
10-2020

Intraminority Solidarity: The Role of Critical Consciousness

Esther Burson

New York University, eburson@smith.edu

Erin B. Godfrey

New York University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.smith.edu/psy_facpubs



Part of the [Psychiatry and Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Burson, Esther and Godfrey, Erin B., "Intraminority Solidarity: The Role of Critical Consciousness" (2020).

Psychology: Faculty Publications, Smith College, Northampton, MA.

https://scholarworks.smith.edu/psy_facpubs/186

This Article has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology: Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Smith ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@smith.edu

Intraminority Solidarity: The Role of Critical Consciousness

Abstract

A small but growing subfield of social psychological research on intergroup dynamics focuses on relations among marginalized groups, commonly termed “intraminority relations.” A central question in this field is how best to promote solidarity among marginalized groups. The current paper reviews barriers to, and facilitators of, intraminority solidarity. We discuss how existing social psychological theoretical frameworks both explain and fail to account for processes of solidarity. We suggest that critical consciousness, a theory of sociopolitical development prominent in the developmental and community psychology literatures, can fill gaps in our understanding of solidarity among marginalized groups. We explore how critical consciousness can reduce perceptions of competition and increase perceptions of similarity among minority groups. We then generate theoretical predictions for the effects of critical consciousness on intraminority solidarity. This exploration furthers existing theoretical work on intraminority solidarity and intergroup relations more broadly.

Keywords: Intraminority relations, solidarity, critical consciousness

The bulk of intergroup relations research focuses on dynamics between majority and minority groups (such as Black-White relations, see Simon, Aufderheide, & Kampmeier, 2001 or Philip, Mahalingham, & Sellers, 2010), or multiple equal status groups. In order to build a more comprehensive theory of intergroup dynamics, a growing body of literature specifically examines dynamics among groups that are marginalized in terms of number, status, power, or resources. The term “intraminority relations” is used to discuss these processes among demographic groups that experience widespread social, political, and/or economic marginalization due to an aspect of social identity shared among group members, regardless of actual group size. Such research is especially topical given current demographic shifts leading to rising numbers of minorities and increased contact and proximity among minority populations at the city, community, and neighborhood levels (Hindriks et al., 2014; Richeson & Craig, 2011). With large numbers of minority groups increasingly living in close proximity to each other, understanding factors that increase solidarity among multiple minority groups is an important real-world issue, especially considering the present highly-charged political climate.

Work on intraminority relations acknowledges the need for more research and theory in this area (Craig & Richeson, 2016; Hindriks, Verkuyten, & Coenders, 2014; Richeson & Craig, 2011). Research specifically focusing on relations among marginalized has traditionally been quite limited. Psychologists wishing to understand relations among marginalized groups drew from a variety of social science disciplines, such as political science and urban studies. The past decade has brought increased researchers on intraminority dynamics in the USA (Craig & Richeson, 2016; Craig & Richeson, 2012; Craig, DeHart, Richeson, & Fiedorowicz, 2012; Glasford & Calcagno, 2012; Philip, Mahalingham, & Sellers, 2010) and elsewhere (Al Ramiah, Hewstone, Little, & Lang, 2013; Hindriks et al., 2014). This work has greatly advanced our

understanding of intraminority intragroup processes. At the same time, however, we lack a comprehensive framework to account for processes of intraminority solidarity. More theory is needed to fully explain processes facilitating solidarity among marginalized groups.

Theories of intraminority solidarity

The first theoretical framework to be widely applied to intraminority relations was realistic group conflict theory (RGCT; Sherif & Sherif, 1953), which suggests that competition over limited resources leads to intergroup strife. In the intraminority paradigm, competition over status and physical resources, such as jobs or housing, have indeed emerged as a major predictor of antagonism among marginalized groups (Alozie & Ramirez, 1999; Gay, 2006; Johnson & Oliver, 1989; Kauffmann, 2003; Sanchez, 2003). In particular, feelings of relative disadvantage compared to another marginalized group have been shown to increase negative attitudes (Gay, 2006) and decrease positive attitudes (Burson & Godfrey, 2018) toward a marginalized outgroup.

More recent research on intraminority relations emerges from Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This research has focused on the role of similarity in increasing solidarity among marginalized groups. This idea draws on the Common Ingroup Identity Model (CIIM), which suggests that providing a shared, superordinate identity leads to more favorable intergroup relations (Gaertner et al., 1993). This process relies on two outgroups cognitively recategorizing themselves under a shared identity to view both groups as part of one new ingroup (Hewstone & Greenland, 2000). Intraminority relations research applies the CIIM by suggesting that a common identity based on marginalization may increase positivity among marginalized groups. Indeed, perceptions of similarity have predicted positive attitudes among marginalized groups in a range of survey and experimental studies (Burson & Godfrey, 2018; Craig & Richeson, 2012; Glasford & Calcagno, 2012; Hindriks et al., 2014).

While Social Identity Theory offers an explanation for increased solidarity among marginalized groups, it can also account for increased derogation, as explored in the only theoretical integration to offer a comprehensive account of solidarity among stigmatized groups (Craig & Richeson, 2016). Craig and Richeson (2016) review the potential of marginalization to generate perceptions of similarity, and also explore how marginalization can trigger two types of identity threat that can ultimately erode solidarity. First, while a shared identity of marginalization can spark perceptions of similarity, as seen above, it can also threaten the need for distinctiveness. This threat to positive distinctiveness can then lead to derogation of a marginalized outgroup (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Craig & Richeson, 2016). The experience of discrimination can also threaten a marginalized individual's positive social identity. This type of social identity threat leads to derogation of marginalized outgroups in order to repair in-group esteem (Craig & Richeson, 2016; for examples of this process see Craig et al., 2012; Craig & Richeson, 2014). As a result, it is suggested that perceptions of similarity can lead either to increased solidarity or increased antipathy, depending on whether perceptions of similarity lead to a common identity or to threats to the ingroup's distinctiveness or positive social identity.

Other theories that are proximal to intraminority solidarity but have not been directly applied to the field include collective victimization and system justification. First, collective victimization explores the psychological experience resulting from collective violence perpetrated by one group against another in order to achieve political, economic, or social goals (Noor, Vollhardt, Mari, & Nadler, 2017). This research documents the tendency for victim groups to either dislike and distance themselves from a victim outgroup, or to express increased empathy and solidarity (Vollhardt, 2015; Vollhardt & Bilali, 2015). The first process, termed

"exclusive victim consciousness," (Vollhardt, 2015) reflects the tendency to view the ingroup as uniquely victimized, and to view a victimized outgroup as antagonistic. The opposite process, "inclusive victim consciousness," can also occur, in which a victim group approaches a victim outgroup with increased compassion and support. These orientations have been demonstrated to predict intergroup attitudes, with exclusive victim consciousness predicting increased social distance, mistrust, and economic exclusion, and inclusive victim consciousness predicting decreased social distance and increased political inclusion (Vollhardt & Bilali, 2015). The processes by which exclusive and inclusive victim orientations develop is unclear, however. Without an understanding of how these opposing intergroup attitudes develop, we cannot apply them to intraminority relations, or learn from them how best to facilitate solidarity.

Collective victimization research is similar to intraminority relations research in that both bodies of work consider processes among social groups that have experienced injustice. Furthermore, both theories describe processes of both increased and decreased solidarity. The fields are different, however, in their target populations. Collective victimization research addresses groups that were the victim of a largescale, targeted, and manmade atrocity within recent historical memory. Intraminority relations research instead focuses on groups that have experienced chronic, pervasive social exclusion and limited access to resources over time, perpetuated by both structural factors and individual or group intentions. These distinct contexts may lead to different intergroup processes and outcomes. Additionally, although existing intraminority relations research acknowledges parallels with Vollhardt's (2015) work on collective victimhood, does not integrate this theoretical orientation (Craig & Richeson, 2016). Furthermore, while both fields discuss processes of increased solidarity and increased antagonism, neither has identified the mechanisms that lead to these two different outcomes.

Another theoretical framework with potential consequences for intraminority solidarity is system justification. This theory posits that individuals are motivated to legitimize the status quo of the social systems in which they are embedded (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Liviatan, van der Toorn, Ledgerwood, Mandisodza, & Nosek, 2011). The idea has serious potential consequences for the intraminority context, as increased SJ would likely lead to increased derogation of a marginalized outgroup in an effort to justify the marginalized group's position in society. Evidence on the tendencies of marginalized groups to system justify is mixed, with some data suggesting increased SJ among marginalized groups, and other studies suggesting that on the whole, marginalized groups engage in less system justification than privileged groups (Jost et al., 2011). In either event, this theory has potential and unexplored consequences for understanding intraminority solidarity.

Burgeoning empirical evidence on intraminority relations drawing on both realistic group conflict theory and social identity theory has shed light on specific circumstances that can lead to competition or solidarity among marginalized groups. This new research represents a significant advance in our understanding of processes driving intraminority relations. Despite this significant growth, however, the field lacks a comprehensive account of processes and mechanisms that can inhibit or generate intraminority solidarity. No existing theory has integrated realistic group conflict and social identity frameworks, or accounted for findings from collective victimization research or system justification theory. Realistic group conflict theory explains the existence of antagonism, but not solidarity, among marginalized groups. Social identity based frameworks identify ways marginalization can lead to both solidarity and derogation, but do not identify mechanisms that can tip the scale in favor of solidarity. The only existing theoretical integration of intraminority solidarity (Craig & Richeson, 2016) fails to

integrate theories of competition and collective victimization, and despite its basis in SIT, does not examine the role of system justification or other social identity-based processes by which individuals perceive the larger social systems in which they are embedded. Finally, existing theory on dynamics among marginalized groups does not attend to the external power structures driving these processes, and research on solidarity among marginalized groups does not examine the development of intraminority attitudes or their potential to change over time.

Critical consciousness

We suggest that the developmental theory of critical consciousness can fill these gaps by providing a lens through which to integrate diverse existing theories of intraminority relations research. This theory situates processes of intraminority solidarity within a larger framework of power and oppression, offers a comprehensive understanding of the mechanisms that lead to solidarity among marginalized groups, and explores the developmental antecedents of these processes. Critical consciousness (CC) refers to a pedagogical concept developed by Brazilian educator Paulo Freire in his work with illiterate peasants (1921-1997). Freire observed that an interest in the political and historical roots of the oppression peasants experienced in their own lives was a powerful motivator for them to learn to read. In response, Freire advanced a pedagogical method centered on discussion about the economic, political, historical, and social forces that contribute to inequitable social conditions. Freire believed that these discussions about the myriad external forces that shape current inequalities leads to an awareness of the causes of marginalization, empowers marginalized groups, and leads them to take action against oppression (Freire, 1973, 1993).

This theory has gained popularity in the study of positive development among marginalized adolescents, which considers critical consciousness as an “antidote for oppression”

(Watts, Griffith, & Abdul-Adil, 1999) because of its potential to empower marginalized youth to identify and resist the inequalities that affect them. Critical consciousness is seen as a promising tool to prepare minority youth to recognize and confront discrimination (Gutierrez, 1995; Watts, Abdul-Adil, & Pratt, 2002). Increased critical consciousness has been linked to a range of positive outcomes for marginalized youth, including higher occupational attainment (Diemer & Blustein, 2006; Diemer & Hsieh, 2008; Diemer, 2009; Olle & Fouad, 2015), increased civic and community engagement (Diemer & Li, 2011; Foster-Fishman et al., 2010), and higher self-esteem (Christens & Peterson, 2012; Zimmerman, Ramirez-Valles, & Maton, 1999). Critical consciousness has also laid the theoretical groundwork for interventions in public health and disease prevention (Campbell & MacPhail, 2002) and community involvement (Carlson, Engebretson, & Chamberlain, 2006; Foster-Fishman, Law, Lichty, & Aoun, 2010) among marginalized youth and adults.

Within the developmental literature, critical consciousness is typically construed as the three major subcomponents of critical reflection, political efficacy, and critical action (Watts, Diemer, & Voigt, 2011; Godfrey & Grayman, 2014). Critical reflection refers to the ability to think critically about the historical root causes underlying present inequality, and to form causal attributions linking historical processes to current realities (Christens, Winn, & Duke, 2016). Political efficacy refers to the perceived ability to make social or political change, similar to the construct of empowerment. Critical action encompasses individual or collective action to change unjust aspects of society, and can include both traditional forms of political participation, such as voting, and nontraditional, such as protest (Watts, Diemer, & Voigt, 2011). The subcomponents of CC can develop independently, but development of CC is thought to be a recursive process, such that an increase in reflection, political efficacy, or action will spur the concurrent

development of the other components. Recent theoretical work suggests that the development of CC is spurred by sociocultural factors including racial discrimination, racial socialization, and racial identity (Anyiwo, Bañales, Rowley, Watkins, & Richards-Schuster, 2018), and new evidence suggests the role of parental racial socialization in increasing critical reflection (Bañales, Aldana, Richards-Schuster, Flanagan, Diemer, & Rowley, 2019). Other predictors of CC development include discussions of political issues with parents and peers, and an open classroom climate that encourages respectful discussions of inequities (Christens et al., 2016; Diemer & Li, 2011; Godfrey & Grayman, 2014).

It is worth noting that critical consciousness overlaps with social psychological theories of group consciousness and the social identity model of collective action. Like group consciousness, CC is conceptualized as an individual, rather than collective, process. Both theories involve awareness of one's own social group's position in society, and a desire to change power imbalances that marginalize the ingroup. Duncan's (2012) suggestion that group consciousness and political self-efficacy predict collective action is similar to CC theory that posits that critical reflection on inequality and political efficacy drive critical action. The constructs have key differences, however. First, group consciousness involves experiences of discrimination and the feelings of identification and common fate with the ingroup that these experiences create (Duncan, 2012). CC is driven less by identity and more by cognition, referring to a critical analysis of structures of inequality and systems of oppression. CC involves awareness of social hierarchy, but does not require particular levels of group identification. While group consciousness focuses on location of the self within a social hierarchy, this process does not entail the macro awareness of structural inequality and systems of oppression inherent in CC. The rejection of inequality and endorsement of egalitarian principles necessary to CC is

not necessary in group consciousness, which addresses rejection of one's social group's position in social hierarchy, but not rejection of the hierarchy itself. Furthermore, CC's focus on one's place within a larger hierarchy paves the way for awareness of different types of oppression, not limited to discrimination experienced by the ingroup. As such, CC is well positioned to address issues of intersectionality, a perspective group consciousness research has yet to incorporate (Duncan, 2012).

Critical consciousness bears overlap with the Social Identity Model of Collective Action (SIMCA, van Zomeren, Postmes, & Spears, 2008), as both theories address relations among perceived injustice, efficacy, and action. As mentioned above, CC is driven not by identity, but by an understanding and rejection of systemic inequality. While individual experiences and identity can serve to spark an analysis of inequality, CC focuses on structural-historical perceptions of injustice at the macro, societal-level, rather than on personal identification with a group. Furthermore, while action is a component of CC, the overall goal of the developmental construct of CC is not collective action so much as personal development (e.g. academic achievement, career attainment, and wellbeing) and liberation, thought to be achieved through an understanding of inequality, empowerment, and action to make social change evolving in tandem throughout the life course. While action is entailed in CC, it is not necessarily collective, and can involve both traditional (voting, volunteering) and nontraditional (protest, interpersonal organizing) forms of action.

Critical consciousness and intraminority relations

We thus view CC as an overarching framework or theoretical orientation representing an awareness of, and reactions to, systemic inequality and structural forces of oppression. As such, CC is broader than, and exists in tandem with, existing theories of social psychology. CC has

unique potential to address gaps in existing theories of intraminority solidarity. In particular, we argue that the structural and historical thinking styles inherent in critical consciousness can form the mechanisms to facilitate intraminority solidarity. CC emphasizes an attribution style in which resource disparities and marginalization are approached with a structural, causal understanding that reflects knowledge of the historical causes of systemic inequalities (Freire, 1973; Diemer, Rapa, Park, & Perry, 2014; Christens et al., 2016). While there are broad definitions of both structural and historical thinking in social psychology, the usages of these terms is more specific in CC research, which generally uses the terms “structural” and “historical” interchangeably to refer to a type of attribution that is in fact both structural and historical in scope (see Christens et al., 2016; Godfrey & Burson, 2018). Thus, while structural and historical thinking are two separate lines of social psychological inquiry, with surprisingly little overlap, these constructs do not appear independently in CC research. We argue that this combined structural-historical attribution style has unique potential to fill the gaps in the processes of how realistic group conflict and social identity theory generate intraminority solidarity.

Indeed, there is burgeoning evidence for the role of structural thinking in generating intergroup solidarity. Past research has found that conceptions of racism as due to structural/institutional factors, as opposed to individual prejudice, are associated with increased awareness of racism among White Americans evaluating the experience of Black Americans (O’Brien, Blodorn, Alsbrooks, Dube, Adams, & Nelson; 2009), suggesting that structural attributions may influence awareness of an outgroup’s plight. Structural attributions for poverty are associated with support for more progressive welfare policies and reform among undergraduate study participants (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2003), indicating that this type of thought affects support for policies to benefit an outgroup. Within the intraminority context,

attributing racism and sexism to structural, institutional policies, as opposed to personal attitudes, has been shown to lead to more coalitional attitudes and support for reduced inequality, possibly due to perceptions of increased pervasiveness of discrimination and increased psychological abstraction involved in structural thinking (Craig & Rucker, manuscript in preparation). In particular, a structural understanding of racism predicted increased support for the Black Lives Matter movement among Hispanic respondents, while a structural understanding of sexism led White women to express more support for coalitions with other stigmatized groups, such as racial/ethnic minorities. These findings suggest that structural attributions may increase awareness of, sympathy for, and desire to change, an outgroup's plight.

Social psychological research also suggests a potential role for historical thinking. This inquiry explores two types of historical thinking, first as factual knowledge (see Bonam, Nair Das, Coleman, & Salter, 2018; Nelson, Adams, & Salter, 2012), and second as endorsement of the importance and relevance of historical knowledge to present day reality (see Liu, Sibley, & Huang, 2013; Sibley & Liu, 2012; Sibley, Liu, Duckitt, & Kahn, 2008). This research does not actively distinguish between these different types of historical thinking. Intergroup relations research recognizes the importance of general historical thinking for intergroup processes, as perceptions of history can inform both individual and group identity (Liu & Hilton, 2005; Hammack, 2008). Groups rely on historical narratives to frame and negotiate past and current competition (Liu & Hilton, 2005). Social psychological research has suggested that historical knowledge of racism may increase the ability to identify instances of racism in the present day among both Black and White Americans (Adams, O'Brien, & Nelson, 2006). In addition to historical knowledge, acceptance or denial of history as relevant to present-day inequality has implications for intergroup relations. For example, among White New Zealanders of European

descent, viewing historical injustices as irrelevant to present issues, and negating the significance and legitimacy of this history, has been linked to increased opposition toward re-distributive social policies in favor of the native Maori (Sibley & Liu, 2012; Sibley et al., 2008). These findings suggest that awareness of specific historical events related to intergroup conflict has direct implications on current attitudes toward intergroup equality.

Evidence from the intraminority context suggests that drawing similarity between past discrimination experienced by the ingroup, and current discrimination experienced by an outgroup, can increase support for the outgroup (Cortland et al., 2017), with straight Black and Asian American respondents reporting increased support for same sex marriage when it was framed as similar to the ingroup's past experiences with the Civil Rights Movement, anti-miscegenation laws, and historical discrimination in housing and employment. The authors suggest that reminders of similar history increased intraminority positivity by increasing perceptions of similarity and a general similarity-seeking mindset (Cortland et al., 2017). These findings demonstrate that reminders of historical oppression can increase solidarity with a marginalized outgroup.

To date, none of this research on the roles of structural and historical thinking appear in existing theories of intraminority solidarity. Furthermore, in the research documented above, historical and structural thinking styles are explored in theoretical isolation from each other, despite conceptual overlaps. For example, the measures of structural thinking used by Craig & Richeson (under review) are entirely structural, despite addressing inequalities with strong historical legacies of discrimination. Conversely, the reminders of historical discrimination provided by Cortland and colleagues (2017), while arguably structural in nature (Jim Crow and anti-miscegenation laws were government policies designed to systematically oppress and isolate

communities of color), are referred to only as historical. Similarly, in Sibley's and colleagues' work, history is viewed as a series of facts, separate from structural policies, although the outcome they assess is the need for structural redress in the present time (Sibley & Liu, 2011; Sibley et al., 2007), suggesting that these historical facts have structural ramifications. The lack of integration presents a problem, as of clear definitions separating structural thinking and historical thinking presents a problem for theory development. Given that historical thinking often overlaps with structural thinking, and vice versa, it is important to articulate when these concepts do and do not overlap. It is not possible to theorize on the roles of structural and historical thinking in intergroup relations if the boundaries between these two thought styles are not explicit.

Sociological research has also considered the role of historical awareness in structural thinking. This work comments that a weak form of structural thought attributes current inequality to the actions of prejudiced people in the remote past, while a stronger form of structural thought involves awareness of the role of both historical and present forces at the individual and institutional levels (Kluegel & Bobo, 1993). Psychological research building on this work elides the role of history in structural thinking, instead focusing exclusively on awareness of present structural inequalities and the institutions that perpetuate them (see Lopez, Gurin, & Nagda, 1998). In contrast, the structural thinking central to CC is deeply historical. Critical consciousness refers to understanding the roots of systemic, macro level forces that lead to inequality, such as government policies preventing a racial or ethnic group from buying real estate in certain neighborhoods. This structural attribution encompasses awareness of the historical context underlying structural problems, and an understanding of how systemic policies

interact and reinforce each other over time to create present inequities. As such, history is cumulative, and directly responsible for the present day.

For example, consider a case in which Thomas, a new employee, is late to his first day of work. An internal attribution would attribute the causality to Thomas' personality—he must not care about being on time. A traditional external attribution would attribute causality to the situation—Thomas was late because of some issue getting to work: perhaps his bus broke down. A structural attribution would place causality at a more distal level, which acknowledges the role of structural factors and inequities. In this case, the structural attribution present in social psychological accounts might be that Thomas was late because he lives in a poor neighborhood that is not well served by public transportation, and as such, when the bus broke down he had no alternative transportation options. An attribution that is both structural and historical would note how historical policies and events are relevant to the current structural inequality. For example, this structural-historical attribution might explain that Thomas's neighborhood is low income and poorly serviced by public transit because of a history of redlining that forced racial/ethnic minorities and low socioeconomic status families into the area. This attention to the historical roots of present inequalities is rooted in Freire's (1973) belief that an understanding of causality encourages a critical analysis of reality.

The theory of CC accounts for structural and historical thinking, but empirical evidence for this process is lacking (Watts et al., 2011), however, as much research in the field has focused on applied developmental outcomes. Conversely, the intraminority relations literature lacks theoretical precedent for the importance of structural and historical thought patterns in intergroup attributions, but presents burgeoning experimental evidence for these mechanisms. We focus on structural and historical thinking as a key bridge between these two disciplines. We

argue that the structural and historical attributions represented in CC are key to its potential to increase solidarity among marginalized groups. In particular, we suggest that the combined structural-historical thinking style encompassed by CC is uniquely situated to predict solidarity among marginalized groups. We will now discuss how structural-historical attributions can predict intraminority processes.

As outlined above, three major mechanisms driving processes of intraminority solidarity are competition, similarity perceptions, and a shared identity of stigma. We explore these processes in more detail and explain how CC can act as a mechanism in order to increase solidarity among marginalized groups through these processes. This endeavor furthers our theoretical understanding of dynamics leading to intraminority solidarity.

Competition and CC. First, we explore the role of competition in eroding intraminority solidarity in order to outline how CC can counteract this process. Intraminority antagonism has been shown to result from competition for economic resources such as jobs or housing (Gay, 2006; Hindriks et al., 2014; Johnson & Oliver, 1989) and social resources such as status (Vollhardt, 2015; Shapiro & Neuberg, 2008), inhibiting the development of solidarity. Recent work has identified relative deprivation as one specific condition that increases antipathy among marginalized groups, such that marginalized groups display increased support for similarly or more disadvantaged outgroups, but this support does not extend to groups that are objectively marginalized, but still better off than the ingroup (Burson & Godfrey, 2018). We suggest that CC can disrupt and mitigate the negative effects of competition on intraminority attitudes, thereby leading to increased solidarity.

In particular, the structural-historical attribution style of CC can reduce competition and the drive to derogate an outgroup by highlighting the external, systemic factors that bring groups

into competition. The structural-historical attributions inherent in critical reflection reduce the victim blaming that stems from internal attributions (Watts, Diemer, & Voigt, 2011), encouraging the viewer to consider the bigger picture behind an individual's actions. An understanding of the historical and structural factors that lead to limited resources removes blame from other marginalized groups that are competing for these scarce resources. This type of construal, in which systemic forces, rather than a target outgroup, are responsible for scarcity experienced by the ingroup may help to reduce intergroup competition. Identifying structural forces as the true driver of competition may reduce antagonism toward the outgroup, perhaps by reducing victim blaming and the concurrent animosity toward a marginalized outgroup. Instead of directing blame for scarcity onto an outgroup that is also vying for these resources, a structural understanding illuminates the systemic factors at work. This redirection provides an alternative attribution for the causes of competition, allowing one to see how both groups are caught in an unjust system. Acknowledgement that there is no ill-intent driving competition for resources, but that instead both groups are at the mercy of a brutal system, may reduce the negative attributions and antagonism sparked by intergroup competition for resources.

As system justification theory posits, people are motivated to believe that dominant power structures are fair and just (Jost & Banaji, 1994). This motivation can lead to the assumption that, because life is fair, victims somehow deserves their circumstances. Structural-historical attributions point to external, rather than internal, causes of behavior, illuminating how behavior follows from systemic factors that are identifiable, concrete, and pervasive. A structural-historical attribution not only removes sole responsibility for an action or outcome from the individual, but also provides a clear alternative explanation, redirecting the locus of causality from an individual and onto the systemic factors that combined to create the observed

instance of individual behavior. This suggestion addresses the supposition that people attribute social patterns to inherent qualities of actors when sociohistorical knowledge is absent (Cimpian, & Saloman, 2014). As a result, when structural and historical knowledge are absent, people become more likely to blame disparities on inherent characteristics of marginalized individuals (Godfrey & Burson, 2018).

In terms of intraminority relations, decreased motivation to blame a victim outgroup for competition over limited resources could bring together formerly antagonistic outgroups to work toward the mutually beneficial goal of changing the system. This type of alliance represents one of Allport's optimal conditions for intergroup contact, in which disparate groups work together toward a common goal (Allport, 1954; Sherif & Sherif, 1953). A structural-historical understanding of the forces that lead to marginalization, such as racism, sexism, and homophobia, suggests that the outgroup is not the cause of ingroup struggles, but rather that unjust systems are responsible for the ingroup's marginalization.

Similarity and CC. Perceptions of similarity based on shared values, goals, or fate have emerged as a major factor of increased intraminority solidarity across a range of studies (Craig & Richeson, 2012, 2016; Glasford & Calcagno, 2012; Hindriks et al., 2014). This perceived similarity may lead to a shared categorization with an outgroup, in line with the Common Ingroup Identity Model (Gaertner et al., 1993). In fact, the CIIM has been applied successfully to the intraminority context, increasing solidarity among different racial minority groups (Craig & Richeson, 2012; Glasford & Calcagno, 2012). The structural-historical attribution style of critical consciousness can highlight shared goals, values, and shared fate among marginalized groups, thereby increasing intraminority solidarity. A structural-historical thinking style reveals the ways in which diverse marginalized groups have been, and continue to be, similarly excluded from

resources, power, and status. Attention to the ways that forces of oppression have created this situation emphasizes that marginalized groups all strive to no longer be marginalized. This shared goal may increase perceptions of similarity.

At the same time, structural-historical awareness of the ways oppression and marginalization have evolved may lead to a more intersectional understanding of inequality, that examines the ways forces of exclusion such as racism, sexism, and classism reinforce each other to serve the interests of those in power. This realization may encourage perceptions of a shared fate, because understanding the ways different types of oppression are linked reveals the need to fight all different types of oppression in order to eliminate the one(s) most directly affecting the ingroup. Recognition of how unjust social structures have operated on one's own and other marginalized groups in similar ways throughout history can increase commonality perceptions among marginalized groups and provide a naturally occurring shared identity. In fact, recent evidence for this process comes from a previously discussed study by Cortland and colleagues (2017), who found that providing marginalized groups with accounts of similar injustices perpetuated against both groups (in this case, reminding Blacks of miscegenation laws in the context of present-day support of marriage equality) leads to more positive intraminority relations, a process that is moderated by increased perceptions of similarity.

Shared identity of stigma and CC. A special case of similarity perceptions is that of similarity based on a shared identity of stigma (Craig & Richeson, 2016) or marginalization (Burson & Godfrey, 2018). Evidence for the success of shared identities of stigma in generating increased solidarity is mixed, but this suggestion remains central to theory on intraminority relations theory (Burson & Godfrey, 2018; Cortland, Craig, Shapiro, Richeson, Neel, & Goldstein, 2017; Craig & Richeson, 2016). We suggest that the combined structural-historical

thought process put forth by CC is uniquely suited to generating perceptions of similarity among marginalized groups. Structural thinking illustrates that different marginalized groups face similar, and often related, barriers. This awareness exposes the common forces and stereotypes that lead to similar historical experiences, thereby making a common identity more readily available and more cognitively compelling.

At the same time, this attribution style illuminates a shared background of privation due to structural forces. The knowledge that similar histories of marginalization spring from the same structural forces may strengthen a shared identity of marginalization. In this way, an understanding of the structural similarity of the histories of oppression faced by different marginalized groups provides grounds for a common superordinate identity of marginalization. These attributions may also reveal parallels between groups' past and current experiences with discrimination. Shared historical grievances have in fact been shown to mediate the association between intraminority contact and increased willingness to participate in joint collective action (Dixon, Cakal, Kahn, Osmany, Majumdar, & Hassan, 2017). For example, Dixon and colleagues (2017) found that increased intraminority contact led to a heightened awareness of common historical experiences of injustice, which itself led to support for collective action. As different minority groups interacted, they discovered the ways that they had been similarly mistreated in the past, and this heightened awareness led to solidarity and the desire to act for change.

Similarly, awareness of similar historical struggles may induce a common ingroup identity of marginalization. Recent work on the role of narratives in identity formation suggests that a shared historical narrative can provide the grounds of a common ingroup identity needed to improve intergroup attitudes (Bilali & Mahmut, 2017). This work cautions, however, that these shared narratives may be difficult to negotiate, especially in contexts in which the

experiences of the groups involved are asymmetric. For example, if one group has experienced more extensive trauma than the other has, it may be difficult to generate a shared identity that feels appropriate to both groups. Shared identities that do not ring true could lead to antipathy or competition between groups. Nevertheless, critical consciousness's focus on the historical roots of present inequalities offers the potential to increase perceptions of similarity among marginalized groups, thereby leading to a common superordinate identity and more favorable intergroup attitudes. These findings lend support to Vollhardt's (2015) supposition that exposure to historical narratives that explicitly link the suffering of different marginalized groups can increase inclusivity among victimized groups.

As discussed above, these shared identities of stigma can decrease solidarity if they threaten a group's positive self-identity or sense of distinctiveness (Craig & Richeson, 2016). A common ingroup identity can backfire if it triggers threats to the ingroup's distinctiveness. This "distinctiveness threat" can lead to elevated antagonism directed at an outgroup (Branscombe, et al., 1999; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000; Craig, DeHart, Richeson, & Fiedorowicz, 2012). Similarly, Hornsey & Hogg (2000) found that groups that otherwise rate each other favorably become more negative when they are categorized together under the same identity, suggesting that the need for distinctiveness can create antipathy. To counteract this process, researchers advocate "dual identity models," in which a minority subgroup's identity is maintained while attention is also drawn to a superordinate identity that encompasses multiple subgroups (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 2009; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000).

We suggest that critical consciousness leads to a shared identity that does not trigger threat to positive ingroup identity or distinctiveness. First, the structural-historical attribution style of critical consciousness mitigates threats to positive ingroup identity. A structural-

historical attribution locates marginalization as an external and unjust factor. Attributing marginalization in this way removes the impulse to victim blame, as discussed above. In this case, this attribution can decrease the negative emotions associated with blaming the ingroup for the marginalization it has faced, while also lessening the impulse to blame a marginalized outgroup. As such, critical consciousness can provide a buffer against threats to a positive ingroup identity, while at the same time reducing the desire to derogate a marginalized outgroup. In this way, critical consciousness allows for a shared identity of stigma that does not threaten a positive ingroup identity.

The structural-historical thinking inherent in CC also addresses the problem of threats to ingroup distinctiveness by highlighting similarities in the ways multiple marginalized groups have faced stigma and oppression, while still allowing for distinct subgroup identities. A structural-historical attribution style highlights the way largescale, systemic factors have oppressed different marginalized groups over time, creating a shared identity of marginalization due to a history of structural inequalities. At the same time, this attribution acknowledges the existence of multiple forms of oppression and different historical experiences. This process provides the benefits of similarity perceptions in creating solidarity without the dangers of triggering distinctiveness threat. In our paradigm, historical awareness of structural inequality encourages the formation of a dual identity model based on real world experiences of oppression, highlighting both the similarities *and* differences underlying experiences with marginalization. This process may provide enough similarity for the formation of a superordinate identity, while still acknowledging difference and giving groups space to keep a distinct subgroup identity within the superordinate identity of “marginalized group.”

Key to the success of this process is the way that structural-historical thinking highlights both similarities and differences of experiences with inequality. Marginalized groups face many types of oppression and have fared differently throughout history. A structural-historical attribution style acknowledges these different histories of oppression, while suggesting that the oppression itself stems from similar social, economic, and political forces. For example, structural-historical attributions might explore how anti-Black racism and homophobia both led to increased risk of police violence and exclusion from the workplace because of macro-level institutional policies. Both groups have suffered because of structural exclusion. At the same time, this attribution acknowledges that Black history and LGBTQ history are very different. Furthermore, racism and homophobia originate in different systems, namely white supremacy and patriarchy. At the same time, both of these forces can be said to uphold capitalist structures. Structural-historical thinking can lead to nuanced attributions that acknowledge both commonalities and differences. This process in effect creates a dual identity model that highlights a shared struggle against oppression, while acknowledging the ways oppression manifests differently for different groups at different times. As a result, a structural-historical attribution style increases perceptions of similarity without triggering identity threat, thereby generating solidarity among marginalized groups.

A focus on historical narratives nuances a common superordinate identity of marginalization, allowing similarities and differences to coexist within a broader identity of exclusion. The resulting narrative shifts blame for past competition onto the structural factors that have historically affected marginalized groups. Structural thinking complements this process, revealing how historically different experiences can be traced back to similar political, social, and economic barriers, thereby strengthening the grounds for a shared identity. This

process induces a shared identity of historical and structural discrimination, while also acknowledging the different ways similar factors have affected diverse groups, thereby reducing identity threat, while leading to increased perceptions of similarity and increased solidarity.

In addition to mutually reinforcing each other, historical and structural thinking together prevent either from having unintended, ironic effects. It is possible that historical thinking on its own would cause marginalized groups to focus on unique aspects of their narratives and conclude that the ingroup is distinct from a marginalized outgroup (Bilali & Mahmut, 2017). The context of systemic inequality provided by a structural attribution style, however, prevents this individualistic thinking. Historical thinking without a structural awareness could cause groups to focus on individual attributions, in which case they may still continue to blame or compete with a marginalized outgroup, rather than seeing them as allies against similar barriers. Historical thinking without structural attributions does not reduce competition or illuminate the larger, systemic nature of marginalization. Structural thinking is necessary to point to possible solutions, by suggesting alliances among marginalized groups in order to confront an unjust system. Similarly, structural thinking in the absence of historical knowledge can lead to identity threat that compromises the common superordinate identity, thereby leading to antagonism. A historical perspective highlights distinct subgroup experiences within a framework of structural oppression, thereby encouraging each group to maintain a unique identity, and reducing identity threat that can lead to negative outgroup emotions.

From attitudes to action

Above we have explored how critical consciousness can generate attitudes of solidarity among marginalized groups by decreasing competition, increasing perceptions of similarity, and generating a shared identity of stigma that does not trigger identity threat. In describing these

processes, we have focused only on critical reflection, which is one of the three subcomponents of critical consciousness mentioned above. We have explained how critical reflection affects intraminority attitudes, but we have not explored how the other components of CC, namely political efficacy and critical action, can affect solidarity among marginalized groups. We focus our analysis on critical reflection in part because current literature on intraminority relations focuses on attitudes. In fact, the shift from coalitional attitudes to concrete action remains a major future direction of this research (Craig & Richeson, 2016).

We suggest that the remaining two components of CC can in fact translate the coalitional intraminority attitudes generated by critical reflection into action in solidarity with other marginalized groups. Political efficacy refers to confidence in one's ability to change political realities, while critical action represents action taken to increase equality within one's community. Critical action offers many opportunities for solidarity among marginalized groups, such as volunteering, community organizing, and advocacy work. We suggest that political efficacy empowers individual actors to turn their attitudinal support for an outgroup into action on behalf of the marginalized outgroup. Without political efficacy, marginalized groups may support each other, but feel disempowered, and so therefore not express solidarity overtly. This phenomenon appears in our own qualitative work, in which young adults from marginalized backgrounds express liking and support towards marginalized outgroups, but report low political efficacy and feelings of helplessness to make change. These feelings prevent them from engaging in action on behalf of a marginalized outgroup (citation redacted). Political efficacy is needed to transform attitudes and beliefs into action. In this way, all three subcomponents of CC are relevant to intraminority solidarity. Critical reflection generates attitudinal support, and

political efficacy transforms this support into critical action in solidarity with marginalized outgroups.

Theoretically, the subcomponents of critical reflection, political efficacy, and critical action develop in tandem and reinforce each other (Watts et al, 2011). Recent research suggests, however, that these subcomponents can manifest independently and in different combinations among adolescents from marginalized racial/ethnic backgrounds (Godfrey, Burson, Yanisch, Hughes, & Way, 2019). For example, reflection can exist without efficacy or action. We have suggested that critical reflection, as represented by structural-historical thinking and a rejection of inequality, can increase attitudinal solidarity among marginalized groups. Critical reflection can exist without efficacy, however, and it is possible that when an individual possesses high critical reflection but low political efficacy, he will show attitudinal support for a marginalized outgroup without taking actual action in solidarity with another group. For example, an individual might be friends with people from other marginalized groups and criticize policies that harm a marginalized outgroup. Without political efficacy, however, he will feel disempowered to fight for change. He may still engage in low-stakes, traditional forms of civic engagement, such as voting for policies that will benefit marginalized groups, but will not protest, petition, or donate to causes that support marginalized outgroups. As such, political efficacy is necessary to fully transform feelings of solidarity into action.

Theoretical model and predications

These arguments bring us to a theoretical model (figure 1) in which CC leads to increased intraminority solidarity by decreasing competition and generating perceptions of similarity and a shared identity of stigma. This model integrates findings based on realistic group conflict theory with research from a social identity framework. Furthermore, it provides a mechanism to

encourage the development of processes leading to solidarity over those leading to derogation outlined in social identity-based approaches, by explaining ways to generate perceptions of similarity while diminishing threats to social identity. In our model, critical consciousness decreases feelings of competition and shifts the reference group for assessing relative deprivation, thereby decreasing intraminority antagonism. At the same time, it increases similarity perceptions, leading to a shared identity of stigma and greater solidarity among marginalized groups. We now suggest a series of predictions generated by our theoretical integration:

Prediction 1: First, we suggest that increased CC will decrease competition among marginalized groups, a process not addressed by existing intraminority relations theory based in Social Identity Theory. We suggest that the awareness of forces that lead to marginalization that is inherent to CC can decrease competition by suggesting that the outgroup is not impeding ingroup success, but rather that unjust systems are responsible for both the outgroup's and the ingroup's marginalization. This recategorization also leads marginalized groups to see privileged groups as a salient social referent when assessing relative deprivation, rather than judging deprivation compared to a marginalized outgroup, and reacting negatively toward the outgroup as a result.

Prediction 2: Second, we predict that increased CC will lead to increased perceptions of similarity among marginalized groups. Social identity-based models of intraminority relations state the importance of perceptions of similarity in creating solidarity, but do not discuss how to generate them. The structural-historical understanding of inequality that CC generates may cause marginalized groups to identify similarities in their historical and present experiences with inequality, leading to increased perceptions of similarity.

Unlike system justification theory, which predicts the need to blame a marginalized outgroup for its low position in society, thereby leading the ingroup to distance itself from the marginalized outgroup, CC suggests that highlighting how other marginalized groups have also suffered may increase perceptions of similarity.

Prediction 3: This idea leads to our third prediction, namely that higher CC will lead to a shared identity of stigma, similar to a common ingroup identity. This shared identity of stigma emerges from the recognition that unjust social structures have operated on one's own and other marginalized groups in similar ways throughout history. This process increases commonality and provides a naturally occurring shared identity of stigma that does not generate threats to positive social identity or distinctiveness. Our theory is the first to suggest how similarity perceptions can be generated in a way that does not trigger competition and threat, leading to a stable shared identity of stigma. Overall, we suggest that CC is key to a full understanding of theories of intraminority solidarity.

Future directions

We have outlined current knowledge on processes driving intraminority solidarity, and identified gaps in existing theory. To fill these gaps, we suggest looking to the developmental theory of critical consciousness. The critical reflection entailed in CC increases intraminority solidarity by decreasing competition and increasing similarity perceptions and a common identity of stigma among marginalized groups. This theory focuses on only one component of CC, critical reflection, because evidence for the importance of this process appears in both fields, and this component acts directly on the aforementioned levers of solidarity among marginalized groups. Future work should borrow from collective action research to further explore the roles of political efficacy and critical action in intraminority solidarity.

Another major potential of CC is to outline developmental antecedents of intraminority solidarity. Research on CC identifies key developmental processes that generate CC. For example, open classroom climate and discussions with parents and peers have been shown to increase critical consciousness (Diemer & Li, 2011; Godfrey & Grayman, 2014), as has racial socialization (Anyiwo et al., 2018). If these processes increase critical consciousness, and critical consciousness can increase solidarity among marginalized groups, it is likely that these processes of open discussions and racial socialization may influence the development of intraminority solidarity. The processes by which these factors influence CC development remains unclear, however, as do the associations between these predictors and the distinct subcomponents of CC. In order to understand how these factors predict intergroup relations, more research is needed on their mechanisms and effects. An understanding of these processes maximizes the utility of our theoretical framework by identifying distal processes that can increase intraminority solidarity. As such, future research should focus on understanding these processes.

References

- Adams, G., O'Brien, L. T., & Nelson, J. C. (2006). Perceptions of racism in Hurricane Katrina: A liberation psychology analysis. *Analyses of social issues and public policy*, 6(1), 215-235.
- Al Ramiah, A., Hewstone, M., Little, T. D., & Lang, K. (2014). The influence of status on the relationship between intergroup contact, threat, and prejudice in the context of a nation-building intervention in Malaysia. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 58(7), 1202–1229. doi:10.1177/0022002713492634
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Alozie, N. O., & Ramirez, E. J. (1999). “A Piece of the Pie” and More: Competition and Hispanic Employment on Urban Police Forces. *Urban Affairs Review*, 34(3), 456-475.
- Anyiwo, N., Bañales, J., Rowley, S. J., Watkins, D. C., & Richards-Schuster, K. (2018). Sociocultural influences on the sociopolitical development of African American youth. *Child Development Perspectives*, 12(3), 165-170.
- Bañales, J., Aldana, A., Richards-Schuster, K., Flanagan, C. A., Diemer, M. A., & Rowley, S. J. (2019). Youth anti-racism action: Contributions of youth perceptions of school racial messages and critical consciousness. *Journal of community psychology*.
- Bilali, R., & Mahmoud, R. (2017). Confronting history and reconciliation: A review of civil society's approaches to transforming conflict narratives. In C. Psaltis, M. Carretero, & S. Cehajic-Clancy (Eds.), *History education and conflict transformation* (pp. 77-96). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bobo, L., Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, R. A. (1996). Laissez-faire racism: The crystallization of a

- “kinder, gentler” anti-black ideology (Working Paper 98). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bonam, C. M., Nair Das, V., Coleman, B. R., & Salter, P. (2019). Ignoring history, denying racism: Mounting evidence for the Marley hypothesis and epistemologies of ignorance. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *10*(2), 257-265.
- Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 35–58). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Bullock, H. E., Williams, W. R., & Limbert, W. M. (2003). Predicting support for welfare policies: The impact of attributions and beliefs about inequality. *Journal of Poverty*, *7*(3), 35-56.
- Burson, E., & Godfrey, E. B. (2018). The State of the Union: Contemporary Interminority Attitudes in the United States. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *40*(6), 396-413.
- 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.
- Christens, B. D., & Peterson, N. A. (2012). The role of empowerment in youth development: A study of sociopolitical control as mediator of ecological systems’ influence on developmental outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *41*(5), 623-635.
doi:10.1007/s10964-011-9724-9
- Christens, B. D., Winn, L. T., & Duke, A. M. (2016). Empowerment and critical consciousness: A conceptual cross-fertilization. *Adolescent Research Review*, *1*(1), 15-27.

- Cimpian, A., & Salomon, E. (2014). The inherence heuristic: An intuitive means of making sense of the world, and a potential precursor to psychological essentialism. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 37(05), 461-480.
- 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(9), 1107-1119.
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2012). Coalition or derogation? How perceived discrimination influences intraminority intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(4), 759-777.
- 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.
- 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(1), 21-27.
- Craig, M. A., & Rucker, J. (2019). *Structural solidarity: Lay theories of group disadvantage and coalitional attitudes among stigmatized groups*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, New York University, New York, USA.
- Diemer, M. A. (2009). Pathways to occupational attainment among poor youth of color: The role of sociopolitical development. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37(1), 6-35. doi: [10.1177/0011000007309858](https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000007309858)
- Diemer, M. A., & Blustein, D. L. (2006). Critical consciousness and career development among

- urban youth. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(2), 220-232. doi:
[10.1016/j.jvb.2005.07.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.07.001)
- Diemer, M. A., & Hsieh, C. A. (2008). Sociopolitical development and vocational expectations among lower socioeconomic status adolescents of color. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 56(3), 257-267.
- Diemer, M. A., & Li, C. H. (2011). Critical consciousness development and political participation among marginalized youth. *Child Development*, 82(6), 1815-1833. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01650.x
- Diemer, M. A., Rapa, L. J., Park, C. J., & Perry, J. C. (2017). Development and validation of the Critical Consciousness Scale. *Youth & Society*, 49(4), 461-483.
- Dixon, J., Cakal, H., Khan, W., Osmany, M., Majumdar, S., & Hassan, M. (2017). Contact, political solidarity and collective action: An Indian case study of relations between historically disadvantaged communities. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 27(1), 83-95.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Saguy, T. (2009). Commonality and the complexity of “we”: Social attitudes and social change. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13(1), 3–20. doi:10.1177/1088868308326751
- Duncan, L. E. (2012). The psychology of collective action. In K. Deaux & M. Snyder (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology* (pp. 781-803). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Foster-Fishman, P. G., Law, K. M., Lichty, L. F., & Aoun, C. (2010). Youth ReACT for social change: A method for youth participatory action research. *American journal of community psychology*, 46(1-2), 67-83.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 2007.

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness* (Vol. 1). Bloomsbury Publishing.

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.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Gay, C. (2006). Seeing difference: The effect of economic disparity on Black attitudes toward Latinos. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(4), 982-997.

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.

Godfrey, E. B., & Burson, E. (2018). Interrogating the intersections: How intersectional perspectives can inform developmental scholarship on critical consciousness. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, 2018(161), 17-38.

Godfrey, E. B., Burson, E. L., Yanisch, T. M., Hughes, D., & Way, N. (2019). A bitter pill to swallow? Patterns of critical consciousness and socioemotional and academic well-being in early adolescence. *Developmental psychology*, 55(3), 525.

Godfrey, E. B., & Grayman, J. K. (2014). Teaching citizens: The role of open classroom climate in fostering critical consciousness among youth. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 43(11), 1801-1817.

Godfrey, E. B., Santos, C. E., & Burson, E. (2019). For better or worse? System-justifying

- beliefs in sixth-grade predict trajectories of self-esteem and behavior across early adolescence. *Child development*, 90(1), 180-195.
- Gutierrez, L. M. (1995). Understanding the empowerment process: Does consciousness make a difference? *Social Work Research*, 19(4), 229-237.
- Hammack, P. L. (2008). Narrative and the cultural psychology of identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12(3), 222-247.
- Hewstone, M., & Greenland, K. (2000). Intergroup conflict. *International Journal of Psychology*, 35(2), 136-144.
- Hindriks, P., Verkuyten, M., & Coenders, M. (2014). Interminority attitudes: The roles of ethnic and national identification, contact, and multiculturalism. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 77(1), 54-74.
- 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.
- Johnson Jr, J. H., & Oliver, M. L. (1989). Interethnic minority conflict in urban America: The effects of economic and social dislocations. *Urban Geography*, 10(5), 449-463.
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British journal of social psychology*, 33(1), 1-27.
- Jost, J. T., Liviatan, I., Van Der Toorn, J., Ledgerwood, A., Mandisodza, A., & Nosek, B. A. (2011). System justification: A motivational process with implications for social conflict. In E. Kals & J. Maes (Eds.), *Justice and conflicts* (pp. 315-327). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Kaufmann, K. M. (2003). Black and Latino voters in Denver: Responses to each other's political leadership. *Political Science Quarterly*, 118(1), 107-125.

- Kay, A. C., & Friesen, J. (2011). On social stability and social change: Understanding when system justification does and does not occur. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*(6), 360-364.
- Liu, J. H., & Hilton, D. J. (2005). How the past weighs on the present: Social representations of history and their role in identity politics. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 44*(4), 537-556.
- Liu, J. H., Sibley, C. G., & Huang, L. L. (2014). History Matters: Effects of Culture-specific Symbols on Political Attitudes and Intergroup Relations. *Political Psychology, 35*(1), 57-79.
- Lopez, G. E., Gurin, P., & Nagda, B. A. (1998). Education and understanding structural causes for group inequalities. *Political psychology, 19*(2), 305-329.
- Nelson, J. C., Adams, G., & Salter, P. S. (2013). The Marley hypothesis: Denial of racism reflects ignorance of history. *Psychological science, 24*(2), 213-218.
- Noor, M., Vollhardt, J. R., Mari, S., & Nadler, A. (2017). The social psychology of collective victimhood. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 47*(2), 121-134.
- O'Brien, L. T., Blodorn, A., Alsbrooks, A., Dube, R., Adams, G., & Nelson, J. C. (2009). Understanding White Americans' perceptions of racism in hurricane Katrina-related events. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 12*(4), 431-444.
- Olle, C. D., & Fouad, N. A. (2015). Parental support, critical consciousness, and agency in career decision making for urban students. *Journal of Career Assessment, 23*(4), 533-544.
- Philip, C. L., Mahalingam, R., & Sellers, R. M. (2010). Understanding East Indians' Attitudes Toward African Americans: Do Mainstream Prejudicial Attitudes Transfer to Immigrants? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 36*(4), 651-671.

- Richeson, J. A., & Craig, M. A. (2011). Intra-minority intergroup relations in the twenty-first century. *Daedalus*, *140*(2), 166-175.
- Salter, P. S., Adams, G., & Perez, M. J. (2018). Racism in the structure of everyday worlds: A cultural-psychological perspective. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *27*(3), 150-155. doi.org/10.1177/0963721417724239
- Sanchez, G. R. (2008). Latino group consciousness and perceptions of commonality with African Americans. *Social Science Quarterly*, *89*(2), 428-444. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2008.00540.x
- Shapiro, J. R., & Neuberg, S. L. (2008). When do the stigmatized stigmatize? The ironic effects of being accountable to (perceived) majority group prejudice-expression norms. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *95*(4), 877.
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1953). *Groups in harmony and tension: An integration of studies of intergroup relations*. Oxford, UK: Harper & Brothers.
- Sibley, C. G., & Liu, J. H. (2012). Social Representations of History and the Legitimation of Social Inequality: The Causes and Consequences of Historical Negation 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *42*(3), 598-623.
- Sibley, C. G., Liu, J. H., Duckitt, J., & Khan, S. S. (2008). Social representations of history and the legitimation of social inequality: The form and function of historical negation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*(3), 542-565.
- Simon, B., Aufderheide, B., & Kampmeier, C. (2001). The social psychology of minority-majority relations. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook in social psychology: Intergroup processes* (Vol. 4, pp. 303-323). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin

- & S. Worschel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47).
Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- 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.
- Vollhardt, J. R. (2015). Inclusive victim consciousness in advocacy, social movements, and intergroup relations: Promises and pitfalls. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 9*, 89–120.
- Vollhardt, J. R., & Bilali, R. (2015). The Role of Inclusive and Exclusive Victim Consciousness in Predicting Intergroup Attitudes: Findings from Rwanda, Burundi, and DRC. *Political Psychology, 36*(5), 489-506.
- Watts, R. J., Abdul-Adil, J. K., & Pratt, T. (2002). Enhancing critical consciousness in young African American men: A psychoeducational approach. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 3*(1), 41.
- Watts, R. J., Diemer, M. A., & Voight, A. M. (2011). Critical consciousness: Current status and future directions. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 2011*(134), 43-57.
- Watts, R. J., Griffith, D. M., & Abdul-Adil, J. (1999). Sociopolitical development as an antidote for oppression—theory and action. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 27*(2), 255-271.
- Zimmerman, M. A., Ramirez-Valles, J., & Maton, K. I. (1999). Resilience among urban African American male adolescents: A study of the protective effects of sociopolitical control on their mental health. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 27*(6), 733-751. doi: 10.1023/A:1022205008