

“The liberation of LGBTQ+ will also liberate heterosexuals”: heterosexual feminist women's participation in solidarity- based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights

Article (Published Version)

Uysal, Mete Sefa, Ulug, Melis, Kanik, Betül and Aydemir, Aslı (2022) “The liberation of LGBTQ+ will also liberate heterosexuals”: heterosexual feminist women's participation in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 52 (2). pp. 377-390. ISSN 0046-2772

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/108061/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

“The liberation of LGBTQ+ will also liberate heterosexuals”: Heterosexual feminist women’s participation in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights

Mete Sefa Uysal^{1,2}  | Özden Melis Uluğ^{3,4} | Betül Kanık^{5,6} | Aslı Aydemir⁷

¹ Department of Social Psychology, Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Jena, Germany

² Psychology Department, Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir, Turkey

³ Department of Psychology, Clark University, Worcester, US

⁴ School of Psychology, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK

⁵ Department of Psychology, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Turkey

⁶ Department of Psychology, Middle Eastern Technical University, Ankara, Turkey

⁷ Department of Psychology, Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey

Correspondence

Mete Sefa Uysal, Psychology Department, Dokuz Eylül University, Tinaztepe Campus, Buca, Izmir, Turkey.
Email: metesefauysal@gmail.com

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 their 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 that higher awareness of sexual orientation privilege predicts more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. By following an intersectional and 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.

KEYWORDS

collective action, feminist identity, intersectionality, LGBTQ+ rights, perceived discrimination, politicized identity, privilege awareness, solidarity

1 | INTRODUCTION

Social psychological research on intergroup relations has overwhelmingly focused on interactions between majority and minority groups (e.g., Saguy et al., 2008, 2009; Shnabel et al., 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 et al., 2019; Subašić et al., 2008). Moreover, current approaches classify motivations for solidarity as ingroup-focused, outgroup-focused, personal, and morality motivations (see Radke et al., 2020). Building on this prior research, 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

“The liberation of LGBTQ+ will also liberate heterosexuals”: This slogan is commonly used by Turkish queer activists in Pride marches and protests for LGBTQ+ rights. Many cis-hetero allies participate in LGBTQ+ movements in Turkey for the liberation of LGBTQ+ and themselves.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2021 The Authors. *European Journal of Social Psychology* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

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 an intersectional and multi-identity 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 has been increasing (Uluğ & Acar, 2018).

1.1 | Politicized ingroup identity and solidarity-based collective action

An extensive body of research in social psychology has examined the factors that motivate people to engage in collective action (see Thomas et al., 2009; van Zomeren, 2016; van Zomeren et al., 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 et al., 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 et al., 2018; Subašić et al., 2018; van Breen et al., 2017; Yoder et al., 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, among heterosexual feminist women, higher feminist identification would predict more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights.

1.2 | Perceived discrimination and intra-minority solidarity

Recent theorizing of Craig, Richeson, and colleagues (Craig & Richeson, 2012, 2014, 2016; Craig et al., 2020; Richeson & Craig, 2011) moves the arguments of the Common Ingroup Identity Model about perceived discrimination one step further (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Gaertner et al., 1993). This recent approach examines how individuals' perception of their own group's discrimination may influence their attitudes towards other minority groups. For instance, Craig and Richeson (2012) showed that perceived discrimination against Latinos affects Latinos' attitudes towards Blacks through activating a common ingroup identity, such as a *disadvantaged racial minority* group identity. Similarly, Acar and Uluğ (2016) showed 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).

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 et al., 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 article, we argue that heterosexual feminist women's perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ predicts their willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights.

1.3 | 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 *political solidarity* to understand solidarity-based activism (e.g., behavior or intention). For example, 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 al., 2019; Smith et al., 2018; Starzyk et al., 2019; Subašić et al., 2008).

Solidarity has important outcomes for intergroup relations, including intra-minority relations. Starzyk and colleagues (2019) showed that a sense of solidarity among Canadians predicted support for Indigenous people's rights in Canada. In a similar 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 for gender equality among men. In doing so, this finding highlights the role of solidarity beliefs 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 alliances 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.

1.4 | Privilege awareness

While Case et al. (2012, p. 3) define privilege as “unearned 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 towards greater acceptance of the disadvantaged. For example, heightened privilege awareness among White Americans has been shown to predict more positive attitudes towards African Americans (Stewart et al., 2012; see also Powell et al., 2005). Relatedly, among heterosexuals, greater acknowledgment of heterosexual privilege has been linked to more

positive attitudes towards 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 towards the disadvantaged. Although the role of privilege awareness on affirmative action is addressed in previous research (Case, 2007, 2012; Case et al., 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 for collective action, no single study has focused on how privilege awareness of a politicized group (i.e., feminists) who have both disadvantaged (i.e., woman identity) and advantaged identities (e.g., 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 et al., 2003; Leach et al., 2002; Uluğ & Tropp, 2021). Privileges of the relatively more advantaged groups make perceived discrimination of stigmatized groups invisible or insignificant (see Bettinsoli et al., 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 et al., 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., 2007, 2012). 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 aimed to examine to what extent we would replicate their findings among heterosexual women who have both advantaged and disadvantaged identities. Moreover, we focused not only on the perceived discrimination against the outgroup (i.e., LGBTQ+) but also on awareness of ingroup privilege as predictors of solidarity-based collective action.

1.5 | Overview of studies

In three studies, we aim to examine how heterosexual feminist women take action for LGBTQ+ rights 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 be linked with more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action (*Hypothesis 1*). We also hypothesize that higher perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ would be linked with 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 be linked with more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action (*Hypothesis 3*).

2 | STUDY 1

2.1 | Method

2.1.1 | Participants and procedure

We aimed to collect data from participants who self-identify as women, feminists, and heterosexuals (<https://osf.io/jup87/>).¹ 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). All participants completed the online questionnaire voluntarily. A total of 188 self-identified women participated in the study. However, one 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.

2.1.2 | Measures

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

Feminist identification. Feminist identification was measured with six items adapted from centrality, solidarity, satisfaction, and ingroup 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 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 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 et al. (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*" ($\alpha = .78$).

2.2 | 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 all study variables positively and significantly correlated with each other (see 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 be linked with 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 associate 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. Higher endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance was

¹ These studies were approved by the Clark Committee for the Rights of Human Participants in Research and Training Programs (IRB) at Clark University and the Sciences & Technology Cross-Schools Research Ethics Committee at the University of Sussex. The anonymized raw data is publicly available via the Open Society Framework (OSF) webpage: https://osf.io/jup87/?view_only=df828303e92f40418a686954cfc82fa9

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 α 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).

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

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

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

TABLE 2 Model summary of regression analysis in Study 1

Willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights					
	B	SE	β	t	p
Feminist identification	.24	.08	.24	2.94	.004
Perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+	.12	.08	.12	1.50	.137
Strategic intra-minority alliance	.21	.07	.25	3.08	.003
F			10.848		
R ²			.192		

associated with 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 be linked with 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 be linked with more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. One can ask why *Hypothesis 2* was not supported in Study 1. As mentioned earlier, 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; Craig et al., 2012). In addition, the lack of insignificant findings may also be related to our sample size and characteristics as we tested our hypotheses among a relatively small sample.

Last, Study 1 also found support for the third hypothesis that more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance would be linked with 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.

3 | STUDY 2

Study 2 aimed to replicate the findings of Study 1 (*Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3*) and 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.

3.1 | Method

3.1.1 | Participants and procedure

As in Study 1, we aimed to collect data from participants who self-identified as women, feminists, and heterosexuals during the Pride Month. We collected data from Facebook, Twitter, and WhatsApp using snowball 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*).

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 feminists, and 289 participants who did not self-identify as heterosexuals were excluded from the sample.

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

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

Note. *** $p < .001$.

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.

3.1.2 | 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" ($\alpha = .88$).

3.2 | 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 feminist identity ($M = 4.40$), 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 showed high awareness of sexual orientation privilege ($M = 4.73$). Bivariate correlations indicated that all study variables positively and significantly correlated with each other (see Table 3).

As in Study 1, a linear regression analysis was carried out in SPSS version 24 (IBM Corp., 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 correlate willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective 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 is linked with higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Unlike the findings of Study 1, higher perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ ($\beta = .11$, $p = .001$) is linked with more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights. Moreover, higher awareness of sexual orientation privilege ($\beta = .11$, $p = .001$) is linked with more willingness to participate in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights among heterosexual feminist women. Lastly, endorsing the strategic intra-minority alliance associated willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action ($\beta = .44$, $p < .001$). In other words, more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance is linked with 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 be linked with willingness to participate in collective action for the outgroup cause. Our findings indicated that higher feminist identification correlated more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Study 2 also found support for *Hypothesis 2* that perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ would be linked with willingness to participate in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights, contrary to Study 1. The findings of Study 2 also supported *Hypothesis 3* as in Study 1. Findings demonstrated that more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance correlated greater willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action.

Our results also extended the findings of Study 1 regarding sexual orientation privilege awareness. The results showed that higher awareness of sexual orientation privilege is related to a greater willingness to engage in solidarity-based collective action, thus they supported *Hypothesis 4* and extended previous findings by shedding light on the role of privilege awareness in solidarity-based collective action (e.g., Case et al., 2014; Stewart et al., 2012).

TABLE 4 Model summary of regression analysis in Study 2

Willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights					
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Feminist identification	.41	.06	.21	6.70	< .001
Perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+	.19	.06	.11	3.33	.001
Awareness of sexual orientation privilege	.19	.04	.11	3.20	.001
Strategic intra-minority alliance	.54	.06	.44	12.47	< .001
<i>F</i>			125.807		
<i>R</i> ²			.433		

4 | 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, 2021) 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), and 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 Study 3, therefore, we 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 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 be linked with more willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. As van Breen et al. (2017) have shown that it is not woman identity, but feminist identity, that is more related to attitudes towards collective action, we hypothesize that woman identification would *not* be linked with 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 towards the disadvantaged as well as motivation to protect the interests of the advantaged (Lowery et al., 2007; Stewart et al., 2012), we hypothesized that higher identification with heterosexual identity would be linked with 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 Study 3, we also 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 be linked with higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action.

Last, we believe that not only a person'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 (*Hypothesis 4*) and gender privilege (*Hypothesis 8*) would be linked with higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action.

4.1 | Method

4.1.1 | Participants and procedure

As in Studies 1 and 2, we aimed to collect data from participants in Turkey who self-identified as women, feminists, and heterosexuals. We collected data from Twitter using snowball sampling. 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

TABLE 5 Means, standard deviations, and correlations of all measures in Study 3

Variables	M(SD)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Feminist identification	4.36 (.62)	.22 ^{***}	-.17 ^{**}	.33 ^{***}	.25 ^{***}	.20 ^{**}	.34 ^{***}	.32 ^{***}	.45 ^{***}
2. Woman identification	4.21 (.64)	-	.18 ^{**}	.19 ^{**}	.19 ^{**}	.10	.23 ^{***}	.06	.13 [*]
3. Heterosexual identification	2.75 (.96)		-	-.09	-.06	-.04	-.09	-.13 [*]	-.19 ^{**}
4. Perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+	4.76 (.56)			-	.77 ^{***}	.33 ^{***}	.48 ^{***}	.39 ^{***}	.32 ^{***}
5. Perceived discrimination against women	4.77 (.51)				-	.28 ^{***}	.43 ^{***}	.24 ^{***}	.23 ^{***}
6. Awareness of sexual orientation privilege	4.79 (.46)					-	.45 ^{***}	.31 ^{***}	.34 ^{***}
7. Awareness of gender privilege	4.86 (.35)						-	.23 ^{***}	.29 ^{***}
8. Strategic intra-minority alliance	4.37 (.76)							-	.44 ^{***}
9. Willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action	4.24 (.93)								-

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

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.

4.1.2 | Measures

We used the same measures in Study 2 to assess feminist identification (Leach et al., 2008; $\alpha = .85$), perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+ (Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2006; $\alpha = .76$), awareness of heterosexual privilege (Case, 2007; $\alpha = .79$), endorsement of strategic intra-minority alliance (Glasford & Calcagno, 2012; $\alpha = .86$) and willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights (Odağ et al., 2016; $\alpha = .88$). We also adapted these items to measure identification with disadvantaged gender identity (i.e., woman identification) by six items (Leach et al., 2008; $\alpha = .79$; centrality, solidarity, satisfaction, and ingroup homogeneity), identification with advantaged sexual orientation identity (i.e., heterosexual identification) by four items (Leach et al., 2008; $\alpha = .83$; centrality and ingroup 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.

4.2 | 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 feminist identity ($M = 4.36$), 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 their disadvantaged woman identity ($M = 4.21$), whereas they showed low identification with their advantaged heterosexual identity ($M = 2.75$). Participants also showed high perceived discrimination against women ($M = 4.77$) and high 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 Corp., 2017) to examine the degree to which (a) identification with multiple identities (i.e., 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 correlate 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 ($\beta = .29$, $p < .001$) related willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Specifically, higher feminist identification is linked with higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. While identification with disadvantaged woman identity did not associate willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action ($\beta = .04$, $p = .460$) and supported our fifth hypothesis, higher identification with advantaged heterosexual identity is linked with 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 associate willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action. Thus, we did not find support for our second and seventh hypotheses. Moreover, higher awareness of sexual orientation privilege ($\beta = .17$, $p = .003$) is linked with more willingness to participate in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights among heterosexual feminist women, supporting Hypothesis 4, whereas

TABLE 6 Model summary of regression analysis in Study 3

Willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights					
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Feminist identification	.43	.08	.29	5.11	< .001
Woman identification	.06	.08	.04	.74	.460
Heterosexual identification	-.10	.05	-.11	-2.08	.039
Perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+	.07	.14	.04	.47	.628
Perceived discrimination against women	-.01	.14	-.00	-.05	.970
Awareness of sexual orientation privilege	.35	.12	.18	3.03	.003
Awareness of gender privilege	.06	.17	.02	.33	.739
Strategic intra-minority alliance	.32	.07	.26	4.61	< .001
<i>F</i>			17.866		
<i>R</i> ²			.345		

awareness of gender privilege did not predict it ($\beta = .02, p = .739$). Thus, our findings did not support our last hypothesis. Similar to the findings of Studies 1 and 2, endorsing the strategic intra-minority alliance is linked with willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action ($\beta = .26, p < .001$). In other words, more endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance correlated with higher willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action.³

5 | 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. Although the dynamics between majority and minority groups have frequently been studied in social psychology (Shnabel et al., 2013; Subašić et al., 2018; Teixeira et al., 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—feminist identity—would be linked with willingness to participate in collective action for outgroup causes. Generally, feminist identity is associated with action and protests for gen-

der 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 links with willingness to participate in solidarity-based collective action for another disadvantaged group. One of the underlying reasons for this finding may be that 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 the 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+ is linked with 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 have shown similar inconsistent effects of perceived discrimination against ingroup and outgroup (see, e.g., Reimer et al., 2017). For example, Craig, Richeson, and colleagues (Craig & Richeson, 2012, 2016; Craig et al., 2012, 2020; Richeson & Craig, 2011) showed that while acknowledging discrimination experiences faced by the outgroup may activate a common disadvantaged ingroup identity, perceived discrimination in inter-categories (e.g., racial minority group and sexual minority group) may increase social identity threats and hinder intra-minority solidarity. Like Studies 1 and 3, Reimer et al. (2017, Study 1b) showed that heterosexual

³ We also conducted a two-step hierarchical regression analysis by adding interactions of identities in Step 2. However, neither the two-way interactions (feminist X heterosexual; feminist X woman; woman X heterosexual) nor the three-way interaction predicted willingness to engage in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights among heterosexual feminist women.

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, 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 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 the minority outgroup's cause. In other words, people should feel a responsibility to the 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, personal, and morality motivations) for solidarity. Scholars argue that advantaged group members seek good moral and social image through confronting inequalities, whereas disadvantaged group members need power and social change (Selvanathan et al., 2020; Shnabel et al., 2008, 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., 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 toward 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, our results also showed that 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 concerns of disadvantaged woman 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 outcomes for 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 showing that identification with woman identity reflects women's critical attitudes towards or lower endorsement of gender stereotypes, while identification with feminist identity reflects attitudes towards collective action (e.g., van Breen et al., 2017). On the other hand, higher identification with advantaged heterosexual identity predicted less willingness to participate in collective action for LGBTQ+ rights, which is consistent with previous findings that advantaged group identity may be a barrier to taking action on behalf of disadvantaged groups (Stewart et al., 2012).

We believe that studies with an intersectional approach should also focus on identity integration and identity (in)compatibility. Previous studies on identity integration have shown that identity integration may have positive effects on well-being (see, e.g., Koc & Vignoles, 2016, 2018). Some recent studies have also indicated that the intersection of incompatible identities predicts feelings like guilt and shame (Anderson & Koc, 2020), which are known to be associated with willingness to collective action (Calcagno, 2016; Shepherd et al., 2013; Solak, Tagar, Cohen-Chen, Saguy, & Halperin, 2017). More work that focuses on whether the intersection of compatible versus incompatible identities predicts collective action for ingroup versus outgroup causes is needed. Moreover, building on our findings, we can argue that more work is needed to understand the contents 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 et al., forthcoming) as well as on behalf of other disadvantaged groups.

5.1 | 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 use 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 March 8 for Study 1, before LGBTQ+ Pride Week for Study 2, and after the Boğaziçi University protests for Study 3. Although the Boğaziçi University protests have started against the appointment of Melih Bulu as rector of the university by President Erdoğan, these protests turned into allyship protests for LGBTQ+. That is the main reason why 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 the interaction between feminist and woman identification following the multiple identities approach. They could not find a significant effect of the interaction between feminist and woman identification on collective action for LGBTQ+ rights. Although our third study followed a similar approach and focused on the role of intersectionality and multiple identities in collective action, we did not test the role of interaction between different identities (e.g., feminist, women, and heterosexual) due to the relatively small sample size and power in Study 3. This limitation may have prevented us from fully reflecting the intersectional approach in our research. Future works that aim to follow an intersectional approach should test the role of interaction between different identities, especially the conflicted ones (e.g., advantaged and disadvantaged identities).

Another limitation concerns the items we used to measure identification. While we used four of the five subscales (centrality, solidarity, satisfaction, and ingroup homogeneity) of Leach et al.'s (2008) identification scale for measuring feminist and woman identities, we used two subscales (centrality and ingroup homogeneity) of the same scale to measure heterosexual identity. Even though we used ingroup homogeneity as one of the subdimensions of the identification scale, some studies have also shown that identification can still be high even when a lack of homogeneity exists (Jans et al., 2012). For this reason, we believe that researchers should be more careful while using subdimensions of identification that are discussed as distinct variables from identification such as ingroup 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). Given this result, 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.

6 | CONCLUSION

Across three studies, we investigated the role of feminist identification, perceived discrimination against LGBTQ+, 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 lit-

erature by showing the crucial link between privilege awareness and solidarity between disadvantaged groups. We also believe that the current article contributes to the debate on the lack of intersectional approaches and the 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 intra-minority solidarity between them by demonstrating how (1) multiple identities, (2) perceived discrimination against one's own group and other disadvantaged groups, (3) endorsement of the strategic intra-minority alliance, and (4) privilege awareness of advantaged groups may become both facilitators of and barriers to solidarity-based collective action.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Open access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

These studies were approved by the Clark Committee for the Rights of Human Participants in Research and Training Programs (IRB) at Clark University and the Sciences & Technology Cross-Schools Research Ethics Committee at the University of Sussex.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The anonymized raw data is publicly available via the Open Society Framework (OSF) webpage: https://osf.io/jup87/?view_only=df828303e92f40418a686954cfc82fa9.

ORCID

Mete Sefa Uysal  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8698-9213>

REFERENCES

- Acar, Y. G., & Uluğ, Ö. M. (2016). Examining prejudice reduction through solidarity and togetherness experiences among Gezi Park activists in Turkey. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 4(1), 166–179. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jssp.v4i1.547>
- Anderson, J. R., & Koc, Y. (2020). Identity integration as a protective factor against guilt and shame for religious gay men. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 57(8), 1059–1068. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2020.1767026>
- Baba, H. B. (2011). The construction of heteropatriarchal family and dissident sexualities in Turkey. *Fe Journal: Feminist Critique/Fe Dergi: Feminist Eleştirisi*, 3(1), 56–64.
- Bettinsoli, M. L., Napier, J. L., & Carnaghi, A. (2021). The “gay agenda”: How the myth of gay affluence impedes the progress toward equality. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2762>
- Burson, E., & Godfrey, E. B. (2020). Intra-minority solidarity: The role of critical consciousness. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 1362–1377. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2679>
- Calcagno, J. (2016). Transforming straight guilt into collective action for LGBs via close cross-group friendships: A gender-moderated process. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(3), 451–463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684315627362>
- Campbell, R., & Wasco, S. M. (2000). Feminist approaches to social science: Epistemological and methodological tenets. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 28, 773–791. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005159716099>
- Case, K. A. (2007). Raising white privilege awareness and reducing racial prejudice: Assessing diversity course effectiveness. *Teaching of Psychology*, 34(4), 231–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00986280701700250>
- Case, K. A. (2012). Discovering the privilege of Whiteness: White women's reflections on anti-racist identity and ally behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(1), 78–96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01737.x>
- Case, K. A., Hensley, R., & Anderson, A. (2014). Reflecting on heterosexual and male privilege: Interventions to raise awareness. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70(4), 722–740. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12088>
- Case, K. A., Iuzzini, J., & Hopkins, M. (2012). Systems of privilege: Intersections, awareness, and applications. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01732.x>
- Case, K. A., & Stewart, B. (2010). Changes in diversity course student prejudice and attitudes toward heterosexual privilege and gay marriage. *Teaching of Psychology*, 37(3), 172–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00986283.2010.488555>
- Code, L. (2000). *Encyclopedia of feminist theories*. Routledge.
- Cortland, C. I., Craig, M. A., Shapiro, J. R., Richeson, J. A., Neel, R., & Goldstein, N. J. (2017). Solidarity through shared disadvantage: Highlighting shared experiences of discrimination improves relations between stigmatized groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113(4), 547–567. <http://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000100>
- Craig, M. A., DeHart, T., Richeson, J. A., & Fiedorowicz, L. (2012). Do unto others as others have done unto you? Perceiving sexism influences women's evaluations of stigmatized racial groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 1107–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212445210>
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2012). Coalition or derogation? How perceived discrimination influences intra-minority intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(4), 759–777. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026481>
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2014). Discrimination divides across identity dimensions: Perceived racism reduces support for gay rights and increases anti-gay bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 55, 169–174. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.07.008>
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2016). Stigma-based solidarity: Understanding the psychological foundations of conflict and coalition among members of different stigmatized groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 25, 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721415611252>
- Craig, M. A., Rucker, J., & Brown, R. M. (2020). Structural solidarity: Lay theories of discrimination and coalitional attitudes among stigmatized groups. Manuscript submitted for publication. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/u9sf6>
- Drury, J., & Reicher, S. (2009). Collective psychological empowerment as a model of social change: Researching crowds and power. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65(4), 707–725. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01622.x>
- Engin, C. (2015). LGBT in Turkey: Policies and experiences. *Social Sciences*, 4(3), 838–858. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci4030838>
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Psychology Press.
- 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/10.1080/14792779343000004>
- Girerd, L., & Bonnot, V. (2020). Neoliberalism: An ideological barrier to feminist identification and collective action. *Social Justice Research*, 33, 81–109. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-020-00347-8>
- Glasford, D. E., & Calcagno, J. (2012). The conflict of harmony: Intergroup contact, commonality and political solidarity between minority groups.

- Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(1), 323–328. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.001>
- Greenwood, R. M. (2012). Standing at the crossroads: An intersectional approach to women's social identities and political consciousness. In S. Wiley & T. A. Revenson (Eds.), *Social categories in everyday experience* (pp. 103–129). American Psychological Association.
- Hines, S. (2019). The feminist frontier: On trans and feminism. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 28(2), 145–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2017.1411791>
- IBM. (2017). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows*. IBM Corp. Retrieved from <https://hadoop.apache.org>
- Iyer, A., Leach, C. W., & Crosby, F. J. (2003). White guilt and racial compensation: The benefits and limits of self-focus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(1), 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202238377>
- Iyer, A., & Ryan, M. K. (2009). Why do men and women challenge gender discrimination in the workplace? The role of group status and ingroup identification in predicting pathways to collective action. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65(4), 791–814. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01625.x>
- Jans, L., Postmes, T., & Van der Zee, K. I. (2012). Sharing differences: The inductive route to social identity formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(5), 1145–1149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.04.013>
- KAOS GL. (2015). The AKP's hate politics has turned into a massacre call. Retrieved from <https://kaosgl.org/en/single-news/the-akprsq-uos-hate-politics-has-turned-into-a-massacre-call>
- Klandermans, B. (1997). *The social psychology of protest*. Blackwell.
- Koc, Y., & Vignoles, V. L. (2016). Global identification predicts gay-male identity integration and well-being among Turkish gay men. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 55(4), 643–661. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12160>
- Koc, Y., & Vignoles, V. L. (2018). Global identification helps increase identity integration among Turkish gay men. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 9(4), 329–342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2018.1496134>
- Leach, C. W., Snider, N., & Iyer, A. (2002). Spoiling the consciences of the fortunate: The experience of relative advantage and support for social equality. In I. Walker & H. J. Smith (Eds.), *Relative deprivation: Specification, development, and integration* (pp. 136–163). Cambridge University Press.
- Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M., Pennekamps, S., Doosje, B., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of ingroup identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(1), 144–165. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144>
- Lowery, B. S., Chow, R. M., Knowles, E. D., & Unzueta, M. M. (2012). Paying for positive group esteem: How inequity frames affect whites' responses to redistributive policies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(2), 323–336. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024598>
- Lowery, B. S., Knowles, E. D., & Unzueta, M. M. (2007). Framing inequity safely: Whites' motivated perceptions of racial privilege. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(9), 1237–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207303016>
- McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In M. L. Anderson & P. H. Collins (Eds.) *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (pp. 76–87). Wadsworth.
- Montgomery, S. A., & Stewart, A. J. (2012). Privileged allies in lesbian and gay rights activism: Gender, generation, and resistance to heteronormativity. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(1), 162–177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01742.x>
- Neufeld, K. H. S., Starzyk, K. B., & Gaucher, D. (2019). Political solidarity: A theory and a measure. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 7(2), 726–765. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v7i2.1058>
- Odağ, Ö., Uluğ, 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*, 28(3), 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000202>
- Ostrove, J. M., & Brown, K. T. (2018). Are allies who we think they are?: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 48(4), 195–204. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12502>
- Painia, B. A. (2018). *Feminism and The Black Church: A Qualitative Analysis of Feminism Among Black Women in A Southern Baptist Church*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Louisiana State University, USA.
- Powell, A. A., Branscombe, N. R., & Schmitt, M. T. (2005). Inequality as ingroup privilege or outgroup disadvantage: The impact of group focus on collective guilt and interracial attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 508–521. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271713>
- Price, C. (2020). *Women's spaces, women's rights: Feminism and the transgender rights movement*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marquette University, USA.
- Radke, H. R. M., Hornsey, M. J., & Barlow, F. K. (2018). Changing versus protecting the status quo: Why men and women engage in different types of action on behalf of women. *Sex Roles*, 79, 505–518. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0884-2>
- Radke, H. R. M., Kutlaca, M., Siem, B., Wright, S. C., & Becker, J. C. (2020). Beyond allyship: Motivations for advantaged group members to engage in action for disadvantaged groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 24(4), 291–315. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868320918698>
- Reimer, N. K., Becker, J. C., Benz, A., Christ, O., Dhont, K., Klocke, U., Neji, S., Rychlowska, M., Schmid, K., & Hewstone, M. (2017). Intergroup contact and social change: Implications of negative and positive contact for collective action in advantaged and disadvantaged groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(1), 121–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167216676478>
- Richeson, J. A., & Craig, M. A. (2011). Intra-minority intergroup relations in the Twenty-First Century. *Daedalus*, 140, 166–175. https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_00085
- Rodemeyer, L. M. (2018). Feminist and transgender tensions: An inquiry into history, methodological paradigms, and embodiment. In C. Fischer & L. Dolezal (Eds.), *New feminist perspectives on embodiment: Breaking feminist waves* (pp. 103–123). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72353-2_6
- Rubin, M., & Badea, C. (2007). Why do people perceive ingroup homogeneity on ingroup traits and outgroup homogeneity on outgroup traits? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(1), 31–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167206293190>
- Rubin, M., & Badea, C. (2012). They're all the same!... but for several different reasons: A review of the multicausal nature of perceived group variability. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21(6), 367–372. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721412457363>
- 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., 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>
- Selvanathan, H. P., Lickel, B., & Dasgupta, N. (2020). An integrative framework on the impact of allies: How identity-based needs influence intergroup solidarity and social movements. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 1344–1361. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2697>
- Shepherd, L., Spears, R., & Manstead, S. R. A. (2013). This will bring shame on our nation: The role of anticipated group-based emotions on collective action. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(1), 42–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.07.011>
- Shnabel, N., Halabi, S., & Noor, M. (2013). Overcoming competitive victimhood and facilitating forgiveness through re-categorization into a common victim or perpetrator identity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(5), 867–877. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2013.04.007>

- Shnabel, N., Nadler, A., Canetti-Nisim, D., & Ullrich, J. (2008). The role of acceptance and empowerment in promoting reconciliation from the perspective of the needs-based model. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 2(1), 159–186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-2409.2008.00014.x>
- Shnabel, N., Nadler, A., Ullrich, J., Dovidio, J. F., & Carmi, D. (2009). Promoting reconciliation through the satisfaction of the emotional needs of victimized and perpetrating group members: The needs-based model of reconciliation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(8), 1021–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167209336610>
- 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, L. G. E., McGarty, C., & Thomas, E. F. (2018). After Aylan Kurdi: How tweeting about death, threat, and harm predict increased expressions of solidarity with refugees over time. *Psychological Science*, 29(4), 623–634. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617741107>
- Solak, N., Tagar, M. C., Cohen-Chen, S., Saguy, T., & Halperin, E. (2017). Disappointment expression evokes collective guilt and collective action in intergroup conflict: The moderating role of legitimacy perceptions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 31(6), 1112–1126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2016.1197098>
- Starzyk, K. B., Neufeld, K. H. S., El-Gabalawy, R. M., & Boese, G. D. B. (2019). The case for and causes of intra-minority solidarity in support for reparations: Evidence from community and student samples in Canada. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 7(1), 620–650. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jssp.v7i1.673>
- Stewart, T., Latu, I. M., Branscombe, N. R., Philips, N. L., & Denney, H. T. (2012). White privilege awareness and efficacy to reduce racial inequality improve White Americans' attitudes towards African Americans. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(1), 11–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01733.x>
- Stürmer, S., & Simon, B. (2004). Collective action: Towards a dual-pathway model. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 15(1), 59–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280340000117>
- Subašić, E., Hardacre, S., Elton, B., Branscombe, N. R., Ryan, M. K., & Reynolds, K. J. (2018). We for she": Mobilising men and women to act in solidarity for gender equality. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 21(5), 707–724. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430218763272>
- 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>
- Teixeira, C. P., Spears, R., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2020). Is Martin Luther King or Malcolm X the more acceptable face of protest? High-status groups' reactions to low-status groups' collective action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 118(5), 919–944. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000195>
- Thomas, E. F., Mavor, K. I., & McGarty, C. (2012). Social identities facilitate and encapsulate action-relevant constructs: A test of the social identity model of collective action. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 15(1), 75–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430211413619>
- Thomas, E. F., McGarty, C., & Mavor, K. I. (2009). Aligning identities, emotions, and beliefs to create commitment to sustainable social and political action. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13(3), 194–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868309341563>
- 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>
- Uluğ, Ö. M., & Acar, Y. G. (2018). What happens after the protests? Understanding protest outcomes through multi-level social change. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 24(1), 44–53. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000269>
- Uluğ, Ö. M., Chayinska, M., & Tropp, L. R. (forthcoming). Conceptual, methodological and contextual challenges in studying collective action: Recommendations for future research. *Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*.
- Uluğ, Ö. M., & Tropp, L. R. (2021). Witnessing racial discrimination shapes collective action for racial justice: Enhancing awareness of privilege among advantaged groups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 51, 248–261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12731>
- Uluğ, Ö. M., & Uysal, M. S. (2021). The role of ethnic identification, allyship and conflict narratives in supporting pro-minority policies among majority and minority groups. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000388>
- van Breen, J. A., Spears, R., Kuppens, T., & de Lemus, S. (2017). A multiple identity approach to gender: Identification with women, identification with feminists, and their interaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(1019), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01019>
- van Zomeren, M. (2016). Building a Tower of Babel? Integrating core motivations and features of social structure into the political psychology of political action. *Political Psychology*, 37(1), 87–114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12322>
- 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>
- Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2006). Understanding multicultural attitudes: The role of group status, identification, friendships, and justifying ideologies. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.05.015>
- Verkuyten, M., & Yildiz, A. A. (2006). The endorsement of minority rights: The role of group position, national context, and ideological beliefs. *Political Psychology*, 27(4), 527–548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00525.x>
- We Will Stop the Femicides. (2020). 2019 Report of We Will End Femicide Platform. Retrieved from <http://kadincinayetlerinidururacagiz.net/veriler/2890/2019-report-of-we-will-end-femicide-platform>
- Williams, C. (2016). Radical inclusion: Recounting the trans inclusive history of radical feminist. *Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 3(1–2), 254–258. <https://doi.org/10.1215/23289252-3334463>
- Yoder, J. D., Tobias, A., & Snell, A. F. (2011). When declaring "I am a feminist" matters: Labeling is linked to activism. *Sex Roles*, 64, 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9890-3>

How to cite this article: Uysal, M. S., Uluğ, Ö. M., Kanık, B., & Aydemir, A. (2022). "The liberation of LGBTQ+ will also liberate heterosexuals": Heterosexual feminist women's participation in solidarity-based collective action for LGBTQ+ rights. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 52, 377–390. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2799>