

# Collective action from a distance: Distance shapes how people view victims of injustice and decreases willingness to engage in collective action

Demis E. Glasford<sup>1</sup> and Krystle Lynn Caraballo<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

The present research examines whether distance affects not only how people view victims of injustice, but also group members' willingness to engage in collective action. Across two experiments, examining both spatial (Experiment 1) and temporal (Experiment 2) distance, distant victims were seen as less familiar and more likely to be viewed at a relatively more superordinate level of identity (less in terms of subgroup identity) compared to near victims. In addition, participants were less willing to engage in collective action on behalf of distant victims, relative to near victims. Across studies, decreased collective action on behalf of distant victims, relative to near victims, was explained by the tendency to view victims in a more abstract way—as less familiar (Experiment 2) and at a more superordinate level (Experiments 1 and 2). Across both studies, results also demonstrated that participants were less willing to engage in collective action on behalf of out-group targets, relative to in-group targets, which was explained by perceptions of familiarity (Experiment 2). Implications for collective action and more broadly social change are discussed.

## Keywords

collective action, distance, group membership, mental construal, superordinate identity

Paper received 4 August 2014; revised version accepted 11 December 2014.

The task, I believe, is explicitly to universalize the crisis, to give greater human scope to what a particular race or nation suffered, to associate the experience with the suffering of others.

Edward Said

Time and space are modes by which we think and not conditions in which we live.

Albert Einstein

Does distance affect how people view victims of injustice? Does distance decrease people's willingness to act on behalf of injustice? Degree of suffering of a victim has often been perceived as

<sup>1</sup>John Jay College and Graduate Center, CUNY, USA

## Corresponding author:

Demis E. Glasford, Department of Psychology, John Jay College; 524 West 59th Street, New York, NY 10019, USA.

Email: [dglasford@jjay.cuny.edu](mailto:dglasford@jjay.cuny.edu)

central to explaining responses to injustice (e.g., to protect sacred values; Tetlock, Kirstel, Elson, Green, & Lerner, 2000). Indeed, it is often assumed that given equivalent suffering of a victim, people should approach near and distant injustice with the same motivation for action. The Said quote suggests that it is necessary to universalize crisis and suffering (to achieve action), but as the Einstein quote implies, time and space, as modes of thinking, may have a way of affecting how people approach injustice. That is, distance may shape not only the way people view victims of injustice, but also affect collective action tendencies. As such, the means by which one needs to universalize crisis may differ depending on whether the injustice is near versus far. Drawing on construal-level theory (CLT; Trope & Liberman, 2003), the aim of the present work was twofold: First, to examine whether distance affects how people mentally construe victims of injustice and second to explore whether distance influences willingness to engage in collective action.

Although there is considerable work on the antecedents to collective action, relatively less work has examined distance as a factor that may affect collective action tendencies. Research on collective action has primarily focused on how individual- and group-level factors, such as regulatory focus (Zaal, van Laar, Ståhl, Ellemers, & Derks, 2012), efficacy (van Zomeren, Leach, & Spears, 2010), or group-based anger (Leach, Iyer, & Pederson, 2006), shape willingness to engage in collective action. Thus, there has been relatively less focus on the potential for contextual factors, such as distance, to influence collective action tendencies. Moreover, much of the research on the psychology of collective action has tended to focus on spatially close or temporally immediate injustice events. Therefore, a great deal is known about collective action in response to spatially or temporally close injustice (immediate contexts), but less is known about the psychology of collective action from a distance (distant contexts). Yet, there is evidence to suggest that distance can change the way people approach injustice. Indeed, geographic distance reduces donations (Simon,

1997) and temporal distance is often cited as one of the primary factors associated with decreased support for environmental policies (Milfont & Gouveia, 2006), leading some to suggest a need to devote greater attention to collective action across distance (e.g., transnational activism; e.g., Tarrow, 2005). As an initial step in understanding the psychology of collective action from a distance, the present work was designed to examine whether distance affects how people view victims of injustice, as well as willingness to engage in collective action.

One reason why distance may affect motivation to engage in collective action is that it can alter the way people view victims of injustice. In seeking to understand the means by which distance might affect collective action tendencies, we drew on construal-level theory. From a CLT perspective (Trope & Liberman, 2003), distance, as manifested for example by spatial or temporal distance, directly affects mental representation or construal of target people and events, such that spatially distant or future events are mentally represented in distinctly different ways than spatially close or temporally near events. As an event or target-person becomes more distant from the immediate experience of an individual, the mental construal or representation of the event or target-person becomes more abstract or superordinate. Thus, for example, when participants in a distant condition were given a list of objects (e.g., chairs, shoes, brush, etc.) they used more superordinate or abstract categories to categorize the objects, compared to participants in a near condition (Liberman, Sagristano, & Trope, 2002). Distance has also been shown to lead people to view targets as more abstract (e.g., less familiar), compared to near targets (Stephan, Liberman, & Trope, 2011). Therefore, drawing on CLT, as well as a large body of research (see Trope & Liberman, 2010, for review), distant victims should be more likely to be perceived at a higher level of construal (superordinate level), compared to near victims.

In the present work, we operationalized level of construal based on sense of familiarity and social categorization. Consistent with past work

on CLT, a superordinate mental construal could be operationalized via perceptions of familiarity regarding a target-victim, such that less familiarity is operationalized as a superordinate construal (Stephan et al., 2011). From a social identity perspective, however, a superordinate mental construal could be operationalized as an increased tendency to view a victim at a relatively more superordinate level of identity. Indeed, social identity is theorized to move along a continuum, from a more subordinate level (personal identity), at one end, to an intermediate level (e.g., subgroup identity), and finally, to a more superordinate level (e.g., human identity), at the other end (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Thus, from a social identity perspective, given a continuum with end-points of subgroup identity and human identity, for example, an increased tendency to view a victim at a relatively more superordinate mental construal would take the form of a shift away from viewing the victim at the subgroup level of identity toward a relatively more superordinate mental construal of human identity. Taken together, one indicator of construing victims in a more superordinate way, from a CLT perspective, would be a tendency to view victims as less familiar (Stephan et al., 2011), but another indicator of superordinate mental construal, from a social identity perspective, would be a tendency to view victims at a relatively more superordinate level of identity (i.e., less in terms of subgroup identity). The first objective of the present work was to examine whether distance affects the way people view victims of injustice. To test whether distance leads people to view victims at a superordinate mental construal, we utilized two distinct indicators of superordinate mental construal: familiarity and tendency to view victim at a relatively more superordinate level of identity. Drawing on CLT (Trope & Liberman, 2003), we hypothesized that distant victims would be more likely to be viewed at a superordinate mental construal, compared to near victims.

The differing mental construal of victims within distant (e.g., less familiar) and near (e.g., more familiar) contexts was expected to affect

willingness to engage in collective action within the respective contexts. First, research suggests that decreased familiarity should lead to decreased action on behalf of a target. Indeed, less familiarity is often associated with decreased action on behalf of target-victims (e.g., less perspective taking results in decreased action; Mallett, Huntsinger, Sinclair, & Swim, 2008). Second, although from a social identity perspective a superordinate identity is relatively more inclusive, and thus is typically associated with more positive and prosocial behavior toward targets (e.g., improved attitudes; Wohl & Branscombe, 2005), recent work suggests that salient superordinate identity (e.g., human identity) may, at times, have negative implications for collective action at the level of subgroup identity. Though it might be expected that victims that are categorized at a relatively more superordinate level of identity, such as human identity, would elicit greater action, a growing body of work suggests that the implications of invoking superordinate identities, such as human identity, are complex and dependent on a variety of factors (Greenaway, Quinn, & Louis, 2011). Of particular importance is the extent to which superordinate level of identity may decrease the salience of subgroup identity. Because a large body of work suggests that salience of subgroup identity is especially important for increasing collective action tendencies (e.g., subgroup identification; van Zomeren, Spears, Fischer, & Leach, 2004; perception of shared subgroup identity; Levine, Prosser, Evans, & Reicher, 2005), when sub-group identity is less salient, group members' may be less willing to engage in collective action on behalf of victims that share subgroup identity, to the extent that subgroup identity is less salient, group members' may be less willing to engage in collective action on behalf of victims that share subgroup identity. Indeed, recent work illustrates that an appeal to common humanity was associated with decreased willingness to engage in collective action (Greenaway et al., 2011). Thus, there is evidence to suggest that, to the degree a perceiver views a target at a relatively more superordinate level of identity, such as human identity, at the expense of

or in favor of viewing the target in terms of a shared subgroup identity, a perceiver may be less willing to engage in collective action (Greenaway et al., 2011). Taken together, to the extent that distance changes the way people view victims of injustice to have a more superordinate mental construal of victims (less familiarity and relatively more superordinate construal of identity), we expected willingness to engage in collective action to be reduced. In other words, not only should distance affect the way people view victims of injustice, but decreased collective action within distant contexts, relative to near contexts, should be explained by the differing mental construal of victims within distant (less familiar; relatively more superordinate construal of identity) and near contexts.

## Overview

The present work examines the effect of distance on how people view victims of injustice and willingness to engage in collective action. Across two studies, the current experiments examine the effect of spatial (Experiment 1) and temporal (Experiment 2) distance on collective action tendencies. The present work extends the literature in two ways. First, past work exploring the antecedents and processes explaining collective action has primarily focused on more immediate contexts. To the extent that collective action research and literature has disproportionately focused on near or immediate contexts, there is less knowledge about collective action from a distance. Second, by exploring the potential for superordinate mental construal to decrease motivation to engage in collective action within distant contexts, the present work contributes to the literature identifying the conditions when an emphasis on superordinate constructs may be disadvantageous to intergroup relations and social change (Wright & Lubensky, 2009).

## Experiment 1

In Experiment 1, we examined distance in the form of space, specifically the effect of spatial distance on willingness to engage in collective

action. To examine whether spatial distance affects collective action, we presented participants with information about police brutality, but varied the location of the event, such that the victim of police brutality was either spatially near or distant. Although the primary focus of the present work was on the effect of distance on collective action, we also explored whether group membership of the target victim would moderate the effects of distance on collective action. Indeed a large body of work has examined the effect of group membership on action tendencies (Levine et al., 2005). In the current work, we therefore explored the potential moderating effect of group membership of the victim on the distance–action relation. Given the strong influence of group membership on action on behalf of others, one hypothesis is that group membership of the target-victim could moderate the hypothesized effects. Past work illustrates that action is often more likely on behalf of one's own group, relative to out-groups (Levine et al., 2005; van Zomeren et al., 2004). Thus, it might be expected that distance would decrease collective action, but especially under conditions when the victim is an out-group member, compared to when the victim is an in-group member. However, because distance can separate people from injustice (Peetz, Gunn, & Wilson, 2010) and an emphasis on human identity has been shown to decrease the salience of subgroup identity (Greenaway et al., 2011), it is also possible that group membership would not moderate the effects of distance on collective action. To explore the potential for target group membership to moderate the effects of distance on action tendencies, we also experimentally varied group membership of the target.

In the first experiment, participants read about police brutality that occurred in either a spatially close (near condition) or far (distant condition) location, with the brutality inflicted on either an in-group or out-group victim. Drawing on construal level theory (Lieberman & Trope, 1998), we hypothesized that distance would be associated with increased tendency to perceive victims at a more superordinate level. More specifically, we expected distant victims would be more likely to

be viewed as less familiar and at a relatively more superordinate level of identity. We also hypothesized that people would be less willing to engage in collective action on behalf of distant victims, relative to near victims. Finally, decreased collective action within the distance condition, relative to the near condition, was expected to be explained by decreased perceived familiarity with victims and by increased tendency to view victims at a relatively more superordinate level of identity.

### *Participants*

A total of 60 Hispanic or Latino/a men and women (35 females and 25 males) participated in the study in exchange for partial course credit ( $M_{\text{age}} = 19.93$ ,  $SD_{\text{age}} = 2.41$ ). All participants explicitly self-categorized as “Hispanic or Latino” rather than other racial/ethnic groups (e.g. “non-Hispanic White”).

### *Procedure and Materials*

Participants were randomly assigned to condition and individually completed questionnaires in a group setting. The between-participants design was a 2 x 2 factorial design, manipulating spatial distance from the victim (near vs. distant) and also group membership of the target-victim (in-group vs. out-group). After completing filler items, participants read one of four one-page news stories about a police brutality event, which varied not only spatial distance (near vs. distant), but also group membership of the target-victim (Hispanic—an in-group for participants—vs. White, an out-group for participants).

To experimentally vary spatial distance from a target-victim, participants were presented with a story of police brutality toward a student from their local university occurring either in New York City (near) or London (distant). More specifically, half of the participants were told that police abuse of the fellow student had occurred in New York City, while attending a City University of New York program event (spatially near condition). The other half of participants were told that police abuse of the fellow student had occurred in London, while the student was

attending a City University of New York study abroad program (spatially distant condition). Thus, consistent with past CLT work (Henderson, Fujita, Trope, & Liberman, 2006), we manipulated distance by varying location of a student program, but held university membership constant.

A secondary purpose of the experiment was to explore whether group membership would moderate the effects of distance on collective action. We therefore also varied group membership of the target-victim. Taken together, police abuse was described as occurring in either a spatially near (New York City) or distant (London) location and to a victim that was either a member of the participants’ in-group (Hispanic) or out-group (non-Hispanic White). The in-group spatially near condition story, for example, read, in part,

Jimi Morales, a Hispanic (Latino) man, was in New York City attending a City University of New York study program when a police cruiser cut in front of his car and he hit the horn in frustration ... he was subsequently pulled over by the police officer ... Morales was shoved to the ground, the officer then smashed his knee into the back of Morales ... As a result of the incident, he was not only struck with a hefty fine, but also lost a day’s worth of pay and was put on probation at his job.

The out-group spatially far condition story, read, in part,

Todd Smith, a White (non-Hispanic) man, was in London attending a City University of New York study abroad program when a police cruiser cut in front of his car and he hit the horn in frustration ... he was subsequently pulled over by the police officer ... Smith was shoved to the ground, the officer then smashed his knee into the back of Smith ... As a result of the incident, he was not only struck with a hefty fine, but also lost a day’s worth of pay and was put on probation at his job.

In sum, all participants read about the same unjust event inflicted on a fellow student attending their university, but what varied was

spatial distance of the victim (near vs. far) and group membership of the victim (in-group vs. out-group).

On the following page, we assessed whether distant victims are viewed in a more superordinate way, relative to near victims. To the extent that distance is associated with more superordinate or abstract mental construal of victims, participants should be more likely to view the victim at a relatively more superordinate level of identity. Thus, we were particularly interested in whether victims would be more likely to be viewed at a relatively more superordinate level (i.e., shift away from subgroup identity, toward more superordinate level of human identity). Therefore, we designed a single measure with the purpose of assessing how the victim was viewed along a social identity continuum, which included both subgroup identity and human identity anchors, and allowed for assessment of tendency to view the victim at a relatively more superordinate level of identity construal (i.e., assessing shift away from subordinate subgroup identity toward superordinate human identity construal). The superordinate identity construal measure asked participants "In thinking about the person that was pulled over by the police officer, the best way to describe the person would be?" Participants responded on a 1 (*member of their racial or ethnic group*) to 6 (*human being of the world*) scale, with no other scale labels. Thus, higher numbers on this measure would indicate a tendency to view the victim at a relatively more superordinate level, between subordinate construal of subgroup identity toward relatively more superordinate level of human identity. Familiarity was assessed using a measure adapted from past CLT work (Stephan et al., 2011), which asked participants "how familiar the person seems to be (for example, having a sense of knowing the person somewhat)" on a 1 (*not at all familiar*) to 7 (*very familiar*) scale.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, on the next page, to examine collective action tendencies, we assessed participants' willingness to act on behalf of the victims of injustice. Four items measured willingness to act collectively "in support of the victim and similar victims of police brutality" ( $\alpha = .77$ ): "I would

participate in a demonstration against police brutality," "I would participate in raising awareness about the injustices facing victims of police brutality," "If I had the opportunity, I would help to organize a rally to prevent police abuse," and "Given the opportunity, I would join an organization protecting the rights of victims of police abuse." Participants answered on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale. These measures were adapted from past work assessing collective action (Subašić, Schmitt, & Reynolds, 2011).<sup>2</sup>

## Results

### *Familiarity and Superordinate Identity Construal*

To test whether distance affects the way people view victims of injustice, as well as the potential moderating role of group membership, a 2 (spatial distance: near vs. far) x 2 (target group membership: in-group vs. out-group) univariate ANOVA was conducted on the familiarity and superordinate identity construal measures, respectively. Consistent with hypotheses, there was a main effect of distance, such that participants perceived the victim to be less familiar when the victim was spatially distant ( $M = 2.77$ ,  $SD = 1.74$ ), relative to when the victim was near ( $M = 4.79$ ,  $SD = 1.61$ ),  $F(1, 56) = 39.52$ ,  $MSE = 56.33$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .41$ . There was also a main effect of group membership of the target,  $F(1, 56) = 58.68$ ,  $MSE = 83.64$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .51$ . Participants perceived the target as more familiar when the victim was a part of their in-group ( $M = 4.96$ ,  $SD = 1.49$ ), compared to when the victim was member of an out-group ( $M = 2.53$ ,  $SD = 1.10$ ). Importantly, though, the effect of distance on familiarity was not qualified by a two-way interaction,  $F(1, 56) = 0.20$ ,  $p = .65$ . Thus, the effect of distance on familiarity did not change based on group membership of the target victim.

Consistent with hypotheses, along a continuum from a subordinate construal (subgroup identity) to a relatively more superordinate identity construal (human identity), distance was associated with an increased tendency to view victims at a relatively



more superordinate construal of identity. Participants were more likely to perceive the victim at a relatively more superordinate level of construal when the victim was spatially far ( $M = 3.51, SD = 1.28$ ), compared to when the victim was spatially near ( $M = 2.20, SD = 1.20$ ),  $F(1, 56) = 69.26, MSE = 22.86, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .55$ . In addition, there was also a significant main effect for target group membership,  $F(1, 56) = 218.08, MSE = 71.98, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .79$ . Participants were more likely to perceive the victim at a relatively more superordinate level when the victim was an out-group member ( $M = 4.01, SD = .78$ ), compared to when the victim was an in-group member ( $M = 1.76, SD = .89$ ). Once again, though, the effect of distance was not moderated by group membership of the victim,  $F(1, 56) = 0.01, p = .83$ .

### *Collective Action Tendencies*

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted on the collective action measure revealed a main effect of distance condition. Participants were less willing to engage in collective action when the victim was spatially distant ( $M = 3.14, SD = 1.65$ ), compared to when the victim was spatially near ( $M = 4.02, SD = 1.26$ ),  $F(1, 56) = 23.92, MSE = 9.83, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .29$ . There was also a main effect for target group membership,  $F(1, 56) = 160.55, MSE = 65.99, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .74$ . Participants were less willing to engage in collective action on behalf of out-group members ( $M = 2.51, SD = .81$ ), compared to in-group members ( $M = 4.63, SD = .68$ ). However, group membership did not moderate the effect of distance on collective action, there was not a significant two-way interaction,  $F(1, 56) = .11, p = .73$ .

### *Group Membership, Mental Construal of the Victim, and Collective Action*

Although not the primary focus of the present work, we explored whether the effect of group membership on collective action was explained by differing mental construal of the victims. To assess the indirect effect of target group membership on collective action tendencies via

superordinate identity construal and familiarity, we used a 5,000 resample bootstrapping procedure (Hayes, 2012). There was no evidence that familiarity ( $b = .08, p = .26; 95\% CI = [-.63, .25]$ ) or superordinate identity construal ( $b = -.20, p = .11; 95\% CI = [-1.51, .16]$ ) explained the association between target group membership and collective action tendencies.

### *Distance, Mental Construal of the Victim, and Collective Action*

We expected decreased motivation to engage in collective action in the distant condition, relative to the near condition, to be explained by changes in the way victims were perceived within distant versus near contexts. To investigate the hypothesized mediating roles of superordinate identity construal and perceptions of familiarity, we conducted a dual mediator path analysis, including the superordinate identity construal and familiarity measures using a 5,000 resample bootstrapping procedure (Hayes, 2012). As hypothesized, the total effect of distance on collective action went from significant (total effect = .34,  $p < .01$ ) to nonsignificant (direct effect = .17,  $p = .50$ ) when the superordinate identity construal and familiarity measures were included as mediators. For bootstrapping, indirect effects are significant if the bias corrected and accelerated confidence interval does not include zero (Hayes, 2012).<sup>3</sup> Whereas familiarity did not significantly explain the relation between distance and collective action, point estimate  $-.24$ , with a 95% bias corrected/accelerated interval between  $-.9447$  and  $.1606$ , the tendency to view the victim at a relatively more superordinate level of identity construal explained the relation between distance and collective action, point estimate  $-.80$  with a 95% CI  $[-1.39, -.38]$ ,  $F(3, 56) = 28.41, p < .001, R^2 = .60$ .

## **Discussion**

The findings of the first experiment provide initial evidence not only that near and distant victims are perceived in different ways, but also for

the effect of distance on collective action. Distant victims were perceived as less familiar and more likely to be viewed at a relatively more superordinate level of identity (shift away from subgroup identity construal toward human identity construal), compared to near victims. In addition, distant victims were less likely to elicit action compared to near victims, which was explained by the tendency to view the victim at a relatively more superordinate construal of identity. The results also demonstrate the strong influence of target group membership on collective action tendencies, such that participants were more willing to engage in collective action on behalf of in-group members, relative to out-group members. The effect of distance on collective action tendencies, however, was not moderated by group membership of the target. Experiment 2 sought to generalize the effects of distance on collective action to an alternative form of distance: time.

## Experiment 2

Experiment 2 was designed to examine whether the effects of distance would generalize beyond spatial distance to temporal distance. Thus, in the second experiment, participants read about the potential for climate change to hurt victims either today (near condition) or in the future (distant condition). We again included group membership as a factor to allow for a test of the effect of group membership on collective action tendencies, as well as to explore the potential for group membership to moderate the effect of distance on collective action. In line with the results of Experiment 1, we hypothesized that relative to temporally near victims, temporally distant victims would be perceived as less familiar, but also be more likely to be viewed at a relatively more superordinate level of identity construal (shift away from subgroup identity toward human identity). In line with the results of Experiment one, we also expected that distant victims would elicit less collective action compared to near victims, which would be explained by tendency to view victims at relatively more superordinate level of identity.

## Method

### *Participants*

Eighty-eight undergraduate students (52 females and 36 males) participated to fulfill one option of an introductory psychology course requirement ( $M_{\text{age}} = 21.63$ ,  $SD_{\text{age}} = 2.65$ ). All participants self-identified as Hispanic (Latino/a).

### *Procedure and Materials*

Participants were randomly assigned to condition and individually completed questionnaires in a group setting. After completing filler items, participants read one of four one-page news stories about the consequences of climate change, which varied temporal distance of the victim(s) (near vs. distant), but also group membership of the target community most likely to be disproportionately hurt by climate change (Hispanic, an in-group to participants vs. White, an out-group to participants).

All participants were presented with a news report explaining that climate change is often associated with heat waves, flooding, and tropical storms. Whereas half of the participants were told that the effects of climate change negatively affect people today (near condition), the other half were told that climate change would have negative consequences for people in the future (distant condition). We again varied group membership of the target community, such that half of the participants were told that the consequences would disproportionately affect Latino/Hispanic communities (in-group), and the other half of participants were informed that the consequences would disproportionately affect White non-Hispanic communities (out-group). Thus, for example, the in-group temporally near condition story read, in part,

A new comprehensive study suggests that climate change is hurting many people *today*, and suggests that heat waves, flooding, and tropical storms associated with climate change have the potential to kill thousands of people, which statistics suggest will disproportionately affect Hispanic communities.



In the out-group spatially far condition, the story read, in part,

A new comprehensive study suggests that climate change will hurt many people in the *future*, and suggests that heat waves, flooding, and tropical storms associated with climate change have the potential to kill thousands of people, which statistics suggest will disproportionately affect White (non-Hispanic) communities.

Thus, across conditions, all participants read that climate change is associated with heat waves, flooding, storms, and could potentially kill thousands of people, but what varied was the temporal distance of the event (near vs. distant) and the group membership of the target community (in-group vs. out-group).

On the next page, to examine whether temporal distance changes the way people view victims of injustice, we measured tendency to view victims at a relatively more superordinate level of identity construal and perceptions of familiarity. Once again, because we were particularly interested in assessing participants' view of the victims along a social identity continuum—assessing shift away from subordinate construal at subgroup level of identity *toward* relatively more superordinate level of identity construal at human identity—participants were given a measure including a social identity continuum, from subgroup identity to human identity. Specifically, participants were asked “In thinking about the victims, the best way to describe them would be?” Participants responded on a 1 (*members of their racial or ethnic group*) to 6 (*human beings of the world*) scale. Familiarity was assessed by having participants indicate “how familiar the victims seemed to be” on a 1 (*not at all familiar*) to 7 (*very familiar*) scale (Stephan et al., 2011).

Finally, on the following page, to assess willingness to engage in collective action, participants were instructed to think about “their willingness to act on behalf of victims of climate change like those described in the story earlier.” Willingness to act collectively in support of victims of climate change was assessed using four

items ( $\alpha = .82$ ; adapted from Subašić et al., 2011): “I would participate in a demonstration on behalf of victims of climate change,” “I would participate in raising awareness about injustices faced by victims of climate change,” “If I had the opportunity, I would help to organize a protest to prevent climate change,” and “If I had the opportunity, I would participate in active protest to support climate change reform.” Participants answered on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale.

## Results

### *Familiarity and Superordinate Identity Construal*

To examine whether temporally distant victims are perceived as less familiar and at a relatively more superordinate level of construal, compared to near victims, as well as the potential moderating role of group membership, a 2 (temporal distance: near vs. distant)  $\times$  2 (target group membership: in-group vs. out-group) univariate ANOVA was conducted on the familiarity and superordinate identity construal measures respectively. Replicating the results of Experiment 1, there was a main effect of distance. Distant victims were perceived as less familiar ( $M = 2.88$ ,  $SD = 1.50$ ) than near victims ( $M = 4.51$ ,  $SD = 1.69$ ),  $F(1, 84) = 38.87$ ,  $MSE = 53.88$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .31$ . There was also a main effect for group membership,  $F(1, 84) = 99.70$ ,  $MSE = 138.16$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .54$ . Participants perceived in-group victims as more familiar ( $M = 4.90$ ,  $SD = 1.13$ ), than out-group victims ( $M = 2.40$ ,  $SD = 1.55$ ). There was not a significant two-way interaction,  $F(1, 84) = 0.19$ ,  $p = .65$ . Thus, group membership of the target community did not moderate the effects of distance on perceptions of familiarity.

Temporal distance was also associated with tendency to view victims at a relatively more superordinate level. Along a social identity continuum, from subordinate identity (subgroup identity) to relatively more superordinate identity construal (human identity), participants were more likely to perceive distant victims at a relatively more superordinate level of identity

( $M = 3.62$ ,  $SD = 1.45$ ), compared to near victims ( $M = 2.34$ ,  $SD = 1.15$ ),  $F(1, 84) = 75.64$ ,  $MSE = 33.06$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .47$ . There was also a significant main effect for group membership,  $F(1, 84) = 213.79$ ,  $MSE = 93.44$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .71$ . Participants were less likely to perceive victims at a superordinate level of identity when the victim was a member of their in-group ( $M = 1.95$ ,  $SD = 1.11$ ), compared to when the victim was a member of an out-group ( $M = 4.06$ ,  $SD = .86$ ). The results revealed that group membership did not moderate the effects of distance on tendency to view the victims at the level of human identity,  $F(1, 84) = .10$ ,  $p = .77$ .

### *Collective Action Tendencies*

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) for collective action revealed a main effect for distance condition. Participants were less willing to engage in collective action on behalf of temporally distant victims ( $M = 3.25$ ,  $SD = 1.21$ ), compared to temporally close victims ( $M = 4.19$ ,  $SD = 1.85$ ),  $F(1, 84) = 41.27$ ,  $MSE = 21.61$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .32$ . There was also a main effect for target group membership,  $F(1, 84) = 204.91$ ,  $MSE = 107.32$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .70$ . Participants were less willing to engage in collective action when the target community was an out-group ( $M = 2.55$ ,  $SD = .79$ ), compared to when the target community was an in-group ( $M = 4.77$ ,  $SD = .99$ ). Target-group membership, however, did not moderate the effects of distance, there was not a significant two-way interaction,  $F(1, 84) = 2.10$ ,  $p = .17$ .

### *Group Membership, Mental Construal of the Victim, and Collective Action*

To assess the indirect effect of target group membership on collective action tendencies via superordinate identity construal and familiarity, we used a 5,000 resample bootstrapping procedure (Hayes, 2012). There was support for partial mediation, the total effect of target group membership on collective action was reduced (total effect =  $-.78$ ,  $p < .001$  to direct effect =  $-.51$ ,  $p < .001$ ) when the superordinate identity

construal and familiarity measures were included as mediators. Whereas there was no evidence that superordinate identity construal was a significant mediator, point estimate  $-.24$  with a 95% CI  $[-.89, .15]$ , there was evidence that familiarity explained the relation between target group membership and collective action tendencies, point estimate  $-.53$ , with a 95% bias corrected/accelerated interval  $[-.94, -.11]$ ,  $F(3, 84) = 59.85$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .68$ .

### *Distance, Mental Construal of the Victims, and Collective Action*

We expected decreased willingness to engage in collective action on behalf of distant victims, relative to near victims, to be explained by perceptions of familiarity and tendency to view victims at a relatively more superordinate level of identity. To investigate the hypothesized mediating roles of familiarity and superordinate identity construal on the relation between distance and collective action motivation, a dual mediator path analysis, including both the familiarity and human identity measures was conducted using a 5,000 resample bootstrapping procedure (Hayes, 2012). The total effect of distance on collective action went from significant (total effect =  $-.36$ ,  $p < .01$ ) to nonsignificant (direct effect =  $-.01$ ,  $p = .96$ ) when the superordinate identity construal and familiarity measures were included as mediators. Consistent with hypotheses, familiarity explained the relation between distance and collective action, point estimate  $-.49$ , with a 95% bias corrected/accelerated interval between  $-1.02$  and  $-.16$ . In addition, the tendency to view victims at a relatively more superordinate level of identity explained the relation between distance and collective action, point estimate  $-.53$  with a 95% CI  $[-.95, -.25]$ ,  $F(3, 84) = 38.37$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $R^2 = .57$ .

## **Discussion**

Experiment 2 provides additional evidence that distance shapes perceptions of victims and also willingness to engage in collective action. Replicating the results of Experiment 1, using

an alternative operationalization of distance (temporal distance), Experiment 2 found that distant victims were especially likely to be perceived as less familiar and more likely to be viewed at a relatively more superordinate level of identity, relative to near victims. Temporal distance, like spatial distance, was associated with decreased collective action tendencies, which was explained by differences in how victims were viewed in distant contexts (less familiar; relatively more superordinate identity construal), compared to near contexts. In addition, target group membership was associated with decreased collective action, such that group members were less willing to engage collective action on behalf of out-group targets, relative to in-group targets, which was explained by familiarity.

The results of the second experiment, focused on temporal distance in the future, suggest that people may be less willing to act on behalf of temporally distant injustice occurring in the future, compared to temporally close or immediate (present) injustice. However, some research, focused on the evaluation of future environmental risk (Bohm & Pfister, 2005; Hendrickx & Nicolaj, 2004), suggests that temporal distance does not influence action tendencies. These divergent findings may be rooted in the extent to which knowledge about specific time points moderates the effects of temporal distance on action tendencies. Indeed, whereas past work on environmental risk specified exact time points in the future (e.g., "one year from now"; Bohm & Pfister, 2005), in the second experiment we did not specify a time point (i.e., climate change was stated to occur "in the future"). This difference in the experimental manipulation of temporal distance suggests knowledge regarding specific time points may moderate the effect of (future) temporal distance on action tendencies. Nevertheless the findings of Experiment 2 complement a growing body of research suggesting that temporal distance has a strong influence on intragroup and intergroup behaviors (e.g., forgiveness for past injustice; Greenaway, Louis, & Wohl, 2012).

## General Discussion

Does distance affect how people view victims of injustice and willingness to act in response to injustice? We sought to provide a first step in the study of collective action from a distance by exploring whether distance alters perceptions of victims, as well as whether willingness to engage in collective action differs for victims within near and distant contexts. Across two experiments, utilizing both temporal and spatial distance, there was support for the hypothesis that distance changes the way people view victims of injustice. Indeed, people reported feeling not only less familiar with distant victims, relative to near victims, but were also more likely to view distant victims at a relatively more superordinate level of identity, both of which indicate that distant victims may be viewed at a more superordinate mental construal. A second objective of the current work was to explore the effect of distance on collective action. Across both experiments, participants were less willing to engage in collective action on behalf of distant victims, relative to near victims, which was explained by differences in how distant victims were viewed relative to near victims (familiarity and relatively more superordinate identity construal). These findings make salient the hidden advantages of near or immediate collective action contexts and also illustrate the challenges of collective action from a distance.

The present research provides evidence to suggest that a "*near/distant*" distinction may be important and necessary for collective action research. Indeed, the current work suggests that people approach collective action within near and distant contexts in dissimilar ways. The differing way people approach near and distant contexts may have implications for how to increase collective action. For example, much like the *structural/incidental* distinction has helped to guide research, and in particular an understanding of how and why people differentially cope with structural (e.g., membership in a low status group) versus incidental (e.g., issue-based) disadvantage (van Zomeren, Postmes, & Spears, 2008), the current

findings suggest that a near/distant distinction may help explain differing responses to near versus distant injustice. Beyond the clear difference in motivation to engage in collective action within near and distant contexts, the results of Experiment 2 suggest that subgroup identity may be less salient under distant conditions. Thus, just as past theory suggests that for incidental disadvantage social identity needs to be created, but for structural disadvantage social identity already exists and therefore needs to be transformed (van Zomeren et al., 2008), one implication, and important distinction between near and distant contexts, may lie in the extent to which social identity needs to be made salient versus transformed within the respective contexts. Indeed, under distant conditions there may be greater need to transform social identity, but under near conditions there may be greater need to make shared identity salient. Thus, the findings of the current work suggest that the *near/distant* distinction may be an important and meaningful distinction for collective action work.

The present findings also complement recent work illustrating unintended negative consequences or “potential dark side” of superordinate identity (Wright & Lubensky, 2009). A growing body of research illustrates the need to question the assumptions underlying the utility of focusing on superordinate identity and suggests that a more complex and nuanced understanding of the relation between superordinate identity and social change may be warranted (Dixon, Durrheim, Kerr, & Thomae, 2013). In line with this theorizing, as well as past work illustrating that invoking a superordinate identity reduces empathy in the context of a temporally distant injustice (Greenaway, et al., 2012), the present results suggest that to the extent that distant injustice elicits a relatively more superordinate identity construal of victims (i.e., decreased salience of subgroup identity), people may be less willing to engage in collective action. Taken together, these findings suggest that within the context of temporally distant injustice, invoking shared superordinate identity, such as human identity, may decrease empathy and action on behalf of victims of

injustice. The current studies therefore complement several strands of recent research illustrating negative intergroup consequences of invoking shared superordinate identity (Dixon, Levine, Reicher, & Durrheim, 2012), but also suggest the need for a more nuanced approach to the study of superordinate identity. Indeed, whereas the current results suggest that invoking superordinate identity within temporally distant contexts may be counterproductive (see also Greenaway et al., 2012), other work has found that responses to invoking a superordinate identity (human identity) differ based on the content or meaning of the identity made salient within the context (Morton & Postmes, 2011). These studies illustrate that the effects of invoking superordinate identity, such as human identity, on intergroup relations outcomes, may be contingent on a variety of moderating factors, such as, distance (current work), intergroup contact (Glasford & Calcagno, 2012), or the way people interpret the meaning of superordinate identity (Morton & Postmes, 2011). For example, whether people interpret the content of superordinate identity in a way that is inclusive (likely leading to increased collective action) or in a way that is abstract (likely leading to decreased collective action; Morton & Postmes, 2011) may change the extent to which invoking superordinate identity leads to decreased or increased collective action on behalf of a target. Taken together, this research suggests the need for a contextualized and nuanced approach to the study of superordinate identity, focused not necessarily on whether to invoke superordinate identity, but on *when* or *under what conditions* will superordinate identity lead to negative versus positive intergroup relations and social change (Dixon et al., 2013).

The current studies also demonstrate the strong effect of target group membership on collective action tendencies. First, consistent with past work suggesting that people are more responsive to in-group targets (Levine et al., 2005), across two studies participants were more willing to engage in collective action on behalf of in-group targets, relative to out-group targets, which was explained by perceptions of familiarity

(Experiment 2). These findings suggest that group membership may serve as a means by which collective action can either be undermined (salience of unshared identity) or facilitated (emphasis on shared identity). Second, and more broadly, the parallel effects of group membership and distance on action tendencies, via familiarity, have one intriguing implication: distance, like target group membership, may be used as a cue by people to communicate information about familiarity. Thus, just as group membership often communicates perceived familiarity (Linville, Fischer, & Salovey, 1989), people may also use distance as a cue to communicate familiarity of targets within intergroup relations. Indeed, near targets were viewed as more familiar than distant targets in the present work. The finding that there is a relation between distance and perceptions of familiarity has implications not only for understanding acceptance of injustice, but also for prejudice-reduction interventions. More specifically, in line with other factors that enable people to accept suffering of others (e.g., social support leads to acceptance of dehumanization; Waytz & Epley, 2012), distance from victims of injustice and the accompanying lack of familiarity may lead people to be more willing to accept suffering or injustice faced by distant victims. However, the finding that “near” out-group members are perceived as more familiar than “distant” out-group members may also provide some utility for prejudice reduction. These findings suggest, for example, there may be utility, under the right conditions, of contrasting “near” out-group members with “distant” out-group members for prejudice-reduction interventions. In sum, the current findings not only speak to the effect of target group membership on collective action tendencies, but also indicate that distance, like target group membership, may serve as a cue to communicate familiarity within intergroup relations.

More broadly, the results of the current work illustrate the strong influence of distance in shaping the way people approach in-group and out-group members within distant contexts. Target group membership did not moderate the effects

of distance on collective action tendencies, thus participants were not less willing to engage in action on behalf of distant out-group victims, relative to distant in-group victims. One interpretation of this finding, as suggested by the construal results of the present work, is that under distant conditions an abstract superordinate identity may be more salient, suggesting that the favoritism typically directed toward in-group targets may be muted within distant contexts. However, given the strong influence of target group membership on a host of behaviors, such as prejudice (Brewer, 1979), we are not arguing that distance mutes the effects of group membership on all intergroup behaviors. It is likely the case that a more nuanced explanation is required to explain the conditions when group membership will moderate the effects of distance on intergroup behaviors. For example, it is possible that group membership may moderate the effect of distance on antisocial behavioral outcomes (e.g., prejudiced attitudes), but less likely to moderate the effect of distance on prosocial behavioral outcomes (e.g., collective action, helping, charitable giving). Additional work is of course needed to explore when group membership moderates the effects of distance on collective action.

We note some potential limitations of the findings and suggest avenues for future research. One of the primary limitations of the present work concerns the measurement of superordinate identity construal. Although our measurement allowed us to explore participants’ construal of a victim along a continuum of social identity (from subordinate construal of subgroup identity to relatively more superordinate construal of human identity), the one item measure does not allow for a clean assessment of decreased salience of subgroup identity versus increased salience of human identity. That is, given the measurement of superordinate identity construal it is impossible to tell whether decreased salience of subgroup identity or increased salience of human identity decreased collective action tendencies. Thus, although we replicated the results across two studies and the



data are consistent with past work (Greenaway et al., 2011), one direction for future research would be to use two separate measures, with multiple items, for subgroup and human identity to help provide further clarity regarding whether decreased salience of subgroup identity or salience of human identity explains the relation between distance and action tendencies. In addition, we note that we are not arguing that an emphasis on superordinate identity per se leads to decreased willingness to engage in collective action. Given that there are a variety of superordinate identities between subgroup identity and human identity, unmeasured in the present work, it is plausible not only that the respective contexts differ regarding relative accessibility of superordinate identities, but also that some superordinate identities could lead to increased collective action across distance (e.g., national identity within international intergroup relations). More broadly, from a social identity perspective (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), categorization involves not just a change in how one views others, but also a change in the categorization of self, *in relation* to others (Turner et al., 1987). Because the present work focused strictly on categorization of others, future work would benefit from examining how self-categorization in relation to distant victims, as well as the perpetrator of injustice, affects how people respond to distant injustice. Thus, there are a number of areas for future research regarding the relation among distance, superordinate identity, and collective action tendencies.

A second limitation concerns the potential for alternative mediators to explain the relation between distance and willingness to engage in collective action. In the present work we focused primarily on construal of victims, but there are a variety of other factors, such as efficacy (van Zomeren, Spears, Fischer, & Leach, 2004) or threat to the self (Cole, Balcetis, & Dunning, 2013), that likely help to explain why distance reduces action tendencies. Thus, one avenue for future work is to explore sequential mediators of the effect of distance on collective action tendencies.

Finally, a third limitation concerns the sample and sample size. In order to examine the potential moderating role of group membership, we used only one racial/ethnic group in the sample (Latinos/Hispanics) and also had relatively small sample sizes. Additional evidence derived from a larger, racially, ethnically, and age diverse sample would help to not only generalize the present effects to other demographics (Cooper, McCord, & Socha, 2011), but also provide more confidence in the reliability of the pattern of findings. Taken together, the present work provides initial evidence for the effect of distance on collective action tendencies, but there are certainly limitations to the current studies, suggesting a need for further replication.

The present research provides evidence not only that distance shapes how people view victims of injustice, but also that willingness to engage in collective action differs based on whether injustice is spatially/temporally close (immediate contexts) or far (distant contexts). Moreover, the current studies suggest that target group membership directly affects willingness to engage in collective action. Finally, the results reveal that appeals to superordinate identity, such as human identity, may reduce willingness to engage in action on behalf of distant victims of injustice. Taken together, the current work suggests that distance seems to have a way of separating people from injustice. To the extent that action results from connecting observers to the suffering of distant others, the present work illustrates that time and space present a unique set of challenges for increasing collective action tendencies. Indeed, our work suggests there may be a space–time social change continuum, with “near” and “distant” anchors at opposite ends of a social change continuum, such that victims and injustice that are close to the “near” anchor in space and time (closer to one’s immediate experience), are relatively more likely to receive attention and action for social change, relative to distant victims and injustice close to the “distant” anchor (further from one’s immediate experience). We suggest that spatial and temporal distance, and more broadly the *near/distant* distinction, has

important implications not only for how people view victims of injustice, but also for collective action tendencies in response to injustice.

### Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Winnifred Louis and three anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this manuscript. In addition, we thank Chavel Guzman and Monica Murillo for their assistance with organizing data collection.

### Notes

1. Consistent with notion that the familiarity and superordinate identity construal measures represent related, but distinct indicators of superordinate construal, familiarity, and tendency to view the victim at a relatively more superordinate identity construal were significantly related to one another. Across both studies, the more a victim was perceived at a relatively more superordinate identity construal (a shift away from subgroup identity toward human identity), the less likely they were to be perceived as familiar (Experiment 1,  $r = -.65$ ; Experiment 2,  $r = -.72$ ). The correlation and pattern of results lends support and provides evidence that both measures were assessing a single construct (superordinate mental construal). Although the measures were related to one another, we chose to assess the constructs separately in both studies because of the unique nature of the superordinate identity construal measure (i.e., a single item continuum measure with distinct and disparate anchors) and to examine the independent effects of familiarity and human identity on collective action tendencies.
2. For all experiments, we have reported all conditions, data exclusions, and, with the exception of several filler items reported in the Method section, all measures.
3. Because group membership of the victim did not moderate the effects of distance on collective action, in both Experiments 1 and 2, mediation tests were conducted by collapsing across target group membership condition.

### References

- Bohm, G., & Pfister, H. (2005). Consequences, morality, and time in environmental risk evaluation. *Journal of Risk Research*, 8, 461–479. doi:10.1080/13669870500064143
- Brewer, M. (1979). Ingroup bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 307–324. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.86.2.307
- Cole, S., Balcielis, E., & Dunning, D. (2013). Affective signals of threat increase perceived proximity. *Psychological Science*, 24, 34–40. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.86.2.307
- Cooper, C. A., McCord, D., & Socha, A. (2011). Evaluating the college sophomore problem: The case of personality and politics. *Journal of Personality: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 145(1), 23–37. doi:10.1080/00223980.2010.528074
- Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., Kerr, P., & Thomae, M. (2013). “What’s so funny ‘Bout peace, love and understanding?” Further reflections on the limits of prejudice reduction as a model of social change. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 1, 239–252. doi:10.5964/jssp.v1i1.234
- Dixon, J., Levine, M., Reicher, S., & Durrheim, K. (2012). Beyond prejudice: Are negative evaluations the problem and is getting us to like one another more the solution? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 35, 411–466. doi:10.1017/S0140525X11002214
- 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, 323–328. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.001
- Greenaway, K. H., Louis, W. R., & Wohl, M. J. A. (2012). Awareness of common humanity reduces empathy and heightens expectations for forgiveness for temporally distant wrongdoing. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(4), 446–454. doi:10.1177/1948550611425861
- Greenaway, K. H., Quinn, E. A., & Louis, W. R. (2011). Appealing to common humanity increases forgiveness but reduces collective action among victims of historical atrocities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 569–573. doi:10.1002/ejsp.802
- Hayes, A. F. (2012). *PROCESS: A versatile computational tool for observed variable mediation, moderation, and conditional process modeling* [White paper]. Retrieved from <http://mres.gmu.edu/pmwiki/uploads/Main/process.pdf>
- Henderson, M. D., Fujita, K., Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2006). Transcending the “here”: The effect of spatial distance on social judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(5), 845–856. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.5.845

- Hendrickx, L., & Nicolaij, S. (2004). Temporal discounting and environmental risks: The role of ethical and loss-related concerns. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 24*, 409–422. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2004.12.001
- Leach, C. W., Iyer, A., & Pederson, A. (2006). Anger and guilt about ingroup advantage explain willingness for political action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 1232–1245. doi:10.1177/0146167206289729
- Levine, M., Prosser, A., Evans, D., & Reicher, S. (2005). Identity and emergency intervention: How social group membership and inclusiveness of group boundaries shape helping behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(4), 443–453. doi:10.1177/0146167204271651
- Liberman, N., Sagristano, M., & Trope, Y. (2002). The effect of temporal distance on level of construal. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*, 523–535. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2005.12.009
- Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (1998). The role of feasibility and desirability considerations in near and distant future decisions: A test of temporal construal theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(1), 5–18. doi:10.1037/0022–3514.75.1.5
- Linville, P. W., Fischer, G. W., & Salovey, P. (1989). Perceived distributions of the characteristics of in-group and out-group members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 165–188. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.2.165
- Mallett, R. K., Huntsinger, J. R., Sinclair, S., & Swim, J. K. (2008). Seeing through their eyes: When majority group members take collective action on behalf of an outgroup. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 11*(4), 451–470. doi:10.1177/1368430208095400
- Milfont, T. L., & Gouveia, V. V. (2006). Time perspective and values. An exploratory study of their relations to environmental attitudes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 26*(1), 72–82. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2006.03.001
- Morton, T. A., & Postmes, T. (2011). Moral duty or moral defence? The effects of perceiving shared humanity with the victims of ingroup perpetrated harm. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*(1), 127–134. doi:10.1002/ejsp.751
- Peez, J., Gunn, G. R., & Wilson, A. E. (2010). Crimes of the past: Defensive temporal distancing in the fact of past ingroup wrongdoing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 598–611. doi:10.1177/0146167210364850
- Simon, A. F. (1997). Television news and international earthquake relief. *Journal of Communication, 47*, 82–93. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1997.tb02718.x
- Stephan, E., Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (2011). The effects of time perspective and level of construal on social distance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(2), 397–402. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.11.001
- Subašić, E., Schmitt, M. T., & Reynolds, K. J. (2011). Are we all in this together? Co-victimization, inclusive social identity and collective action in solidarity with the disadvantaged. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 50*(4), 707–725. doi:10.1111/j.2044–8309.2011.02073
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–48). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tarrow, S. (2005). *The new transnational activism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tetlock, P. E., Kirstel, O. V., Elson, S. B., Green, M. C., & Lerner, J. S. (2000). The psychology of the unthinkable: Taboo trade-offs, forbidden base rates, and heretic counterfactuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 853–870. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.78.5.853
- Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2003). Temporal construal. *Psychological Review, 110*, 403–421. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.110.3.403
- Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. *Psychological Review, 117*(2), 440–463. doi:10.1037/a0018963
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. New York, NY: Basil Blackwell.
- Van Zomeren, M., Leach, C. W., & Spears, R. (2010). Does group efficacy increase group identification? Resolving their paradoxical relationship. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*, 1055–1060. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.05.006
- Van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2008). Toward an integrative social identity model of collective action: A quantitative research synthesis of three socio-psychological perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin, 134*(4), 504–535. doi:10.1037/0033–2909.134.4.504
- Van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2012). On conviction's collective consequences: Integrating moral conviction with the social identity model of collective action. *British Journal of*

- Social Psychology*, 51(1), 52–71. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.2010.02000.x
- Waytz, A., & Epley, N. (2012). Social connection enables dehumanization. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 70–76. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.07.012
- Wohl, M. J. A., & Branscombe, N. R. (2005). Forgiveness and collective guilt assignment to historical perpetrator groups depend on level of social category inclusiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 288–303. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.2.288
- Wright, S., & Lubensky, M. (2009). The struggle for social equality: Collective action versus prejudice reduction. In J. P. Leyens & J. R. Dovidio (Eds.), *Intergroup misunderstandings: Impact of divergent social realities* (pp. 291–310, 347). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Zaal, M. P., van Laar, C., Ståhl, T., Ellemers, N., & Derks, B. (2012). Social change as an important goal or likely outcome: How regulatory focus affects commitment to collective action. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 51(1), 93–110. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.2010.02006