Applying the Dynamic Dual Pathway Model of Approach Coping to Collective Action Among Advantaged Group Allies and Disadvantaged Group Members
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We apply the dynamic dual pathway model of approach coping to understanding the predictors of future collective action among a sample of advantaged group allies and disadvantaged group members who were attending a protest. We propose that problem-focused approach coping (i.e., group efficacy beliefs) would be a stronger predictor of future collective action among disadvantaged compared to advantaged group members, and emotion-focused approach coping (i.e., group-based anger) would be a stronger predictor of future collective action among advantaged compared to disadvantaged group members. Data was collected from LGBTIQ+ and heterosexual people (N = 189) protesting as part of the 2019 Christopher Street Day Parade in Cologne, Germany. We found that increased group efficacy predicted intentions to engage in future collective action for the rights of sexual minorities among LGBTIQ+ but not heterosexual participants. Increased group-based anger was a predictor of future collective action intentions regardless of which group the participants belonged to. Our findings extend the dynamic dual pathway model by applying it to a sample of advantaged group allies and disadvantaged group members attending a protest using a multiple perspectives approach.
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INTRODUCTION

Advantaged group allies, such as White Americans who participate in the Black Lives Matter movement or heterosexual people who protest for LGBTIQ+ rights, can work together with disadvantaged group members (e.g., Black Americans, sexual minorities) to achieve social change (Czopp and Monteith, 2003; Drury and Kaiser, 2014). Yet it is only recently that the psychological literature has sought to understand allies’ motivations to engage in collective action for disadvantaged groups [see Radke et al. (2020), for an overview]. And few studies use a multiple perspectives approach (Dixon et al., 2012; Di Bernardo et al., 2019; Hässler et al., 2020) which simultaneously considers the experiences of both advantaged and disadvantaged group members (Kutlaca et al., 2020a). Moreover, much of the previous research on this topic has focused on
intentions to engage in collective action among members of the
general population rather than those who are actively protesting
as part of a movement. It is important to study these processes
among protesters because doing so acknowledges that activists
are a psychologically distinct population [see Zucker (2004),
for an example], and suggests that participants will engage in
future collective action given that they are already participating
in this behavior. In this paper, we address these limitations and
extend previous theorizing by applying the dynamic dual
pathway model of approach coping with collective disadvantage
(Van Zomeren et al., 2012) to understanding the predictors of
future collective action among LGBTIQ+ and heterosexual
people protesting as part of the 2019 Christopher Street Day
Parade in Cologne, Germany.

Collective action is broadly defined as any action, such as
protesting or signing petitions, taken to improve the status of
a group (Wright et al., 1990; Van Zomeren and Iyer, 2009).
While initially this definition was used to describe the actions
of disadvantaged group members (Wright et al., 1990), more
recently collective action has come to include behaviors taken by
people who do not belong to this group (Van Zomeren and Iyer,
2009; Van Zomeren et al., 2011; Saab et al., 2015; Droogendyk
et al., 2016; Louis et al., 2019; Radke et al., 2020). In this paper,
we refer to advantaged group members who engage in collective
action for a disadvantaged group as advantaged group allies (allies
for brevity) who are participating in allyship or ally behavior.

Based on a meta-analysis conducted by Van Zomeren
et al. (2008), the social identity model of collective action
(SIMCA) identified the predictors of collective action. These
include identification with the disadvantaged group, perceiving
and collectively feeling angry about the injustice that the
disadvantaged group experiences (group-based anger), and
perceiving that the group can achieve the goals of the collective
action [group efficacy beliefs; see also Thomas et al. (2012)]. More
recently this model has been expanded to include identification
with a politicized group and violated moral beliefs (Simon and
Klandermans, 2001; Van Zomeren et al., 2018).

The predictors of SIMCA were later formulated as a theory of
collective action in the dynamic dual pathway model of approach
coping with collective disadvantage (Van Zomeren et al., 2012).
This model proposes that there are two distinct approaches
which lead to collective action based on Lazarus (1991) theory of
emotion and coping; a problem-focused approach through group
efficacy beliefs, and an emotion-focused approach via group-
based anger. Previous research has found that these two processes
are distinct but complementary, and can be activated by support
for social action (predicting collective action via increased group
efficacy beliefs) as well as procedural fairness and perceived
support from others [predicting collective action via increased
group-based anger; Van Zomeren et al. (2004)].

This model has largely been used to describe the processes
through which disadvantaged group members come to engage
in collective action. Nevertheless, we believe that it is also
applicable to understanding the predictors of collective action
among both advantaged and disadvantaged group members,
ahtbeit to differing degrees. Specifically, we propose that the
problem-focused approach (via group efficacy beliefs) is a
stronger predictor of future collective action intentions among
disadvantaged compared to advantaged group members. And the
emotion-focused approach (via group-based anger) is a stronger
predictor of future collective action intentions among advantaged
compared to disadvantaged group members. We outline our
argument for these predictions below.

With regards to the problem-focused approach, Klandermans
(1984) proposed that people conduct a cost-benefit analysis when
deciding to engage in collective action, weighing up the subjective
value of participating in this behavior against their expectations
that the goals of the movement will be achieved [see also Olson
(1968) and McCarthy and Zald (1977)]. As such, people should
collaborate in collective action when they believe that this behavior
will be effective and that collectively, the goals of the movement
are achievable. This is often referred to as group efficacy beliefs
(Van Zomeren et al., 2008).

We propose that group efficacy beliefs are particularly relevant
to understanding why disadvantaged group members participate
in collective action. Disadvantaged group members stand to
benefit from collective action more than allies because this
behavior seeks to directly improve the status of their group.
Similarly, if a movement does not reach its goal, disadvantaged
group members have more to lose (in terms of not improving
their status and receiving backlash for challenging the status quo)
than allies who continue to maintain their higher status as an
advantaged group member.

Previous research supports this argument. For example,
Hornsey et al. (2006) found that individuals who belong to
organized political groups focus on the effectiveness of a rally
for building an oppositional movement rather than expressing
their values and influencing the public. While the two are not
synonymous, disadvantaged group members are more similar to
people who are involved in organized political groups (compared
to those who are not) because they have an ongoing and pre-
established commitment to the cause. As such, we propose
that disadvantaged group members are more interested in
participating in behaviors that seek to directly improve the status
of their group (i.e., building an oppositional movement), rather
than more peripheral and personal goals (such as expressing
their values), which is consistent with group efficacy beliefs.
Importantly other research has also found that lower status group
members evaluate whether the social system is unstable (Ellemers
et al., 1990; Ellemers, 1993; Saguy and Dovidio, 2013; Scheifele
et al., 2021) and change is possible (Cohen-Chen and Van
Zomeren, 2018) before participating in collective action, echoing
the cost-benefit analysis earlier outlined by Klandermans (1984).

We also expect that the emotion-focused approach will
be particularly relevant to understanding intentions to engage
in future collective action among advantaged group allies
compared to disadvantaged group members. Previous research
has shown that a moral conviction—defined as a strong
and absolute stance on moralized issues—against inequality
predicted intentions to engage in collective action against the
discrimination that Muslims experience among non-Muslim
participants [Van Zomeren et al., 2011; see also Saab et al. (2015)].
These findings suggest that allies—especially those with a strong
moral conviction in favor of the disadvantaged group (such
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Procedure
The data was collected at the 2019 Christopher Street Day Parade in Cologne, Germany. Participants were approached by a team of research assistants working in pairs and asked to complete a short survey about their reasons for attending the protest. The data was collected using pen and paper questionnaires and by giving participants a link to the same study online that they could complete on their phones or a tablet provided by the research assistants. Participants were asked to read the information and informed consent sheet, complete the survey, and then read the debriefing sheet before being rewarded with rainbow stickers and flags as well as the chance to go into a draw to win one of many gift cards. Participants had the option of completing the questionnaire in German or English.

A protocol was developed to standardize the data collection based on previous research conducted by the authors (Ferris et al., 2019; Kutlaca et al., 2020b) and other researchers (Van Leeuwen et al., 2015; Walgrave et al., 2016). Research assistants were instructed to wear t-shirts or stickers on their coats that identified them as being from the university, and to carry their university ID card with them. They were to introduce themselves as a student from the university that was asking protesters to complete a survey about their reasons for attending the march. They were instructed to not give their opinion, give the participants some space when completing the survey, and encourage the participants to complete the questionnaire separately.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants
The participants of this study were 234 people who were protesting as part of the 2019 Christopher Street Day Parade in Cologne, Germany. Twenty-nine participants were deleted from the dataset because they could not be categorized as an ally or disadvantaged group member, and 16 participants were deleted because they were not 18 years or older. The final sample size consisted of 189 participants. Power analysis using G*Power (Faul et al., 2007) indicated that a total sample of 199 participants would be needed to detect a small to medium effect ($f = 0.20$, $r = 0.20$) with 80% power and an alpha of 0.05.1

The participants had an age range of 18–67 years old, with a mean age of 27.54 years ($SD = 10.38$; 1 participant did not report their age). The sample was comprised of 108 participants (57%) who identified as female, 75 participants (40%) who identified as male, and five participants (3%) who did not identify with either group (one participant did not report their sex). One hundred and twenty-five participants (66%) identified as being a member of the LGBTIQ+ community and 64 participants (34%) identified as heterosexual. One hundred and sixty-six participants (88%) had German citizenship, and 19 participants (10%) did not report their nationality (2%). The majority of participants had completed high school ($N = 117$; $62%$), followed by 62 participants (33%) who completed a university degree, and eight participants (4%) who did not complete high school (two participants did not indicate their highest level of education; 1%).

1 Data was collected from other protests (Women’s Day March in Münster; Stand Up Against Racism Protest in Berlin) but the sample size was too small to analyze on its own.

2 The study was not preregistered but outlined in a funded grant application (DFG BE 4648/4-2) awarded to the third author.
The research assistants were instructed to approach the protest from all sides, as well as from the front and back, but to not find themselves in a situation where it would be difficult to exit the crowd quickly. If they were to feel uncomfortable they were told to step away from the crowd, and had the phone numbers of the other research assistants (and the authors) if they got lost or had any difficulties. They were instructed to watch the police as an indicator of what might happen next at the protest. The study was approved by the University of Osnabrück research ethics committee.

**Measures**

The following variables were measured on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) likert-type scale unless otherwise specified.

**Group Efficacy Beliefs**

Group efficacy beliefs was measured using four items (e.g., “I believe that demonstrators, as a group/together/through joint actions, can achieve greater rights for LGBTIQ+ people”; “I believe that demonstrators can reach their common goal of achieving greater rights for the LGBTIQ+ community”; α = 0.96).

**Group-Based Anger**

Group-based anger was measured using three items (e.g., “I feel angry/outraged/furious about how LGBTIQ+ people are treated in Germany”; α = 0.92).

**Future Collective Action Intentions**

Future collective action intentions were measured using eight items (e.g., “In the future I would be willing to participate in the following actions to achieve greater rights for the LGBTIQ+ community... attend public talks, discussion meetings, rallies and demonstrations, distribute flyers, sign petitions, strikes, boycott companies, donate money”; α = 0.87) on a 1 (very unlikely) to 7 (very likely) likert-type scale.

**Previous Experience Engaging in Collective Action for LGBTIQ+ Rights**

Previous experience engaging in collective action for LGBTIQ+ rights was measured using one item (“I regularly attend demonstrations for LGBTIQ+ rights”).

**RESULTS**

Means, standard deviations, and correlations between the variables can be seen in Table 1.

We used Mplus version 8.6 to run a moderation model with two predictors (group-based anger and group efficacy), group membership as the dichotomous moderator (advantaged group allies = 0; disadvantaged group members = 1), and future collective action intentions as the outcome (Stride et al., 2015). We opted for maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors (MLR). Regression analyses were conducted, the variables were mean-centered, and the analysis was conducted on the observed variables so no model fit indices are reported (see Table 2).

We did find a main effect of group membership (B = 0.67, BSE = 0.20, p = 0.001). Moreover, no main effect of group efficacy beliefs on future collective action intentions emerged (B = 0.02, BSE = 0.14, p = 0.919). But we did find that group membership moderated this relationship (B = 0.43, BSE = 0.20, p = 0.030). In line with our hypothesis, simple slopes analyses revealed that group efficacy beliefs predicted future collective action intentions among disadvantaged group members (B = 0.45, BSE = 0.14, p = 0.001) but not allies (B = 0.02, BSE = 0.14, p = 0.919; see Figure 1).

We also found a significant main effect of group-based anger (B = 0.30, BSE = 0.09, p = 0.001), such that increased group-based anger among both allies and disadvantaged group members predicted intentions to engage in future collective action. But we did not find an interaction between group-based anger and group membership on future collective action intentions (B = −0.18, BSE = 0.12, p = 0.133). The overall model was significant (R² = 0.19, p = 0.002).

It is possible that our results are affected by participants’ previous experience with collective action and other demographic variables (i.e., participant age, sex, nationality, and level of education). We therefore ran the analysis again controlling for these variables. Only previous experience engaging in collective action was significant (B = 0.29, BSE = 0.06, p < 0.001) but not the other control variables (pS ≥ 0.286).

We did not find a main effect of group membership (B = 0.30, BSE = 0.19, p = 0.116). No main effect of group efficacy beliefs on future collective action intentions emerged.

**TABLE 1 | Means, standard deviations, and correlations between the variables.**

|                | LGBTIQ+ mean (SD) | Heterosexual mean (SD) | 1   | 2   | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Age         | 26.56 (9.25)      | 29.44 (12.13)          | −   | −   | −0.07| −0.29| −0.28| −0.07| −0.22|
| 2. Education   | 3.90 (1.07)       | 4.02 (0.97)            | 0.26**| −   | 0.13 | 0.16 | −0.16| 0.05 |
| 3. CA experience| 4.80 (1.89)       | 3.48 (1.92)            | −0.06| −0.01| −    | 0.26*| 0.07 | 0.39**|
| 4. Group efficacy| 6.16 (1.04)     | 5.99 (1.20)            | −0.01| −0.03| 0.34***| −    | 0.10 | 0.05 |
| 5. Group-based anger| 4.33 (1.72)   | 4.51 (1.74)            | −0.08| −0.26**| 0.04  | 0.09 | −    | 0.37**|
| 6. Future CA    | 4.77 (1.31)       | 4.12 (1.45)            | −0.04| −0.06| 0.49***| 0.37***| 0.20*| −    |

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001. Education: Kein Abschluss/No Education Certificate = 1, Hauptschulabschluss/GCSE General School = 2, Realschulabschluss/GCSE Vocational Training = 3, (Fach-) Abitur/A-Level = 4, Hochschulabschluss/University Degree = 5. Data from LGBTIQ+ participants reported below the diagonal and heterosexual participants above the diagonal. CA = collective action.
Without control variables

Main effect of group-based anger  $0.30^{***}$ 0.09 0.15, 0.46
Main effect of group efficacy  0.02 0.14 −0.22, 0.25
Main effect of group membership  0.67** 0.20 0.34, 1.00
Group-based anger × group membership −0.18 0.12 −0.37, 0.02
Group efficacy × group membership  0.43* 0.20 0.11, 0.76
Simple slopes for LGBTIQ+ participants  0.45*** 0.14 0.22, 0.68
Simple slopes for heterosexual participants  0.01 0.14 −0.22, 0.25

With control variables

Main effect of group-based anger  0.27** 0.08 0.14, 0.41
Main effect of group efficacy  −0.13 0.12 −0.34, 0.07
Main effect of group membership  0.30 0.19 −0.01, 0.62
Group-based anger × group membership −0.10 0.10 −0.26, 0.07
Group efficacy × group membership  0.37* 0.16 0.11, 0.64
Simple slopes for LGBTIQ+ participants  0.24* 0.12 0.04, 0.43
Simple slopes for heterosexual participants −0.13 0.12 −0.34, 0.07

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. LGBTIQ+ participants = 1. Heterosexual participants = 0. Control variables included age, sex, nationality, level of education, and past collective action. Simple slopes only reported for significant interactions.

We also found a significant main effect of group-based anger ($B = 0.27, B_{SE} = 0.08, p = 0.001$), such that increased group-based anger among both allies and disadvantaged group members predicted intentions to engage in future collective action. We did not find that this relationship was moderated by group membership ($B = -0.13, B_{SE} = 0.10, p = 0.344$). The overall model was significant ($R^2 = 0.38, p < 0.001$).

**DISCUSSION**

In this paper we applied the dynamic dual pathway model of approach coping with collective disadvantage (Van Zomeren et al., 2012) to understanding the predictors of future collective action among a sample of advantaged group allies and disadvantaged group members who took part in a protest. Specifically, we proposed that the problem-focused approach would be particularly relevant to disadvantaged group members, but the emotion-focused approach would be especially important to advantaged group members. We collected data from heterosexual and LGBTIQ+ people protesting as part of the 2019 Christopher Street Day Parade in Cologne, Germany to test our hypotheses. We found that group efficacy beliefs were a stronger predictor of future collective action intentions among disadvantaged group members compared to allies. However, group-based anger predicted future collective action intentions among both heterosexual and LGBTIQ+ people. This pattern of results held when including the additional control variables.

The finding that group efficacy predicts future collective action intentions among disadvantaged group members but not allies is consistent with our argument that the problem-focused approach would be more relevant to disadvantaged group members. We drew from previous research to make this argument (Hornsey et al., 2006) which found that individuals who belonged to an organized political group (who we argue are more similar to disadvantaged group members because they have an ongoing and pre-existing commitment to the cause) focused on the effectiveness of the rally for building an oppositional movement compared to people who did not belong to an organized political group. This is in line with other research which has found that disadvantaged group members weigh up (Klandermans, 1984) whether change is likely (Ellemers et al., 1990; Ellemers, 1993;
status (because of the potential for backlash for challenging the gain (in terms of improved status) but also a lot more to lose is not successful—disadvantaged group members have a lot to collective action. Unlike advantaged group members—who will (Cohen-Chen and Van Zomeren, 2018) before participating in Saguy and Dovidio, 2013; Scheifele et al., 2021) and possible Radke et al. Dual Pathway Model and Allies

support for our hypotheses. having a small and unbalanced sample we still found partial independence (Muthén and Asparouhov, 2002). And despite (MLR) as it is a robust to violations of normality and non-

for maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors real-world event where it is limited to a given day and time. contained a relatively small and unbalanced sample. This is a common constraint associated with data collection during a real-world event where it is limited to a given day and time. We took steps to mitigate this in the data analysis by opting for maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors (MLR) as it is a robust to violations of normality and non-

future research could consider recruiting participants who take part in other protests to show that our findings can be replicated and are generalizable. Although our results are promising we are aware that we cannot fully determine whether our findings hold for all disadvantaged group members and advantaged group allies until further data is collected. Nevertheless, we believe that it is still important to publish these results as a step forward toward answering this research question. Our findings provide preliminary support for the usefulness of applying the dual process model to understanding the predictors of collective action taken by a politicized sample of disadvantaged group members and advantaged group allies using a multiple perspectives approach.
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