

Comparing the Roles of Positive and Supportive Intergroup Contact on Social Cohesion and Social Change: Theoretical Extensions and Practical Implications

Julia A. Schreiber¹, Linda R. Tropp², and Özden Melis Uluğ¹

¹ Department of Psychology, University of Sussex

² Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, University of Massachusetts Amherst

A common approach to building social cohesion involves programming that fosters contact between social groups. However, some scholars are wary of this approach, suggesting that instead of seeking to promote improved attitudes and greater cohesion between groups through contact, efforts should first focus on addressing and achieving greater social equality and change. In light of these debates, the present review will compare and contrast two types of intergroup contact—*positive contact* and *supportive contact*—in terms of their short- and long-term implications for social cohesion and social change. We then highlight the importance of these implications for practitioners to consider when designing contact-based programs, and we offer recommendations for future research and practice to maximize the likelihood of achieving desired outcomes and minimize the potential for unintentional harm.

What is the significance of this article for the general public?


Contact programs that bring together members of different groups (e.g., on the basis of race, ethnicity, or religion) are often implemented to foster social cohesion in diverse societies. In this article, we highlight that it is not only important to create spaces for discussion of cross-group commonalities when implementing contact programs but also important for the groups to discuss group differences in power and status to foster sustainable social cohesion and social change.

Keywords: intergroup contact, positive contact, supportive contact, social cohesion, social change

With the increasing diversity of societies around the globe, many government agencies and nongovernmental organizations have identified the need to actively promote social cohesion in their societies (e.g., International Organization for Migration [IOM], 2021). One frequently used approach to building social cohesion involves programming that fosters contact between social groups. Such contact programs typically encourage positive interaction between social groups who differ on a

meaningful group categorization (e.g., race, ethnicity, religion, and age), and positive interactions between groups may be achieved through a variety of means ranging from engaging in intergroup dialogues to shared cooperative activities (Hewstone, 2015).

However, many scholars have questioned whether social cohesion should be the ultimate goal of intergroup programs, particularly given the pervasive structural inequalities that create and perpetuate group differences in power and status all around the world (see, e.g., Dixon et al., 2012; Hässler et al., 2021). Scholars subscribing to this view suggest that, instead of seeking to promote improved attitudes and greater cohesion between groups, efforts should first focus on addressing and achieving greater social equality and change. Thus, rather than focusing principally on programs

This article was published Online First January 25, 2024.
Julia A. Schreiber  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7711-7838>

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Julia A. Schreiber, Department of Psychology, University of Sussex, Pevensey 1 Building, Falmer BN1 9QH, United Kingdom. Email: J.Schreiber@sussex.ac.uk

that encourage members of different groups to experience positive interactions with one another (i.e., *positive contact*; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), more attention should be granted to encouraging members of different groups to acknowledge and discuss the social inequalities that exist, in the hope of motivating members of advantaged groups to openly support the need for social change alongside members of disadvantaged groups (i.e., *supportive contact*; Becker & Wright, 2022; Droogendyk et al., 2016; Hässler et al., 2021).

In this article, we provide brief overviews of the research literature on social cohesion and social change, and we discuss how two distinct forms of contact—namely, *positive contact* and *supportive contact*—may promote these desired outcomes as well as create unintended consequences among members of advantaged and disadvantaged groups. On the one hand, previous literature has focused mainly on desired outcomes of positive intergroup contact for social cohesion (see Hewstone, 2015), thus granting little attention to its unintended consequences on social cohesion as well as its outcomes on social change. On the other hand, literature on supportive contact has focused mostly on desired outcomes related to social change (see Droogendyk et al., 2016), with limited focus on its unintended consequences on social change and neglecting its impact on social cohesion. With this review, we aim to close these existing gaps in the literature by providing a more comprehensive overview of the potential strengths and pitfalls of both types of contact in relation to both social cohesion and social change. We believe greater integration of relevant literature is essential to derive practical recommendations for contact programs that can both minimize the potential for harmful effects of positive contact and enhance the potential of supportive contact to promote sustainable social change (e.g., Dixon et al., 2010; Hässler et al., 2020).

Intergroup Contact and Social Cohesion

While there is no single agreed-upon definition of social cohesion, recent scholarship emphasizes that it involves how much members of a given society feel positively connected toward each other (i.e., bonding), as well as the extent to which there are strong ties and positive relationships between members of different social groups in society (i.e., bridging; see, e.g., Leininger et al., 2021; Schiefer & van der Noll, 2017). Although

findings on social cohesion and diversity are quite mixed and culturally dependent (van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014), it is commonly understood that social cohesion might be easier to achieve in homogeneous societies while relatively challenging to achieve in diverse societies where members of many different social groups coexist (Putnam, 2007). Moreover, some scholars suggest that it is segregation between groups, rather than diversity per se, that hinders social cohesion (e.g., Uslaner, 2009). Given the central role that segregation may play in curbing social cohesion in diverse societies, it has been proposed that promoting positive contact between groups might help to foster desirable intergroup outcomes relevant to social cohesion (see, e.g., Hewstone, 2015).

Numerous studies conducted in laboratory and field settings suggest that positive intergroup contact is associated with positive intergroup outcomes like reduced prejudice or improved attitudes toward outgroup members (e.g., Lemmer & Wagner, 2015; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), as well as trust, willingness to engage in future cross-group interaction, and greater support for social integration (Tropp & Dehron, 2023). In light of the relatively robust effects of intergroup contact (but see Paluck et al., 2019 for a more critical review), many international organizations and communities encourage positive contact between different groups in their local contexts. One example is the Living Library, a program in which disadvantaged groups volunteer to serve as “living books” that engage with and respond to questions from advantaged group members (Little et al., 2011), which has been shown to curb advantaged group members’ prejudices and strengthen their willingness for social integration (e.g., Orosz et al., 2016).

While outcomes of programs like Living Library are encouraging, it is important to note that the effects of such programs usually do not last long; their short duration may limit effects relative to what might be achieved through more intensive contact experiences that occur across group lines. In contrast, programs that last for longer periods of time—such as the 3-week camp “Seeds of Peace” that brings together Palestinian and Israeli teenagers in the United States to participate in shared activities and engage in daily dialogues—can provide environments in which participants from different groups can forge deeper relationships with one another (Schroeder & Risen, 2016). Studies that investigate the effects of longer-term contact programs (ranging between 4 days

and 9 weeks in duration) have shown encouraging effects over time, such as reduced intergroup anxiety, increased intergroup empathy, and positive outgroup attitudes that last for at least between 1 and 3 years after the program (e.g., Schroeder & Risen, 2016; Schumann & Moore, 2022; White et al., 2014).

Nevertheless, to sustain positive relations between groups over the long term, it is important not only to consider whether and how contact programs can promote greater social cohesion but also to consider whether and how they lay the foundation for social change toward greater equality.

Improved relations between groups in the short term may be difficult to sustain in the long term if fundamental group differences in power and status are not adequately addressed, as noted by Martin Luther King Jr. in his *Letter From a Birmingham Jail*, “injustice must be exposed, with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience ... before it can be cured” (M. L. King, 1963). Given that the implications of intergroup contact may differ considerably for members of advantaged and disadvantaged groups (Dixon et al., 2010), we must attend to ways in which intergroup contact may affect both groups as we work toward the goals of promoting social cohesion and social change.

In the following sections, we consider how two types of intergroup contact—*positive contact* and *supportive contact*—may shape prospects for social cohesion and social change. Here, we consider possible desirable outcomes and unintended consequences of these approaches that may emerge in the short term and long term, considering the perspectives of both advantaged and disadvantaged groups. Table 1 provides an overview of the short- and long-term implications we envision for the two types of contact in relation to outcomes relevant to social cohesion and social change.

Positive Contact: Desired Outcomes in Promoting Social Cohesion

Programs that focus on positive intergroup contact usually try to build a nurturing environment by creating a comfortable, safe, and positive atmosphere in which members of different groups can interact. These programs might focus on creating comfortable spaces for cross-group conversations (e.g., dialogue groups focusing on similarities between groups or individuals; e.g., Turner &

Cameron, 2016) or shared activities (e.g., outdoor camps or city trips; IOM, 2021). In the short term, by creating safe spaces for cross-group engagement, the basic needs of humans for safety and security might be fulfilled and, in turn, results in less outgroup anxiety between groups (Tropp, 2021). Furthermore, focusing on similarities between groups can be beneficial to create greater perceived overlap between self and others, which also reduces outgroup anxiety (Stathi & Crisp, 2010). Indeed, a broad body of research confirms that positive intergroup contact can contribute to reducing outgroup anxiety (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). In turn, lower levels of intergroup anxiety might enhance people’s willingness to engage in future contact with the outgroup (Tropp, 2021) since people are generally less willing to interact with outgroups if they fear rejection or discrimination (Shelton & Richeson, 2005; Stephan & Stephan, 1985).

In addition to reducing outgroup anxiety, positive contact can help to improve intergroup attitudes, such as reduced prejudice and increased feeling of closeness toward the outgroup, as well as highlighting perceived similarities between groups (e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Schumann & Moore, 2022). Positive contact can also elicit positive emotions such as sympathy, warmth, and cheerfulness in relation to the outgroup (Grütter et al., 2018; Kenworthy et al., 2016). These effects of contact that focus on similarities lead especially advantaged group members to be more willing to interact with disadvantaged groups (e.g., Saguy & Kteily, 2014). Furthermore, research on intimate cross-group relationships such as friendships shows that these positive emotions, perceived similarities, self-closure, and spending longer time periods together can be the foundation for the formation of new friendships (Davies & Aron, 2016; Davies et al., 2011, 2013; Waugh & Fredrickson, 2006). Therefore, positive contact programs that encourage positive contact over longer time periods might be a good means to encourage quality contact between groups.

In the long term, a reduction in anxiety, an increase in positive emotions and attitudes, and the resulting formation of close cross-group relationships should build general feelings of trust between groups, which is one of the crucial dimensions of social cohesion (see McKenna et al., 2018). Several studies show that high-quality intergroup contact—through which members of different groups can develop deep and meaningful ties

Table 1

Comparisons Between Positive Contact and Supportive Contact: Outcomes Relevant to Social Cohesion and Social Change

Implications	Positive contact		Supportive contact	
	Short-term implications	Long-term implications	Short-term implications	Long-term implications
Social cohesion	<i>Desired outcomes</i> Reduces intergroup anxiety and improves intergroup attitudes (especially for advantaged group) Elicits positive emotions toward outgroup members	<i>Desired outcomes</i> Promotes intimate intergroup relationships and intergroup trust Fosters willingness for social integration and social cohesion	<i>Desired outcomes</i> Nourishes need for empowerment and creates foundation for building intergroup trust (especially for disadvantaged group) Increases psychological safety (for disadvantaged group)	<i>Desired outcomes</i> Creates foundation for sustainable intergroup trust (for disadvantaged group)
	<i>Unintended consequences</i> Can cause feeling misunderstood or having own group experiences not recognized (for disadvantaged group) Can create conditional belonging (for disadvantaged group)	<i>Unintended consequences</i> Promotion of colorblind ideology (for advantaged group) Lack of representation by inclusive identities (for disadvantaged group)	<i>Unintended consequences</i> Can heighten intergroup anxiety, discomfort, and motivation for avoidance (for advantaged group)	<i>Unintended consequences</i> Can create more obstacles toward building trust (for advantaged group) Can increase hesitance to have further contact, work together (for advantaged group)
Social change	<i>Desired outcomes</i> Creates foundation for building intergroup empathy	<i>Desired outcomes</i> Can enhance empathic concern for welfare of disadvantaged (for advantaged group) May encourage greater support for equality (for advantaged group)	<i>Desired outcomes</i> Can foster greater awareness of privilege (for advantaged group) Can enhance awareness and reduce perceived legitimacy of power differences (for disadvantaged group)	<i>Desired outcomes</i> Creates foundation for broad-scale social change, more equal power relations between groups Increases engagement in joint collective action
	<i>Unintended consequences</i> Can legitimize or reduce perceptions of power inequalities Can introduce false expectations for fair treatment (for disadvantaged group) Can reduce willingness for collective action (for disadvantaged group)	<i>Unintended consequences</i> Can maintain broad-scale inequalities in status and power	<i>Unintended consequences</i> Often heightens intergroup threat (for advantaged group) Can increase concern about losing privileged status (for advantaged group)	<i>Unintended consequences</i> May encourage “zero-sum” thinking/narratives as status positions shift between groups (for advantaged group) May produce backlash resulting in resentment and reduced support for equal rights (for advantaged group)

Note. When groups are not specified, we expect there to be implications for both advantaged and disadvantaged groups.

across group lines—is positively related to higher outgroup trust (e.g., Grütter et al., 2018; Kenworthy et al., 2016; Reimer et al., 2021). Paying attention to this long-term goal is important because research suggests that beyond any effect of mere outgroup liking, trust in the outgroup predicts

more positive behavioral tendencies toward outgroup members (Tam et al., 2009), which may be particularly relevant for achieving social cohesion. As one example, greater outgroup trust can lead advantaged group members to express more inclusive intergroup attitudes (Grütter et al., 2018;

Hässler et al., 2019), which can facilitate processes of social integration. Positive contact in workplaces and schools can also lead to a greater willingness to live and work in ethnically diverse communities (Wood & Sonleitner, 1996), which may ease social integration and cohesion among diverse groups in society. In summary, the rich body of literature on positive contact and social cohesion highlights the potential of positive contact to reduce outgroup anxiety, increase positive intergroup attitudes and emotions, and enhance trust and social integration between groups.

Positive Contact: Unintended Consequences of Promoting Social Cohesion

Despite the promising short- and long-term implications of positive contact on social cohesion, programs focusing on positive contact may also inadvertently produce unintended consequences for social cohesion. In contrast to advantaged group members who prefer talking about commonalities between groups, disadvantaged groups prefer talking about both commonalities and differences between them (Saguy & Kteily, 2014; Saguy et al., 2009). In cases where intervention programs focus only on intergroup commonalities, disadvantaged group members' needs to express their distinct perspectives will not be fully met (Marinucci et al., 2021). Hence, disadvantaged group members might not feel understood by members of the advantaged group, though feeling understood is regarded as important for building outgroup trust and encouraging positive outgroup behaviors (Livingstone et al., 2020). Moreover, avoiding confrontational topics in pursuit of greater social cohesion might strengthen disadvantaged group members' feeling that they are only accepted and belong under certain conditions (i.e., conditional belonging; see Hackl, 2022 for an overview). Thus, programs that promote positive contact experiences through highlighting only similarities between groups might inadvertently signal to the disadvantaged that greater social cohesion requires an exclusive focus on factors that can create intergroup harmony, to the relative neglect of their own distinct psychological needs and perspectives. Indeed, it is possible that positive contact interventions that focus on intergroup similarities and neglect potential differences between groups will, in the long term, promote a colorblind ideology (Park & Judd, 2005; Sasaki & Vorauer, 2013).

Moreover, to the extent that members of disadvantaged groups do not feel like their perspectives are being heard or understood, they might feel less sufficiently represented by, and more oppressed within, any national identity they may share with the advantaged group (Dovidio et al., 2007; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000). Consequently, feeling less well represented could lower their feeling of belonging, which could in turn diminish their feeling of intergroup trust (Valcke et al., 2020), and run counter to long-term social cohesion goals. Thus, although much of the literature highlights the positive outcomes of positive contact on social cohesion, there might be drawbacks to focusing exclusively on the positivity of people's intergroup experiences, such as promoting colorblindness among advantaged groups or conditional belonging as well as threat among disadvantaged groups, in the pursuit of intergroup harmony.

Intergroup Contact and the Need for Social Change

As outlined above, prior literature on positive contact has focused mainly on its desired effects on social cohesion outcomes. However, other work argues that, in a world dominated by power asymmetries between groups, the primary focus should be on social change rather than on social cohesion (e.g., Dixon et al., 2012). The importance of focusing on social change is reinforced by work that emphasizes that equality between groups is a prerequisite for social cohesion (Schiefer & van der Noll, 2017). This point is underscored by studies showing that inequality leads to less social cohesion and social integration in terms of fewer interracial marriages (McDoom et al., 2019) and reduced trust between groups (Gould & Hijzen, 2016). In light of these debates and research trends, we provide an overview of the short- and long-term implications of positive contact on social change in the next sections.

Positive Contact: Desired Outcomes in Promoting Social Change

In the short term, positive contact programs can be effective for building empathy between groups (e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008), particularly when participants experience high-quality intergroup contact, which has been shown to be a strong positive predictor of outgroup empathy (Johnston & Glasford, 2018). Successively, greater

empathy can make people more inclined to help and lend support to outgroup members (e.g., Batson & Ahmad, 2009; Mallett et al., 2008).

In the longer term, increased empathy should increase advantaged groups' concern for the welfare of the disadvantaged group (Tropp & Barlow, 2018). For example, it has been shown that White Americans who have greater contact with Black Americans report more empathy toward Black people, which corresponds with greater anger regarding the injustices that Black people face (Selvanathan et al., 2018). In turn, greater empathic concern can fuel advantaged group members' support for the equal rights of the disadvantaged. Positive contact with Black Americans has been shown to enhance White Americans' support for the Black Lives Matter movement (e.g., Reimer et al., 2017; Selvanathan et al., 2018; Tropp & Uluğ, 2019). Relatedly, a multinational study by Hässler et al. (2020) demonstrates the generalizability of this positive effect of intergroup contact on advantaged group members' support for social change. Though research on how positive contact shapes support for social change remains limited, the findings outlined above suggest that positive contact has the potential to foster greater empathy and support for social change, at least among advantaged group members.

Positive Contact: Unintended Consequences for Promoting Social Change

At the same time, recent scholarship indicates that while positive intergroup contact is associated with greater support for social change toward equality among advantaged group members, it tends to be related to lower intentions of the disadvantaged to fight for social equality (e.g., Hässler et al., 2020). Often referred to as a “sedative” or “ironic” effect of intergroup contact, studies show that positive contact between advantaged and disadvantaged groups is associated with reduced recognition of discrimination among the disadvantaged (e.g., Dixon et al., 2010) and less willingness to engage in collective action for social change (e.g., Dixon et al., 2010; Hässler et al., 2020).

One explanation for these trends is that contact focusing on positive experiences and commonalities can encourage disadvantaged group members to develop positive attitudes toward the advantaged group while also increasing their expectations that the advantaged group will treat them fairly (Saguy et al., 2009). Relatedly, positive contact

may also diminish perceptions of systemic injustice (Dixon et al., 2010). For instance, as shown in an evaluation of a positive contact program in the United Kingdom, in which youth from different racial backgrounds (White, Black, and Asian) came together for 5 days to learn new skills and participate in shared activities, the contact program reduced outgroup anxiety and increased perspective-taking, yet it did not increase participants' perceptions of relative (dis)advantage (Reimer et al., 2021). It is also possible that, following contact, members of disadvantaged groups might even perceive power inequalities to be more legitimate (see Saguy & Chernyak-Hai, 2012; Sengupta & Sibley, 2013) or may see less of a need for social change toward greater equality (e.g., Dixon et al., 2010; Hässler et al., 2020). Thus, in the long run, positive contact might inadvertently hinder prospects for social change and maintain inequalities in society.

Supportive Contact: Desired Outcomes in Promoting Social Change

Researchers have therefore sought to test other contact-based strategies that might encourage both disadvantaged and advantaged groups to recognize the need for social change toward greater equality and, thus, eliminate any sedative effect of contact. As one such approach, supportive contact addresses existing inequalities between groups directly, thereby helping advantaged groups to become aware of their privileges and the injustices that disadvantaged groups encounter regularly (see Droogendyk et al., 2016; Techakesari et al., 2017). Enhancing advantaged groups' awareness of existing inequalities is crucial because systematic injustices are often subtle (Uluğ & Tropp, 2021), and therefore, people who belong to the advantaged group may not always recognize the privileges they hold (Todd et al., 2023; Tropp & Barlow, 2018).

As a result, in the long term, focusing on societal inequalities and group differences in lived experiences may not only build advantaged group members' empathic concern for the disadvantaged outgroup but also motivate their support for social change toward greater equality (Di Bernardo et al., 2021; Selvanathan et al., 2018; Tropp, 2021; Uluğ & Tropp, 2021). Moreover, whereas merely positive contact may inadvertently diminish disadvantaged group members' support for social change, supportive contact can encourage disadvantaged group members to sustain intentions to engage in

collective action for social change (Hässler et al., 2020). Indeed, when advantaged group members address the illegitimacy of unequal treatment between groups, disadvantaged group members' commitment to social change is no longer undermined (Becker et al., 2013; Hässler et al., 2020).

As a consequence of supportive contact, then, both advantaged and disadvantaged group members might express a greater willingness to engage in collective action and to do so jointly (see Hässler et al., 2020). On the one hand, when advantaged group members observe collective action that includes members of their own group, they begin to identify more with the movement for social change; at the same time, disadvantaged group members may identify with movements for social change provided that they perceive their group's goals and interests to be supported and empowered by the advantaged group (for a theoretical reflection, see Kutlaca et al., 2022; Selvanathan et al., 2020). The more people identify with a movement, the more likely they are to participate in collective action (Van Zomeren et al., 2012). Thus, supportive contact has the potential to support social change through (a) increasing empathic concern and privilege awareness among the advantaged, (b) sustaining perceptions of illegitimacy regarding the injustice experienced by the disadvantaged, and (c) encouraging willingness to engage in collective action for social equality among members of both groups.

Supportive Contact: Unintended Consequences in Promoting Social Change

However, addressing privilege and discrimination during intergroup contact can often provoke feelings of threat for advantaged groups since it challenges their belief in meritocracy and that they deserve their higher status due to personal efforts (Knowles et al., 2014). It is therefore common for advantaged group members to react to discussions of group inequalities by denying or defending the inequality (Knowles et al., 2014; Shuman et al., 2022) or by emphasizing their personal hardships and hard work to dilute feelings of threat (Phillips & Lowery, 2020). In turn, advantaged group members might be motivated to justify the status quo to restore the moral standing of their group, yet this has the consequence of decreasing their motivation to work toward social change (Hässler et al., 2019; Jost et al., 2017).

Furthermore, advantaged groups often perceive a change in intergroup power dynamics as a loss (Eibach & Keegan, 2006), and such power shifts can even threaten the advantaged such that they may worry about a reverse effect and becoming relatively disadvantaged (e.g., Shuman et al., 2022). Thus, focusing mainly on power differences and how to dismantle inequalities to satisfy the psychological needs of disadvantaged groups (see Hässler et al., 2022; Shnabel & Nadler, 2008) might trigger zero-sum thinking and perceptions of intergroup competition among members of the advantaged group (see, e.g., Kuchynka et al., 2018). Growing from such fears, advantaged group members often do not engage in supportive actions to promote social change even if they advocate equality (Shuman et al., 2022). Moreover, in their extreme forms, accumulated fears about losing privileges to promote the interests of disadvantaged groups can lead to resentment among members of historically advantaged groups (see, e.g., Davis & Wilson, 2022; Genter, 2022). Consequently, although supportive contact has many positive implications for promoting social change, potential challenges involve increased perceptions of intergroup threat, concerns about privilege loss, zero-sum thinking, and resentment among advantaged group members.

Supportive Contact: Desired Outcomes for Social Cohesion

Although supportive contact has been widely discussed regarding its (mainly positive) impact on social change (see section "Supportive Contact: Desired Outcomes in Promoting Social Change"), the research literature tends to neglect how supportive contact may shape social cohesion outcomes. However, keeping social cohesion in mind while seeking to foster social change is important because of the potential for systemic changes that promote greater equality to create new conflicts between groups. In light of this, we will now discuss the implications of supportive contact for social cohesion.

On the one hand, supportive contact is important for social cohesion because it may allow disadvantaged groups to give voice to their lived experiences in unequal societies and to help them to feel heard and understood (Marinucci et al., 2021). Acknowledging differences in identity and lived experience can create feelings of psychological safety among the disadvantaged

(Collier-Spruel & Ryan, 2022). In turn, the more disadvantaged group members feel heard and understood, the less they may fear being dominated by the advantaged group (Horenczyk, 2004) and the more willing they should be to engage in intergroup contact (Ron et al., 2017). In line with these trends, research suggests that disadvantaged group members are especially likely to exhibit more positive intergroup attitudes when they engage in perspective-giving (i.e., voicing their own perspectives) as compared to when they engage in perspective-taking (i.e., listening to the perspectives of others; see Bruneau & Saxe, 2012).

Over time, feeling heard and understood should lead to greater feelings of trust among disadvantaged group members toward the advantaged group (Brik et al., 2023; Livingstone et al., 2020). Thus, although research in this area is limited, there is strong reason to believe that supportive contact should have positive implications for social cohesion, particularly with respect to creating a foundation for building intergroup trust among members of disadvantaged groups.

Supportive Contact: Unintended Consequences for Social Cohesion

At the same time, even if programs based on supportive contact try to promote safe spaces for addressing group differences in power and societal inequalities, they might be challenged in reducing feelings of anxiety and threat among advantaged group members. As noted previously, being confronted with one's own privileges puts advantaged group members in an uncomfortable position and might threaten their beliefs and positive ingroup image (Knowles et al., 2014; Shnabel & Nadler, 2008). Furthermore, supportive contact might trigger advantaged group members' fear of being rejected (Barlow et al., 2009) or fear of being seen as discriminatory by the disadvantaged outgroup (Ron et al., 2017). Over time, the abovementioned trends might lead advantaged groups to avoid contact with outgroup members (Shuman et al., 2022), thereby curbing prospects for achieving greater intergroup trust and social cohesion (Schmid et al., 2014). In sum, then, it seems that supportive contact might introduce some obstacles to social cohesion, especially among members of the advantaged group, by provoking greater anxiety, threat, and contact avoidance, along with hindering intergroup trust.

Positive and Supportive Contact: Practical Implications for Designing Interventions

By disentangling the likely effects of positive and supportive contact for social cohesion and social change, our review shows that both types of contact have great potential for promoting desired outcomes as well as shortcomings and downfalls. Whereas positive contact alone might help to encourage social cohesion through identifying commonalities between groups and creating a foundation for intergroup trust, it might create a conditional sense of belonging and a feeling of not being understood among members of disadvantaged groups, and it may also appear to support a colorblind ideology among members of advantaged groups. In addition, positive contact might establish support for social change toward equality by enhancing advantaged group members' empathic concern for the disadvantaged, yet it may inadvertently curb disadvantaged group members' efforts to promote social change, thereby contributing to maintaining inequalities over time.

By contrast, supportive contact carries the potential to support social change toward greater equality through enhancing awareness of privilege and injustice among advantaged group members; however, supportive contact may also result in a backlash by increasing advantaged group members' perceptions of threat, intergroup competition, and zero-sum thinking. Supportive contact also provides an environment in which members of disadvantaged groups may come to feel empowered, heard, and understood, yet there is a risk of provoking greater anxiety among advantaged group members who may fear a loss in status or questions about the presumed legitimacy of their privileged status.

As we highlight in this article, we believe that for social cohesion to be sustainable, social change is ultimately a necessity. Therefore, we encourage further developments in the research literature to promote the effectiveness of supportive contact. Nonetheless, due to some obstacles that may be associated with supportive contact noted above, we suggest that supportive contact strategies should be implemented in combination with other approaches that may inhibit threat responses among advantaged groups during supportive contact interventions. Similar to Pettigrew's (1998) sequential model, we suggest that contact programs need to first build some degree of trust and rapport

between members of different groups to reduce feelings of anxiety and encourage feelings of psychological safety among interactants before engaging in deep discussions of group differences in power. We propose that there might be several pathways for contact programs to achieve this delicate balance and, as a result, to become more successful in achieving goals relevant to social cohesion and social change both in the short term and long term. We will shortly outline some underlying principles and strengths of these potential approaches in the following paragraphs.

First, when we look at the impacts of these two types of contact on social cohesion and social change, they appear to complement each other. Whereas the ultimate goals of supportive contact might feel threatening to members of advantaged groups, the aims of positive contact can help to reduce feelings of intergroup anxiety. Conversely, whereas the presumed goals of positive contact may pose a threat to members of disadvantaged groups, the aims of supportive contact can help to alleviate such threats. We, therefore, propose that contact interventions need to find ways to effectively integrate both types of contact.

Qualitative work suggests that participants in a contact program might sequentially engage in change processes over time by first developing relationships with one another, then learning about power differences, and lastly, acting with more awareness (Watkins et al., 2007). In line with this view, we suggest that contact interventions begin with strategies that can ease anxieties and foster active engagement among interactants to build a reservoir of trust and psychological safety as they engage with each other; however, these initial efforts should be coupled with the early acknowledgment that group differences will be addressed and with subsequent supportive contact strategies that follow through in having members of the different groups discuss and address power inequalities. A first indication of the effectiveness of this approach on social cohesion and social change can be found in contact programs between Israelis and Palestinians in which a dialogue about communalities slowly is transitioned to a confrontation about differences and inequalities between groups (i.e., mixed-model encounters; Abu-Nimer & Lazarus, 2007; Maoz, 2004). These programs were shown, on the one hand, to be effective in increasing the willingness of contact and empathy while decreasing perceptions of threats among both Israelis and Palestinians and, on the other hand, increasing

the support for Palestinian rights among Israelis as well as support for inclusion of Israelis in Arab localities among Palestinians (Shani & Boehnke, 2017).

Second, an added approach may involve the provision of training to advantaged group members that can enhance their capacity to address power differences and privileges to minimize the likelihood of provoking threats during supportive contact with disadvantaged group members. As one example, some studies suggest trainings that include reflections on one's own group memberships and how they may have experienced disadvantage on the basis of some identity dimensions, along with guidelines on how to reckon with privilege on other identity dimensions in a constructive way (see, e.g., Ehrke et al., 2020). Other examples may involve self-affirmation exercises in which advantaged group members are encouraged to recognize the value and moral nature of many of their identity characteristics to serve as a buffer to identity threats when asked to reflect on the unmoral behavior or privilege of their advantaged ingroup (see, e.g., Sherman et al., 2021). Such strategies could be used by practitioners to prepare advantaged group participants to engage in constructive discussions of group-based inequalities before they come into contact.

Yet another approach could involve establishing networks of ingroup members, outside of the contact situation, that could serve as bases of support for advantaged and disadvantaged groups as they engage with each other. Such support networks may help interactants in contact programs to feel more confident and secure and help them to contend with intergroup anxieties that may arise (P. M. King et al., 2011; Marinucci et al., 2021). Support networks through which interactants could connect with prior program participants (alumni) would be especially beneficial so that they could feel understood when expressing concerns or anxieties (see Livingstone et al., 2020) and see how others have successfully navigated challenging conversations across group lines (Gurin et al., 2013).

Conclusion and Implications for Future Research

Our review provides an up-to-date overview and makes some novel connections of literature on positive and supportive contact on social cohesion and social change, such as the impact of

supportive contact on social cohesion and the considerations of long-term effects of these two types of contacts (e.g., conditional belonging). Some of these connections will need to be further examined by empirical research. Based on the implications of these different types of contact, we suggest some directions for researchers and practitioners regarding potential fruitful paths for designing future contact programs. Further research will need to test the effectiveness of these approaches and whether they can encourage the desired goals of positive and supportive contact while overcoming the obstacles they face regarding social cohesion and social change.

References

- Abu-Nimer, M. A., & Lazarus, N. (2007). The peacebuilder's paradox and the dynamics of dialogue: A psychological portrait of Israeli–Palestinian encounters. In J. Kuriansky (Ed.), *Beyond bullets and bombs: Grass-roots peacebuilding between Israelis and Palestinians* (pp. 19–32). Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Barlow, F. K., Louis, W. R., & Hewstone, M. (2009). Rejected! Cognitions of rejection and intergroup anxiety as mediators of the impact of cross-group friendships on prejudice. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *48*(3), 389–405. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466608X387089>
- Batson, C. D., & Ahmad, N. Y. (2009). Using empathy to improve intergroup attitudes and relations. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *3*(1), 141–177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-2409.2009.01013.x>
- Becker, J. C., & Wright, S. C. (2022). Can cross-group contact turn advantaged group members into allies? The role of inequality-delegitimizing contact and interpersonal connection. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *25*(6), 1496–1515. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302211015273>
- Becker, J. C., Wright, S. C., Lubensky, M. E., & Zhou, S. (2013). Friend or ally: Whether cross-group contact undermines collective action depends on what advantaged group members say (or don't say). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*(4), 442–455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213477155>
- Brik, T., Livingstone, A. G., Chayinska, M., & Bliznyuk, E. (2023). How feeling understood predicts trust and willingness to forgive in the midst of violent intergroup conflict: Longitudinal evidence from Ukraine. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506231183195>
- Bruneau, E., & Saxe, R. (2012). The power of being heard: The benefits of 'perspective-giving' in the context of intergroup conflict. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(4), 855–866. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.02.017>
- Collier-Spruel, L. A., & Ryan, A. M. (2022). Are all allyship attempts helpful? An investigation of effective and ineffective allyship. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-022-09861-9>
- Davies, K., & Aron, A. (2016). Friendship development and intergroup attitudes: The role of interpersonal and intergroup friendship processes. *Journal of Social Issues*, *72*(3), 489–510. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12178>
- Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Cross-group friendships and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *15*(4), 332–351. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868311411103>
- Davies, K., Wright, S. C., Aron, A., & Comeau, J. (2013). Intergroup contact through friendship: Intimacy and norms. In G. Hodson & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Advances in intergroup contact* (pp. 200–229). Psychology Press.
- Davis, D. W., & Wilson, D. C. (2022). *Racial resentment in the political mind*. The University of Chicago Press. <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/Chicago/R/bo124039550.html>
- Di Bernardo, G. A., Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., McKeown, S., Cocco, V. M., Saguy, T., & Dixon, J. (2021). Fostering social change among advantaged and disadvantaged group members: Integrating intergroup contact and social identity perspectives on collective action. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *24*(1), 26–47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430219889134>
- Dixon, J., Levine, M., Reicher, S., & Durrheim, K. (2012). Beyond prejudice: Are negative evaluations the problem and is getting us to like one another more the solution? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *35*(6), 411–425. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X11002214>
- Dixon, J., Tropp, L. R., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2010). "Let them eat harmony": Prejudice-reduction strategies and attitudes of historically disadvantaged groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *19*(2), 76–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721410363366>
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Saguy, T. (2007). Another view of "we": Majority and minority group perspectives on a common ingroup identity. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *18*(1), 296–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280701726132>
- Droogendyk, L., Louis, W. R., & Wright, S. C. (2016). Renewed promise for positive cross-group contact: The role of supportive contact in empowering collective action. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, *48*(4), 317–327. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000058>

- Ehrke, F., Ashoe, A., Steffens, M. C., & Louvet, E. (2020). A brief diversity training: Raising awareness of ingroup privilege to improve attitudes towards disadvantaged outgroups. *International Journal of Psychology, 55*(5), 732–742. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12665>
- Eibach, R. P., & Keegan, T. (2006). Free at last? Social dominance, loss aversion, and white and black Americans' differing assessments of racial progress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(3), 453–467. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.3.453>
- Genter, S. (2022). Collective racial resentment and emotion: Toward an understanding of Whites' reactions to demands for racial equity. *Sociology Compass, 16*(10), Article e13026. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.13026>
- Gould, E. D., & Hijzen, A. (2016). *Growing apart, losing trust? The impact of inequality on social capital*. International Monetary Fund. <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2016/wp16176.pdf>
- Grütter, J., Gasser, L., Zuffianò, A., & Meyer, B. (2018). Promoting inclusion via cross-group friendship: The mediating role of change in trust and sympathy. *Child Development, 89*(4), 414–430. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12883>
- Gurin, P., Nagda, B. A., & Zúñiga, X. (2013). *Dialogue across difference: Practice, theory, and research on intergroup dialogue*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hackl, A. (2022). Good immigrants, permitted outsiders: Conditional inclusion and citizenship in comparison. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 45*(6), 989–1010. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2021.2011938>
- Hässler, T., González, R., Lay, S., Lickel, B., Zagefka, H., Tropp, L. R., Brown, R., Astudillo, J. M., & Bernardino, M. (2019). With a little help from our friends: The impact of cross-group friendship on acculturation preferences. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 49*(2), 366–384. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2383>
- Hässler, T., Ullrich, J., Bernardino, M., Shnabel, N., Laar, C. V., Valdenegro, D., Sebben, S., Tropp, L. R., Visintin, E. P., González, R., Dittmann, R. K., Abrams, D., Selvanathan, H. P., Branković, M., Wright, S., von Zimmermann, J., Pasek, M., Aydin, A. L., Žeželj, I., ... Ugarte, L. M. (2020). A large-scale test of the link between intergroup contact and support for social change. *Nature Human Behaviour, 4*(4), 380–386. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0815-z>
- Hässler, T., Ullrich, J., Sebben, S., Shnabel, N., Bernardino, M., Valdenegro, D., Van Laar, C., González, R., Visintin, E. P., Tropp, L. R., Dittmann, R. K., Abrams, D., Aydin, A. L., Pereira, A., Selvanathan, H. P., von Zimmermann, J., Lantos, N. A., Sainz, M., Glenz, A., Kende, A., ... Pistella, J. (2022). Need satisfaction in intergroup contact: A multinational study of pathways toward social change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 122*(4), 634–658. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000365>
- Hässler, T., Uluğ, Ö. M., Kappmeier, M., & Travaglino, G. A. (2021). Intergroup contact and social change: An integrated Contact-Collective Action Model. *Journal of Social Issues, 77*(1), 217–241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12412>
- Hewstone, M. (2015). Consequences of diversity for social cohesion and prejudice: The missing dimension of intergroup contact. *Journal of Social Issues, 71*(2), 417–438. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12120>
- Horenczyk, G. (2004). Identity processes in intergroup encounters. In R. Halabi (Ed.), *Israeli and Palestinian identities in dialogue: The school for peace approach* (pp. 179–184). Rutgers University Press.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*(2), 143–156. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0402_03
- International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2021). *The power of "contact". Designing, facilitating and evaluating social mixing activities to strengthen migrant integration and social cohesion between migrants and local communities. A review of lessons learned*. <https://publications.iom.int/books/power-contact-designing-facilitating-and-evaluating-social-mixing-activities-strengthen>
- Johnston, B. M., & Glasford, D. E. (2018). Intergroup contact and helping: How quality contact and empathy shape outgroup helping. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 21*(8), 1185–1201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217711770>
- Jost, J. T., Becker, J., Osborne, D., & Badaan, V. (2017). Missing in (collective) action. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 26*(2), 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417690633>
- Kenworthy, J. B., Voci, A., Ramiah, A. A., Tausch, N., Hughes, J., & Hewstone, M. (2016). Building trust in a postconflict society. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 60*(6), 1041–1070. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002714564427>
- King, M. L., Jr. (1963). *Letter from a Birmingham Jail* [King, Jr.] (N.p, n.d. Web). https://www.africa.upenn.edu/Articles_Gen/Letter_Birmingham.html
- King, P. M., Magolda, M. B. B., & Massé, J. C. (2011). Maximizing learning from engaging across difference: The role of anxiety and meaning making. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 44*(4), 468–487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2011.608600>
- Knowles, E. D., Lowery, B. S., Chow, R. M., & Unzueta, M. M. (2014). Deny, distance, or dismantle? How White Americans manage a privileged identity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 9*(6), 594–609. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614554658>

- Kuchynka, S. L., Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., & Puryear, C. (2018). Zero-sum thinking and the masculinity contest: Perceived intergroup competition and workplace gender bias. *Journal of Social Issues, 74*(3), 529–550. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12281>
- Kutlaca, M., Radke, H. R. M., & Becker, J. (2022). The impact of including advantaged groups in collective action against social inequality on politicized identification of observers from disadvantaged and advantaged groups. *Political Psychology, 43*(2), 297–315. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12755>
- Leininger, H., Burchi, F., Fiedler, C., Mross, K., Nowack, D., von Schiller, A., Sommer, C., Strupat, C., & Ziaja, S. (2021). *Social cohesion: A new definition and a proposal for its measurement in Africa*. Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik. <https://www.idos-research.de/uploads/media/DP31.2021.v1.1.pdf>
- Lemma, G., & Wagner, U. (2015). Can we really reduce ethnic prejudice outside the lab? A meta-analysis of direct and indirect contact interventions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 45*(2), 152–168. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2079>
- Little, N., Nemutlu, G., Magic, J., & Molnár, B. (2011). *Don't judge a book by its cover!* Council of Europe Publishing. <https://rm.coe.int/16807023dd>
- Livingstone, A. G., Fernández Rodríguez, L., & Rothers, A. (2020). “They just don’t understand us”: The role of felt understanding in intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 119*(3), 633–656. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000221>
- Mallett, R. K., Huntsinger, J. R., Sinclair, S., & Swim, J. K. (2008). Seeing through their eyes: When majority group members take collective action on behalf of an outgroup. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 11*(4), 451–470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430208095400>
- Maoz, I. (2004). Coexistence is in the eye of the beholder: Evaluating intergroup encounter interventions between Jews and Arabs in Israel. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*(2), 437–452. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00119.x>
- Marinucci, M., Maunder, R., Sanchez, K., Thai, M., McKeown, S., Turner, R., & Stevenson, C. (2021). Intimate intergroup contact across the lifespan. *Journal of Social Issues, 77*(1), 64–85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12399>
- McDoom, O. S., Reyes, C. M., Mina, C. D., & Asis, R. D. (2019). Inequality between whom? Patterns, trends, and implications of horizontal inequality in the Philippines. *Social Indicators Research, 145*(3), 923–942. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-1867-6>
- McKenna, S., Lee, E., Klik, K. A., Markus, A., Hewstone, M., & Reynolds, K. J. (2018). Are diverse societies less cohesive? Testing contact and mediated contact theories. *PLoS ONE, 13*(3), Article e0193337. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0193337>
- Orosz, G., Bánki, E., Bóthe, B., Tóth-Király, I., & Tropp, L. R. (2016). Don’t judge a living book by its cover: Effectiveness of the living library intervention in reducing prejudice toward Roma and LGBT people. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 46*(9), 510–517. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12379>
- Paluck, E. L., Green, S., & Green, D. P. (2019). The contact hypothesis re-evaluated. *Behavioural Public Policy, 3*(02), 129–158. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2018.25>
- Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2005). Rethinking the link between categorization and prejudice within the social cognition perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9*(2), 108–130. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0902_2
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*(1), 65–85. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65>
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751–783. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751>
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*(6), 922–934. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.504>
- Phillips, L. T., & Lowery, B. S. (2020). I ain’t no fortunate one: On the motivated denial of class privilege. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 119*(6), 1403–1422. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000240>
- Putnam, R. (2007). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. *Scandinavian Political Studies, 30*(2), 137–174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2007.00176.x>
- 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>
- Reimer, N. K., Love, A., Wölfer, R., & Hewstone, M. (2021). Building social cohesion through intergroup contact: Evaluation of a large-scale intervention to improve intergroup relations among adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 50*(6), 1049–1067. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-021-01400-8>
- Ron, Y., Solomon, J., Halperin, E., & Saguy, T. (2017). Willingness to engage in intergroup contact: A multilevel approach. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 23*(3), 210–218. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000204>
- Saguy, T., & Chernyak-Hai, L. (2012). Intergroup contact can undermine disadvantaged group members’

- attributions to discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(3), 714–720. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.01.003>
- Saguy, T., & Kteily, N. (2014). Power, negotiations, and the anticipation of intergroup encounters. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 25(1), 107–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2014.957579>
- Saguy, T., 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>
- Sasaki, S. J., & Vorauer, J. D. (2013). Ignoring versus exploring differences between groups: Effects of salient color-blindness and multiculturalism on intergroup attitudes and behavior. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7(4), 246–259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12021>
- Schiefer, D., & van der Noll, J. (2017). The essentials of social cohesion: A literature review. *Social Indicators Research*, 132(2), 579–603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-016-1314-5>
- Schmid, K., Ramiah, A. A., & Hewstone, M. (2014). Neighborhood ethnic diversity and trust: The role of intergroup contact and perceived threat. *Psychological Science*, 25(3), 665–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613508956>
- Schroeder, J., & Risen, J. L. (2016). Befriending the enemy: Outgroup friendship longitudinally predicts intergroup attitudes in a coexistence program for Israelis and Palestinians. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 19(1), 72–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430214542257>
- Schumann, S., & Moore, Y. (2022). What can be achieved with online intergroup contact interventions? Assessing long-term attitude, knowledge, and behaviour change. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 22(3), 1072–1091. <https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12333>
- 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(6), 1344–1361. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2697>
- Selvanathan, H. P., Techakesari, P., Tropp, L. R., & Barlow, F. K. (2018). Whites for racial justice: How contact with Black Americans predicts support for collective action among White Americans. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 21(6), 893–912. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217690908>
- Sengupta, N. K., & Sibley, C. G. (2013). Perpetuating one's own disadvantage: Intergroup contact enables the ideological legitimization of inequality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(11), 1391–1403. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213497593>
- Shani, M., & Boehnke, K. (2017). The effect of Jewish–Palestinian mixed-model encounters on readiness for contact and policy support. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 23(3), 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000220>
- Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2005). Intergroup contact and pluralistic ignorance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(1), 91–107. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.91>
- Sherman, D. K., Lokhande, S., Müller, T., & Cohen, G. L. (2021). Self-affirmation interventions. In G. M. Walton & A. J. Crum (Eds.), *Handbook of wise interventions: How social psychology can help people change* (pp. 63–99). Guilford Press.
- Shnabel, N., & Nadler, A. (2008). A needs-based model of reconciliation: Satisfying the differential emotional needs of victim and perpetrator as a key to promoting reconciliation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(1), 116–132. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.1.116>
- Shuman, E., van Zomeren, M., Saguy, T., & Knowles, E. (2022, June 5). *Defend, deny, distance, and dismantle: A measure of how advantaged group members manage their identity*. PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/6d4qc>
- Stathi, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2010). Intergroup contact and the projection of positivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34(6), 580–591. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2010.04.002>
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41(3), 157–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1985.tb01134.x>
- Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., & Cairns, E. (2009). Intergroup trust in Northern Ireland. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(1), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208325004>
- Techakesari, P., Droogendyk, L., Wright, S. J., Louis, W. R., & Barlow, F. K. (2017). Supportive contact and LGBT collective action: The moderating role of membership in specific groups. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 23(3), 307–316. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000240>
- Todd, N. R., Blevins, E. J., Yi, J., Bergmann, B. A. B., & Meno, C. G. (2023). Examining awareness of privilege among midwestern college students: An analysis of race/ethnicity, gender, and religion. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 71(1–2), 224–241. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12625>
- Tropp, L. R. (2021). Crossing to safety: Attachment processes in intergroup contact. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(1), 86–104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12426>
- Tropp, L. R., & Barlow, F. K. (2018). Making advantaged racial groups care about inequality: Intergroup contact as a route to psychological investment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(3), 194–199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417743282>
- Tropp, L. R., & Dehron, T. A. (2023). Prejudice reduction and social change: Dual goals to be pursued in

- tandem. In L. Huddy, D. Sears, J. Levy, & J. Jerit (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of political psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 1062–1094). Oxford University Press.
- 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>
- Turner, R. N., & Cameron, L. (2016). Confidence in contact: A new perspective on promoting cross-group friendship among children and adolescents. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 10(1), 212–246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12023>
- 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(3), 248–261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12731>
- Uslaner, E. M. (2009). *Segregation and mistrust: Diversity, isolation, and social cohesion*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssm.1523709>
- Valcke, B., Van Hiel, A., Onraet, E., & Dierckx, K. (2020). Procedural fairness enacted by societal actors increases social trust and social acceptance among ethnic minority members through the promotion of sense of societal belonging. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 50(10), 573–587. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12696>
- Van der Meer, T., & Tolsma, J. (2014). Ethnic diversity and its effects on social cohesion. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40(1), 459–478. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043309>
- Van Zomeren, M., Leach, C. W., & Spears, R. (2012). Protesters as “passionate economists”: A dynamic dual pathway model of approach coping with collective disadvantage. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(2), 180–199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868311430835>
- Watkins, N. D., Larson, R. W., & Sullivan, P. F. (2007). Bridging intergroup difference in a community youth program. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(3), 380–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764207306066>
- Waugh, C. E., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2006). Nice to know you: Positive emotions, self-other overlap, and complex understanding in the formation of a new relationship. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1(2), 93–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760500510569>
- White, F. A., Abu-Rayya, H. M., & Weitzel, C. (2014). Achieving twelve-months of intergroup bias reduction: The dual identity-electronic contact experiment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 38, 158–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.08.002>
- Wood, P. B., & Sonleitner, N. (1996). The effect of childhood interracial contact on adult antiblack prejudice. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20(1), 1–17. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(96\)00038-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(96)00038-7)

Received May 25, 2023

Revision received October 2, 2023

Accepted November 20, 2023 ■