of privilege that creates their disadvantaged position (e.g., gender privilege) but also awareness of privilege that creates
their advantaged position (e.g., sexual orientation privilege) is important in predicting their willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Therefore, we aim to examine the role of awareness of gender privilege in solidarity-based collective action, in addition to the role of awareness of sexual orientation privilege. We hypothesize that higher awareness of both sexual orientation privilege and gender privilege (Hypothesis 8) would predict higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action.

**Method**

**Participants and Procedure**

This study approved by Sciences & Technology Cross-Schools Research Ethics Committee of University of Sussex. As in Studies 1 and 2, we aimed to collect data from participants in Turkey who self-identified as woman, feminist, and heterosexual. We collected data from Twitter using snowball sampling. Data were collected in April 2021. All participants completed the online questionnaire voluntarily. A total of 378 self-identified women participated in the study. Seventy-nine participants who did not complete the key study variables and 19 participants who did not self-identify as heterosexual were excluded from the sample. The final sample, therefore, was composed of 280 participants. Participants’ ages ranged from 18 to 60 years ($M = 29.78, SD = 8.71$). Thirty-two participants had completed a PhD degree, 66 an MSc degree, 109 a university degree, 72 high school, and one secondary school.

**Measures**

We used the same measures in Study 2 to assess feminist identification (Leach et al., 2008; $a = .85$), perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ (Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2006; $a = .76$), awareness of heterosexual privilege (Case, 2007; $a = .79$), endorsement of strategic intra-minority alliance (Glasford & Calcagno, 2012; $a = .86$) and willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights (Odağ et al., 2016; $a = .88$). We also
adapted these items to measure identification with disadvantaged gender identity (i.e., women identification) by six items (Leach et al., 2008; $\alpha = .79$; centrality, solidarity, satisfaction, and in-group homogeneity), identification with advantaged sexual orientation identity (i.e., heterosexual identification) by four items (Leach et al., 2008; $\alpha = .83$; centrality and in-group homogeneity), perceived discrimination against women by three items (Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2006; $\alpha = .74$), and awareness of gender privilege by four items (Case, 2007; $\alpha = .82$). We used 5-point response scales (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) with the exception of the demographic variables, as we did in Studies 1 and 2.

**Results and Discussion**

Preliminary analyses examined relations between the variables. Correlations among the variables, means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 5. As in Studies 1 and 2, inspection of the means showed that, on average, participants were highly identified with their ingroup ($M = 4.36$), perceived high discrimination against LGBTQ+ ($M = 4.76$), largely endorsed the strategic intra-minority alliance that feminists should stand in solidarity with LGBTQ+ ($M = 4.37$) and showed high willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights ($M = 4.24$). In addition, as in Study 2, participants displayed high awareness of sexual orientation privilege ($M = 4.79$). Moreover, in Study 3, we found that they were highly identified with the disadvantaged woman identity ($M = 4.21$), whereas they showed lower identification with the advantaged heterosexual identity ($M = 2.75$).

Participants also showed higher perceived discrimination against women ($M = 4.77$) and awareness of gender privilege ($M = 4.86$).

As in Studies 1 and 2, a linear regression analysis was carried out in SPSS version 24 (IBM, 2017) to examine the degree to which a) identification with multiple identities (i.e., identification with politicized feminist identity, disadvantaged woman identity, and
advantaged heterosexual identity), b) perceived discrimination against both ingroup (i.e.,
women) and outgroup (i.e., LGBTQ+), c) awareness of privilege as an advantaged group
(sexual orientation privilege) and disadvantaged group (gender privilege), and d) endorsement
of the strategic intra-minority alliance predict willingness to participate in solidarity-based
collective action. The standardized and unstandardized coefficients of our analyses are
presented in Table 6.

As in the first two studies, identification with politicized feminist identity ($\beta = .29, p <
.001$) predicted willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Specifically,higher feminist identification predicted higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based
collective action. While identification with disadvantaged woman identity did not predict
willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action ($\beta = .04, p = .460$) and
supported our fifth hypothesis, higher identification with advantaged heterosexual identity
predicted lower willingness to participate in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights ($\beta = -.11, p
= .039$), supporting Hypothesis 6. Both perceived discrimination against women ($\beta = -.01, p
= .970$) and LGBTQ+ ($\beta = .04, p = .628$) did not predict willingness to participate in solidarity-
based collective action. Thus, we did not find support for our seventh hypothesis. Moreover,
higher awareness of sexual orientation privilege ($\beta = .17, p = .003$) predicted more
willingness to participate in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights among heterosexual
feminist women, supporting Hypothesis 4, whereas awareness of gender privilege did not
predict it ($\beta = .02, p = .739$). Thus, our findings did not support our eighth hypothesis. Similar
to the findings of Studies 1 and 2, endorsing the strategic intra-minority alliance predicted
willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action ($\beta = .26, p < .001$). In other
words, more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance predicted higher willingness
to participate in solidarity-based collective action.

[Insert Table 6]
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General Discussion

The present research examined the role of feminist identification, perceived discrimination against another disadvantaged group (i.e., LGBTQ+), and endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance between feminists and LGBTQ+ in heterosexual feminist women’s willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. In doing so, we took the multiple identities of a politicized group with both advantaged and disadvantaged identities (i.e., heterosexual feminist women) into account based on Greenwood’s (2012) singular approach critique as well as previous studies on advantaged and disadvantaged identity integration (Koc & Vignoles, 2016, 2018). Although the dynamics between majority and minority groups have frequently been studied in social psychology (Shnabel et al., 2013; Subašić et al., 2018; Teixeira, Spears, & Yzerbyt, 2020), the present set of studies sheds some light on the relationship between disadvantaged groups who share both similar and different (dis)advantaged identities. The current set of studies also offers a different perspective in the field of collective action, as the results show the underlying mechanisms behind strategic alliances between disadvantaged groups that aim to bring about social change.

All three studies offered support for our first hypothesis that politicized ingroup identity (i.e., feminist identity) would predict willingness to participate in collective action for outgroup causes. Generally, feminist identity is associated with action and protests for gender equality (Girerd & Bonnot, 2020; Iyer & Ryan, 2009; Radke et al., 2018; van Breen et al., 2017; Yoder et al., 2011). However, to our knowledge, current research is the first to show that feminist identification predicts willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for another disadvantaged group. One of the underlying reasons for this finding may be heterosexual feminist women in Turkey acknowledge that LGBTQ+ are suffering from gender inequality and heteropatriarchy in the country (see, e.g., Baba, 2011; Engin, 2015). This acknowledgment can make them a potential ally in their struggle. Although heterosexual
feminist women have an advantaged status compared to LGBTQ+ in terms of their sexual identity, both feminists and LGBTQ+ are exposed to gender inequality and patriarchal violence in Turkey. This common threat may motivate feminists, especially those who tend to be more politicized, to form a strategic alliance with LGBTQ+ for improving ingroup’s causes and thereby predict heterosexual feminist women’s support for LGBTQ+’s rights. We believe that high mean scores of endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance and its association with willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action support this idea.

We also found contradictory findings related to our second hypothesis: perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ predicts willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. While Study 2 offered support for our second hypothesis, perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ did not predict willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action in Studies 1 and 3. The different and null effects of perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ in these studies complement the previous findings in the literature that has shown similar inconsistent effects of perceived discrimination against ingroup and outgroup (see e.g., Reimer et al., 2017). For example, Craig, Richeson, and colleagues showed that while acknowledging discrimination experiences faced by outgroup may activate a common disadvantaged ingroup identity (Craig & Richeson, 2012; Craig et al., 2020; Richeson & Craig, 2011), perceived discrimination in inter-categories (e.g., racial minority group and sexual minority group) may increase social identity threats and hinder intra-minority solidarity (Craig et al., 2012; Craig & Richeson, 2016). Similar to Studies 1 and 3, Reimer et al. (2017; Study 1b) showed that heterosexual participants’ perceptions of discrimination against non-heterosexuals do not predict their collective action participation to promote the interests of LGBTQ+ communities. Hence, it is fair to argue that perceived discrimination against an outgroup may not be enough to motivate ingroup members (see Uluğ & Tropp,
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2021). Nevertheless, perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ predicted heterosexual feminist women’s willingness to participate in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights in Study 2. This may be related to the salience of the movements in the time period of data collection as participants were recruited just before the LGBTQ+ Pride Week 2020 in Study 2.

Our third hypothesis was supported across three studies: Endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance between feminists and LGBTQ+ predicts willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. One may ask why members of a disadvantaged group (women) feel that they should stand in solidarity with members of another disadvantaged group (LGBTQ+) and how this quest predicts their participation in solidarity-based collective action for outgroup causes (LGBTQ+ rights). Subašić and colleagues (2008) have suggested two important facets of political solidarity. First, individuals should commit themselves to minority outgroup’s cause. In other words, people should feel a responsibility to outgroup’s cause, namely “a sense of common cause,” even if this cause does not directly relate to ingroup causes (p. 331). Second, individuals should show political solidarity as a social change commitment (see also Neufeld et al., 2019). In other words, individuals engage in activism, not just to help the outgroup but also to challenge the status quo and authority for their ingroup causes. Similarly, Radke et al. (2020) pointed out different motivations (i.e., ingroup focused, outgroup focused, morality, personal) for solidarity. Scholars argue that members of advantaged group members seek good moral and social image through confronting inequalities, whereas disadvantaged group members need power and social change (Selvanathan, Lickel, & Dasgupta, 2020; Shnabel, Nadler, Canetti-Nisim & Ullrich, 2008; Shnabel, Nadler, Ullrich, Dovidio, & Carmi, 2009).

In this respect, we argue that majority-minority solidarity may require a sense of common cause (Subašić et al., 2008) or morality motivations (Radke et al., 2020); however, intra-minority solidarity is generally fostered by social change commitment (Subašić et al.,
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2008) or ingroup focused motivations (Radke et al., 2020) such as strategic intra-minority alliance. Previous research has shown that disadvantaged groups who unite around a shared goal against a perceived common threat are more motivated to stand in solidarity with one another (see, e.g., Acar & Uluğ, 2016). As the current conservative government’s politics in reinforcing the hatred against LGBTQ+ (KAOS GL, 2015) and attacks on women’s rights (We Will Stop the Femicides, 2020) put both women and LGBTQ+ at a disadvantage, heterosexual feminist women may have formed a strategic intra-minority alliance with LGBTQ+ to achieve ingroup goals to the extent they endorse this alliance.

We also examined the role of awareness of ingroup’s privileges on heterosexual feminist women’s willingness to engage in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights in Studies 2 and 3. As expected, higher awareness of sexual orientation privilege predicted higher willingness to engage in solidarity-based collective action, thus confirming our fourth hypothesis. People who are aware of their ingroup’s privilege have more positive attitudes towards outgroup members (Case & Stewart, 2010; Montgomery & Stewart, 2012; Stewart et al., 2012) and even higher motivation to participate in collective action for them (Uluğ & Tropp, 2021). Our findings contribute to the literature on the role of privilege awareness not only in the context of majority-minority relations (Case & Stewart, 2010; Montgomery & Stewart, 2012; Stewart et al., 2012; Uluğ & Tropp, 2021) but also in the context of intra-minority relations. However, awareness of gender privilege did not predict solidarity-based collective action. Although awareness of sexual orientation privilege may be more related to advantaged heterosexual identity, awareness of gender privilege may reflect to concerns of disadvantaged women identity. We, therefore, believe that awareness of gender privilege may be a predictor for ingroup-focused collective action, rather than solidarity-based collective action.
Lastly, we tested the role of multiple identities of participants in Study 3 by taking Greenwood’s (2012) criticism into account. Although we tested the role of feminist identification of heterosexual feminist women in Studies 1 and 2, the multifaceted nature of heterosexual feminist identity should not be overlooked. Heterosexual feminist women have a disadvantaged position in terms of their politicized and gender identity in Turkey. However, they can still be considered privileged as they have a socially accepted sexual orientation compared to their LGBTQ+ counterparts. Study 3 showed that different identities of the same social group might have contradictory relationships with their willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. While higher politicized feminist identification was related to willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action, identification with disadvantaged woman identity did not predict willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. These findings complement the previous findings in the literature that has shown that identification with woman identity reflects women’s attitudes towards gender stereotypes, while identification with feminist identity reflects attitudes towards collective action (e.g., van Breen et al., 2017). On the other hand, higher advantaged heterosexual identification predicted lower level of willingness to participate in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights, which is consistent with previous findings that advantaged group identity may be a barrier to take action on behalf of disadvantaged groups (Stewart et al., 2012).

While discussing the role of intersection between conflicted multiple identities on collective action, we believe that identity integration and identity (in)compatibility are one of the most important issues. In addition to the studies that showed the link between identity integration and well-being (Koc & Vignoles, 2016, 2018), recent studies showed that intersection of incompatible identities predict feelings like guilt and shame which known as associated with willingness to collective action (Calcagno, 2016; Shepherd, Spears, & Manstead, 2013; Solak, Tagar, Cohen-Chen, Saguy, & Helparin, 2017). More works that focus whether intersection of
compatible vs. incompatible identities predict collective action for ingroup causes vs. outgroup causes are needed. Moreover, based on our findings, we can argue that more work is needed to understand the content of identities for disadvantaged groups as these contents may (not) motivate members of disadvantaged groups to choose to act for the benefit of their own group (see, e.g., Uluğ, Chayinska, & Tropp, forthcoming) as well as on behalf of other disadvantaged groups.

Limitations and Future Directions

Our studies are not without limitations. We collected data online by using social media platforms. Therefore, we believe that we reached out to a young and politicized sample in Turkey. In general, young feminists in Turkey are using social media frequently both to claim their rights and to protest. Although reaching out to this politicized sample gave us a unique opportunity to test the relationship between heterosexual feminist women’s ingroup identification (i.e., feminist identification) and willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action, we should be careful not to generalize our findings to all feminists in Turkey. As feminist perspectives differ in supporting LGBTQ+ rights (Price, 2020), future studies should make a more concerted effort to get a more heterogeneous sample and focus on generational differences in feminism, such as second-wave and third-wave feminists.

Moreover, we conducted all of our studies during politically salient times. We collected data before the 8th of March for Study 1, before LGBTQ+ Pride Week for Study 2, and after Boğaziçi University protests for Study 3. Although Boğaziçi University protests have started against the appointment of Melih Bulu as rector of the university by the president Erdogan, these protests turned into allyship protests for LGBTQ+. The main reason behind that four LGBTQ+ activists were arrested and the ministry of interior referred to the arrested students as “LGBT perverts” in his tweets. As these different times might have affected our findings, we believe that these studies should be replicated during politically less salient times by...
including more diverse samples. In addition, we targeted specifically feminist women across three studies. This might have reduced the range of feminist identification and created a ceiling effect for feminist identification scores. Therefore, future research which may focus on non-feminist women and how their identification with feminist identity may be related to solidarity-based collective action is needed.

Feminism has many variants associated with a variety of political, social, methodological, and philosophical perspectives. Some scholars have distinguished different feminist approaches such as radical, socialist, and liberal feminism (see, e.g., Campbell & Wasco, 2000; Code, 2000). Relatedly, it is important to note that at the time of data collection, TERF (trans-exclusionary radical feminists) debates (see, e.g., Hines, 2019; Rodemeyer, 2018; Williams, 2016) were very intense among feminist and queer activists in Turkey on social media. High mean scores of endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance in our studies might mean that many trans-exclusionary feminists in Turkey did not participate in our studies. One may also ask how our results would look if we had asked feminists’ willingness to engage in collective action only for trans rights instead of LGBTQ+ rights. Future studies should focus particularly on trans-exclusionary feminists to understand the barriers to both supporting LGBTQ+ rights and collective action participation on behalf of LGBTQ+ among them.

van Breen et al. (2017) tested interaction between feminist and women identification following the multiple identities approach. They could not find significant effect of the interaction between feminist and women identification on collective action. Although our third study followed a similar approach and focused on the role of intersectionality and multiple identities, we did not test the role of interaction between different identities (e.g., feminist, women, and heterosexual) due to relatively small sample size and power. This limitation may have prevented fully reflecting the intersectional approach in our research.
Future works that aim to follow intersectional approach should test the role of interaction between different identities, especially the conflicted ones (e.g., advantaged and disadvantaged identities).

As another limitation, we believe that items used for identification measures need to be discussed. While we used four of five subscales (centrality, solidarity, satisfaction, and in-group homogeneity) of Leach et al.’s (2008) identification scale for measuring feminist and women identity, we adapted items from two subscales (centrality and in-group homogeneity) for heterosexual identity. We did not include the items from solidarity and satisfaction subscales for measuring heterosexual identity for their contradiction with awareness of sexual orientation privilege. Yet, items that reflected different dimension of identification might be confounding while working with multiple identities and future studies should use standardized and uniform items. Moreover, we believe that researchers should be more careful while using subdimensions of identification that discussed as distinct variables from identification such as in-group homogeneity (e.g., Rubin & Badea, 2007, 2012).

Last, we believe that differences in effect sizes should be discussed. Across three studies, endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance has high effect sizes (which is the highest in Studies 1 and 2, and second highest in Study 3; over .25 standardized betas for all studies) in predicting solidarity-based collective action. In addition to this result, Radke et al. (2020) positioned motivations of solidarity (e.g., ingroup focused motivations) such as strategic intra-minority alliance between the antecedents of solidarity (e.g., identification, emotions, attitudes) and behavioral outcomes of solidarity (e.g., collective action). Based on this, it is fair to argue that strategic intra-minority alliance may be a more proximal predictor of solidarity-based collective action than the other antecedents such as feminist identification and perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+. Therefore, the mediator role of the strategic intra-minority alliance in the relationship between antecedents (e.g., identification, perceived
discrimination, privilege awareness) and solidarity-based collective action should be examined in future studies.

**Conclusion**

Across three studies, we investigated the role of feminist identification, perceived discrimination against another disadvantaged group (LGBTQ+), sexual orientation privilege awareness, and endorsement of strategic intra-minority alliance between feminists and LGBTQ+ in heterosexual feminist women’s willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights. Our findings contribute to the literature by showing the relationship between privilege awareness and solidarity between disadvantaged groups. Lastly, we believe that the current paper contributes the intersectional approaches and critique of singular identity approaches in social psychology research by testing and discussing the contradictory roles of the politicized disadvantaged and advantaged identities of the same group in solidarity-based collective action. We hope that our studies may pave the way for intraminority solidarity between them by demonstrating how 1) multiple identities, 2) perceived discrimination against one’s own group and other disadvantaged groups, 3) endorsement of strategic intra-minority alliance, and 4) privilege awareness of advantaged groups may become both facilitators of and barriers to solidarity-based collective action.
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Table 1

*Means, standard deviations, and correlations of all measures in Study 1.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$M$ $(SD)$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feminist identification</td>
<td>4.45 (.60)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+</td>
<td>4.64 (.60)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategic intra-minority alliance</td>
<td>4.30 (.71)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>33***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action</td>
<td>4.50 (.60)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$*
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Table 2

Model Summary of Regression Analysis in Study 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminist identification</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic intra-minority alliance</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F$  
10.848

$R^2$  
.192
Table 3

*Means, standard deviations, and correlations of all measures in Study 2.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>( M ) (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feminist identification</td>
<td>4.40 (.52)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+</td>
<td>4.61 (.60)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Awareness of sexual orientation privilege</td>
<td>4.73 (.59)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strategic intra-minority alliance</td>
<td>4.23 (.83)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action</td>
<td>4.07 (1.01)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ***\( p < .001 \)
### Table 4

*Model Summary of Regression Analysis in Study 2.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminist identification</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of sexual orientation privilege</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic intra-minority alliance</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F* 125.807  
*R*² .433
Table 5
*Means, standard deviations, and correlations of all measures in Study 3.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feminist identification</td>
<td>4.36 (.62)</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>0.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Woman identification</td>
<td>4.21 (.64)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Heterosexual identification</td>
<td>2.75 (.96)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+</td>
<td>4.76 (.56)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.77***</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.48***</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perceived discrimination against women</td>
<td>4.77 (.51)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.43***</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Awareness of sexual orientation privilege</td>
<td>4.79 (.46)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.45***</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Awareness of gender privilege</td>
<td>4.86 (.35)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Strategic intra-minority alliance</td>
<td>4.37 (.76)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.44***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action</td>
<td>4.24 (.93)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05*
### Table 6

*Model Summary of Regression Analysis in Study 3.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminist identification</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman identification</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual identification</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination against women</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of sexual orientation privilege</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of gender privilege</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic intra-minority alliance</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F$  
17.866

$R^2$  
.345