Fall 11-3-2021

Factors Contributing to Activism among Advantaged-Group and Disadvantaged-Group Undergraduate Students

Anne Guzman
University of New Mexico

Anne Guzman
Candidate

Psychology
Department

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Bruce Smith, Chairperson

Dr. Nancy López

Dr. Kamilla Venner

Dr. Steven Verney

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO ACTIVISM AMONG ADVANTAGED-GROUP AND DISADVANTAGED-GROUP UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

by

ANNE GUZMAN
Master of Science, Psychology
Bachelor of Arts, Psychology

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
Psychology

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

December, 2021

FACTORS RELATED TO ACTIVISM IN UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

by
ANNE GUZMAN

BA, Psychology, University of New Mexico, 2013
MS, Psychology, University of New Mexico, 2017
PhD, Psychology, University of New Mexico, 2021

ABSTRACT

Identifying factors that contribute to activism may be helpful in increasing activism. This study investigated how experiences, personality characteristics, beliefs, attitudes, group membership (i.e., POC, women, LGBTQ, and disabled individuals), and intersectional group membership defined by social location related to reported engagement in racial justice activism. A sample of 155 undergraduate students completed measures of empathy, openness to diversity, authoritarianism, multicultural experiences, level of prejudice, motivation to respond without prejudice, allophilia, understanding of privilege, racial/ethnic identity, and social support. Results supported that engagement in activism differed based on group membership for gender, LGBTQ+, and primary race and based on social location. Results also supported that internal motivation to respond without prejudice and activism-specific social support were more relevant to engagement in activism than external motivation or general social support. Most factors contributed to a significant model for predicting activism, and correlations with activism differed based on social location.

Keywords: activism, social justice, social location, group membership, race, ethnicity, street race

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Factors Contributing to Activism among Advantaged-Group and Disadvantaged-Group Undergraduate Students

Prior to the 2016 United States presidential election, some privileged individuals may have assured themselves that racism and prejudice was on the decline or generally rare in the United States (Bobo, 2017). However, during and since that election, overt and covert racist action has increased. Stein and Allcorn (2018) found evidence that racism and prejudice were increasing in groups during Barack Obama's presidency and the campaign of Donald Trump. They state that the election may have then contributed to overt racism. While important to consider that racism and prejudice were never gone, the increase of overt racism has made the idea of a post-racial America even more distant. In the face of increased racism and prejudice, the focus should be not only to reduce racism and prejudice but increase antiracist behaviors in the form of activism.

This question of how to do this has no easy answer and there are many levels of racism that can be addressed. Racism exists on macro-, meso-, and micro-levels so that targets for intervention include policies, institutions, groups, and individuals (Buhin & Vera, 2008). When addressing the micro- or individual level, it may help to identify which individuals are most likely to change and what factors contribute to change. Individuals range from highly engaged in racial justice activism to highly engaged in racist ideologies and actions. While it may be enticing to "reach across the aisle" to try to change those who overtly hold racist ideologies, this is likely to include large amounts of defensiveness for both parties involved in these interactions. Since defensiveness impedes change in behavior (Miller & Rollnick, 2013), successful change may rely on endeavors that reduce defensive responses. It would be more practical to encourage those who are "on the cusp" of racial

justice activism to start engaging or increase their engagement in activism because there is already some level of alignment in values and beliefs about racism.

Understanding factors related to racial justice activism may help identify individuals who are most likely to respond to intervention to increase engagement in activism. Based on racial identity development models, reduction in level of prejudice appears to be a pre-cursor to racial justice activism (Sue & Sue, 2012). Similarly, allophilia as well as the motivation to respond without prejudice would likely occur before any racial justice activism. This is supported by both racial identity development models as well as research on allyship (Sue & Sue, 2012; Ostrove & Brown, 2018).

In addition, it may be important to consider variables that have a relationship with prejudice. Lower levels of authoritarianism, more diverse experiences, and higher openness and empathy correspond with lower levels of prejudice (Hodson & Dhont, 2010; Levin et al., 2016). Through reduced prejudice, these factors likely impact racial justice activism. Additionally, racial/ethnic identity and understanding of privilege may impact different groups' engagement in activism (Sue & Sue, 2012; Reason, Millar, & Scales, 2005). More social support may be related to engagement in racial justice activism, but the most helpful support may need to be related to activism (Sue, 2017; Tarakeli, 2007).

Group Membership and Activism

Being a disadvantaged group member in domains other than racial and ethnic identity can influence engagement in activism. Curtin, Kende, and Kende (2016) found that being a member of a disadvantaged group was correlated with activism not only for that group but also for other disadvantaged groups, thereby encouraging activism as an ally. Being a

woman, member of the LGBTQ community, or disabled may be correlated with higher levels of activism beyond activism for one's specific group.

Jones & Brewster (2017) tested the impact of positive marginality as a contributor to LGBTQ+ ally activism and did not find that it was a significant predictor. Positive marginality is the idea that experiencing discrimination encourages activism. Their study asked participants to report on experiences of discrimination and found that these reports did not correlate as they had predicted with activism. However, they did find that female participants were more likely to engage in activism than male participants of the study, citing that group identity – at least in relation to gender – does impact activism. This suggests that group identity may be more important than specific experiences. In a review of relevant literature, Sue & Sue (2012) also found that women tend to be less racist than men. Curtin, Kende, and Kende (2016) found that disadvantaged group identity contributed to activism in those they interviewed. Frost, Fine, Torre, & Cabana, A. (2019) found that gender non-conforming, transgender, and non-binary adolescents reported higher levels of activism than cisgender peers (those whose gender identity matches their sex assigned at birth). These studies suggest that overall group membership (i.e., identifying as Black, gay, and/or female) has a relationship with activism.

Individuals with different social locations including gender, race, and ethnicity may have differing levels of activism than when compared based on one of these identity characteristics. There is evidence that exploring differences based on one identity characteristic, for example race alone, may miss different experiences in different social locations (López, 2013). White (2006) found that African American women were more likely to engage in feminist activism when they also identified as a sexual minority. Hope, Keels,

& Durkee (2016) found that Latina women participated more heavily in activism than Latino men. This appears to be a complex relationship based on levels of group membership and social location, as they did not see a significant difference for Black men and women. Social location

Factors Related to Reducing Prejudice

Because lowered prejudice is a step on the way to activism (Sue & Sue, 2012), factors that are related to reduced prejudice are likely also related to activism. People's previous multicultural and diverse experiences have been related to prejudicial beliefs. Multiple authors have theorized and found that contact with other groups can reduce prejudice (Pettigrew et al., 2011). Allport (1954) stated that certain conditions are required to reduce prejudice through contact. While Allport proposed that there had to be equal status between groups, there had to be shared goals and cooperation, and support on a higher level for working together and overcoming prejudice, Pettigrew et al. (2011) found that contact without Allport's requirements still encouraged reductions in prejudice, indicating that contact and experiences contribute to reduced prejudice alone.

It is unclear, however, if contact is directly related to reduced levels of prejudice or if the reduction occurs through changes in other factors. It may be that experiences change other person-based factors. Life experiences including increased diverse interactions through attending college and studying abroad have been found to impact measures related to prejudice. Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini (1996) found that students increased in openness and decreased in authoritarianism over the first year of college due to diverse interpersonal interactions. Clarke, Flaherty, Wright, & McMillen (2009) found that traveling abroad was related to lower levels of authoritarianism. Another factor of diverse or

multicultural experiences includes creating friendships with members of disadvantaged groups. This may increase the likelihood that individuals will engage in activism for that group. For example, Swank, Woodford, & Lim (2013) found that heterosexual participants were more likely to sign a petition for LGBTQ+ rights if they had a friend who identified as LGBTQ+. Multicultural experiences broadly defined appear to contribute to reducing prejudice and engaging in activism.

In addition to experiences, many person-based variables are correlated with prejudice. Hodson & Dhont (2010) reviewed literature on person-based variables that are related to prejudice and found that personality traits, ideological constructs, and cognitive ability are related to prejudice in a range of studies. For personality traits, low openness to experience is related to higher ratings of prejudice. Authoritarianism is also related to higher ratings of prejudice.

Jones, Brewster, & Jones (2014) included questions about openness when they created a measure for LGBTQ+ ally identity by interviewing LGBTQ+ allies. In their factor analysis, they found that openness was an important component of allyship. Openness is a particularly interesting factor to evaluate as there is existing literature suggesting that treatment can increase openness. Acceptance and commitment therapy includes a goal of increasing psychological flexibility (Hayes, Luoma, Bond, Masuda, & Lillis, 2006) which has been linked to openness to experience (Mussel, Winter, Gelleri, & Shuler, 2011), so it may be possible to increase openness to experience through therapy. Openness can also increase based on life experiences. Sparkman, Eidelman, & Blanchar (2016) found that multicultural experiences led to a reduction in prejudice because participants' level of openness to experience changed. Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, and Terenzini (1996)

found that students tend to become more open-minded throughout college and developed a scale to evaluate openness to diversity and challenge for college students. Mallinckrodt et al. (2014) found that students scoring higher on openness to diversity also scored higher on a measure of multicultural competency.

Authoritarianism has been linked to higher levels of prejudice against many minority groups (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Brandt & Reyna, 2014). Jones, Brewster, and Jones (2014) found that authoritarianism was negatively related to their measure of LGBTQ+ allyship. While authoritarianism and conservatism may be harder to modify with interventions, there are some indications that authoritarianism decreases while students attend colleges and universities due to the interpersonal contact with a more diverse range of individuals while attending school (Pascarella et al., 1996).

Empathy as measured by both empathic concern and perspective taking has been correlated with lower levels of prejudice (Levin et al., 2016). The combination of empathetic concern with perspective taking may be essential for increased activism. Jones & Brewster (2017) measured perspective-taking as a measure of empathy but did not find a correlation with activism. This is likely due to not assessing emotional empathy. As an example, Becker & Swim (2011) found that changes in sexist beliefs among male participants significantly changed after asking them to think about how women experiencing sexism felt. They did not find a significant change among male participants when they journaled about experiences of sexism without considering the emotion of the person experiencing it.

Core Requirements for Activism

In order to engage in activism, an individual must have certain beliefs and attitudes as a precursor. Research on allies and activism can help to identify some of these core

requirements. Brown & Ostrove (2013) asked people of color (POC) how they would identify allies. They identified that allyship frequently involves concern about what happens to POC, showing respect and interest in the lives of POC, and engaging in antiracist action. To address some of what they called affirming attitudes of allies, they then asked POC to nominate allies for a study that measured allies' level of prejudice, motivation to respond without prejudice, and allophilia (Ostrove & Brown, 2018). The measures of these basic concepts, while aimed at White allies for racial justice, may be relevant for understanding how any group may show changes in anti-racist attitudes. There is also some evidence that it is internal motivation to respond without prejudice that beneficially impacts interracial relations (Butz & Plant, 2009)

Allophilia goes beyond respect, tolerance, or acceptance of an outgroup, but also includes feelings of liking, comfort, and kinship with that group or groups. Gonzales, Riggle, and Rostosky (2015) suggest that prejudice towards other groups is only reduced when there are both reduced negative feelings and increased positive feelings towards stigmatized outgroups. Ostrove & Brown (2018) found little difference in allophilia between friends and allies in their studies, but this may be because the participants were suggested for the study by POC as either friends or allies. There may be differences in allophilia when recruiting through other means. Allophilia may be a factor that may be necessary but not sufficient for activism.

Privilege and Racial/ Ethnic Identity

Sue (2017) questions why some individuals may be non-racist but do not engage in activism. One possible reason for this discrepancy is identity and group membership. Advantaged group members may have power to leverage but their concept of their identity

and direction of focus on their group identity may impact using power and privilege in activism for disadvantaged groups (Curtin & McGarty, 2016). White racial identity models (Hardiman, 1982; Helms, 1990; Rowe, Bennett, & Atkinson, 1994; Sue, 2012 & 2017) provided some clues as to factors of identity that are relevant for White individuals moving from non-racist to antiracist. White racial identity development models have multiple stages, statuses, or levels that define the different perspectives that White individuals may have towards and about people of color. The stage, level, or status in each model that defines White individuals most likely to engage in racial justice activism is often characterized by identity integration. This integration includes a more nuanced understanding of Whiteness and the privilege that accompanies Whiteness in the United States. In Hardiman's (1982) model, the internalization stage involves combining one's racial identity with the rest of one's identity. Helms (1995) describes a status of autonomy that is characterized by the ability to recognize one's own White identity with less guilt, more comfort with discussing race and interacting with people of color and Greenwood (2015) supports that a focus on positive aspects of advantaged identity over guilt contributes to successful activism. Rowe, Bennett, and Atkinson (1994) state that a person in their integrative "type" of White identity acts in a rational, moral way towards the self and people of color.

Part of White identity development is understanding White privilege. Droogendyk, Wright, Lubensky, and Louis (2016) indicated that understanding privilege would be essential for White allies to engage in beneficial activism. Understanding privilege entails reflecting on what Whiteness means in general and to that individual, that Whiteness comes with certain privileges in the United States, and that this privilege is not fair or just. Reason, Millar, and Scales (2005) found that "students who exhibited more reflection on Whiteness

also participated in more, and "higher level," racial justice actions" (p. 543). However, understanding privilege is complicated and emotionally taxing, which can contribute to defensiveness and an overall disinclination to engaging in antiracism (Lensmire et al, 2013). Understanding White privilege may be most impactful after a White ally already has reduced levels of prejudice, strong motivation to respond without prejudice, openness, empathy, and allophilia towards POC. After this, having more understanding of one's privilege may increase activism because of the desire to change the system that privileges some over others.

For activists of color, level of acculturation or ethnic identity may be a relevant factor. Sue & Sue (2012) reviews identity development models relevant to multiple racial and ethnic groups as well as a racial/cultural identity development model that can be applied to disadvantaged racial/ethnic groups in general. Their model has five stages of development that address the individual's opinions of their minority group, the dominant group, and other minority groups. In three of the stages, an individual from a disadvantaged racial or ethnic group has some amount of appreciation for their racial/ethnic group, but only in the last is there appreciation for other disadvantaged racial/ethnic groups in addition to their own. It is in this stage that someone is most likely to support disadvantaged/racial ethnic groups. In addition, to approach any of these stages, the individual would have explored their own racial/ethnic identity.

Social Support

An additional factor that may impact engagement in activism is perceived social support. People may have developed an understanding of elements of their identity as well as addressing issues related to privilege, but still do not engage in racial justice action. One contributing factor is support in antiracist action. Perceived social support is not only related

to better well-being (Sherbourne & Stewart, 1991), but also may contribute to engaging in activism (Sue, 2017; Tarakeli, 2007). Sue (2017) states, "Doing antiracist work is exhausting unless White allies develop support systems that can nurture and encourage them along the way" (p, 714). However, it would be important to identify what kind of social support is related to activism. The arguments raised by both Sue (2017) and Tarakeli (2007) about troubles facing burgeoning activists both suggest that the most important social support may be from other allies or activists – or in relation to activism itself. Simply having friends and family as social support may not encourage racial justice activism if they do not share antiracist values.

Current Study

The goal of the study is to extend previous research by examining the potential predictors of racial justice activism in both advantaged group and disadvantaged group members. By identifying relevant factors, this can guide action and funding towards the most beneficial ways to increase racial justice activism. These factors may differ based on identity of the participants, including complex intersectional identities including both privileged and disadvantaged identities. Social support may also be a driver of engagement in racial justice activism.

There are several hypotheses based on the above cited research and theory.

1. Disadvantaged groups will be higher on activism than advantaged groups
    a. Race/Ethnicity
        i. Participants who self-identify their race as Latino/Hispanic, Black, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific

Islander, or other race will be higher on activism than non-Hispanic White (NHW) participants.

ii. Participants who report their street race as Latino/Hispanic, Black, American Indian or Alaska Native, Mexican, Middle Eastern/Arab, Asian or another street race will be higher on activism than participants who report their street race as White.

iii. Participants who self-identify as Hispanic and report their street race as Latino/Hispanic, Black, American Indian or Alaska Native, Mexican, Middle Eastern/Arab, Asian or other race will be higher on activism than participants who self-identify as Hispanic and report their street race as White.

b. Gender - Women will be higher on activism than men.

c. Sexual Identity/Orientation - Participants who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or any other sexual minority (LGBTQ+ participants) will be higher on activism than the rest of the participants (cisgender heterosexual participants).

d. Disability Status - Participants with at least one disability will be higher on activism than those with no disabilities.

2. The level of activism will vary by social location. Social location will be determined by self-identification, street race, and ethnicity (Hispanic participants who report their street race as Latino/Hispanic, Black, American Indian or Alaska Native, Mexican, Middle Eastern/Arab, Asian or other race vs. Hispanic participants who report their street race as White vs. NHW participants) and gender (female vs. male). Thus, there

will be six groups will be (1) Hispanic street race non-White /female, (2) Hispanic street race non-White/male, (3) Hispanic street race White/female, (4) Hispanic street race White/male, (5) NHW/female, (6) NHW/male. The number of groups compared are limited to these six because the sample size (n = 300-400) may not allow for further subdividing according to additional forms of disadvantage.

   a. Overall group differences – There will be differences in total activism among the six groups.
   b. Specific group differences – Of the six groups, the Hispanic street race non-White/female group will be the highest and the NHW/male group will be the lowest in activism.

3. Whether participants endorse any level of "true" for each item of the activism scale will differ based on social location as defined in Hypothesis 2.
4. Internal motivation to respond without prejudice will be more strongly related to activism than external motivation to respond without prejudice.
5. Activism-specific social support will be more strongly related to activism than general social support.
6. Activism will be positively correlated with openness, empathy, multicultural experiences, motivation to respond without prejudice, allophilia, racial/ethnic identity, understanding privilege, and social support. Activism will be negatively correlated with authoritarianism and level of prejudice.
7. All the predictors will together account for significant variance in activism when examined in the whole sample and when examined in the groups defined in hypothesis 2, separately.

Methods

Participants

Of 175 participants that consented to participated, only 155 completed the survey. An additional six participants were identified as outliers and were excluded from analyses, leaving 149 participants included in the analyses. Of these participants, the largest number of participants identified their primary racial identity as Hispanic White and non-Hispanic White, respectively. Table 1 shows the number and percentages of participants by primary racial identity, street race, ethnicity, and highest parental achievement. Ethnicity (Hispanic vs. non-Hispanic) was included as part of primary racial identity and street race as well as tallied separately and with more detail since ethnicity is an important factor in differentiating outcomes (López, 2013). Most of the sample identified their street race as non-Hispanic White, followed by Hispanic or Latina(o). The sample was more than half first-generation college students (N=84 / 56.4%). The majority of the sample was female (*N*=114/76.5%). There were no transgender or non-binary participants in the final sample, though 39 (26%) participants identified a LGBTQ+ sexual orientation. Disabilities were reported by seven (5%) participants. Ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 64 with a mean of 22.77 (*SD* 7.52). Most participants (77.7%) were under the age of 24. Participants were recruited from a medium-sized metropolitan area in the southwestern U.S.

Table 1. *Number and Percentages of Participants by Primary Racial Identity, Street Race, Ethnicity, and Highest Parental Achievement.*

	N	%
Primary Race		
non-Hispanic White	44	29.5%
non-Hispanic Black	5	3.4%
American Indian or Alaska Native	11	7.4%
Asian American or Pacific Islander	17	11.4%
Hispanic White	51	34.2%
Hispanic Mestiza(o)/Brown	17	11.4%
Hispanic Indigena(o)	2	1.3%
Other	2	1.3%
Street Race		
non-Hispanic White	69	46.3%
non-Hispanic Black	6	4.0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	5	3.4%
Asian American or Pacific Islander	17	11.4%
Arab/Middle Eastern	1	0.7%
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	47	31.5%
Other race	4	2.7%
Ethnicity		
not Hispanic	71	47.7%
Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano	40	26.8%
Puerto Rican	1	0.7%
Other Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish group	44	29.5%
Highest parental educational attainment		
Less than high school	12	8.1%
High School Graduate; high school DIPLOMA or the equivalent (for example: GED)	23	15.4%
Some college credit one or more year of college, no degree	25	16.8%
Associates degree (for example: AA, AS)	24	16.1%
Bachelor's degree (for example: BA, AB, BS)	28	18.8%
Master's degree (for example: MA, MS, MEng, EEd, MSW, MBA)	28	18.8%
Professional Degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD)	3	2.0%
Doctorate Degree (for example: PhD, EdD)	6	4.0%

Procedures

Participants were recruited using an online recruitment website that students used to sign up to participate in experiments in return for course credit. The data for this paper was

collected during the spring of 2021. Students were at least 18 years of age and answered the questionnaires through a secure survey system used by the University of New Mexico. All forms, questions, and procedures were approved by the Human Research Review Committee at the University of New Mexico.

Participants were directed to the online recruitment website by their classes that offered extra credit in the form of research participation. Other extra credit options were also available for students. Students viewed a brief description of the study stating that they would be able to participate online or in person in a study to learn more about positive psychology variables. If they chose to participate, they would sign up for the study on the online recruitment website, then receive an email with an Opinio survey system link to consent. After reviewing the approved consent documents and consenting to participate, the participants were provided a random system-generated ID and provided a separate Opinio survey system link to answer the demographic questions and study measures. The participants completed measures in the same order with each measure on a separate page but could not go back and edit their previous answers.

Measures

Demographics. Participants completed questions about their age, ethnicity, primary self-identified race, street race (López, Vargas, Juarez, Cacari-Stone, & Bettez, 2018), disability status, sexual orientation, and gender.

Activism. The Involvement in Feminist Activism Scale (IFAS; Syzmanski, 2004) was used to assess racial justice activism by adjusting the items to ask about racial justice issues. There are 17 items (e.g., “I am involved in antiracist work”) responded to on a nine-point scale from 1 = very untrue of me to 9 = very true of me. Cronbach’s alpha was .944.

Allophilia. The Allophilia Scale (Pittinsky, Rosenthal, & Montoya, 2011) was used to assess participants' level of liking for POC by altering the wording to "people with different racial/ethnic backgrounds than my own." There are 17 items (e.g., "in general, I have positive attitudes about people with different racial/ethnic backgrounds than my own") responded to on a nine-point scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 9 = strongly agree. Cronbach's alpha was .768.

Authoritarianism. The Aggression-Submission-Conventionalism Scale (ASC; Dunwoody & Funke, 2016) was used to assess authoritarianism. There are four subscales (authoritarian submission, conventionalism, authoritarian aggression, and political intolerance) with six items (three reverse-coded) each, responded to on a five-point scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Cronbach's alpha was .817.

Empathetic perspective-taking. The Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI; Davis, 1980) was used to assess empathetic perspective taking by utilizing the perspective-taking (e.g., "I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective") and empathetic concerns (e.g., "I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me") subscales from the index. There are seven items in each subscale responded to on a 5-point scale from 0 = does not describe me well to 4 = describes me very well. There are two reverse coded items in the perspective-taking subscale and three reverse-coded items in the empathetic concern subscale. Cronbach's alpha was .738.

Multicultural experiences. The Multicultural Experiences Questionnaire (MEQ; Narvaez & Hill, 2010) was used to evaluate the multicultural experiences of participants. There are 15 items (e.g., "I have friends from cultural-racial-ethnic backgrounds different than my own") that range in scale based on the question. Cronbach's alpha was .622.

Motivation to respond without prejudice. The Motivation to Respond without Prejudice Scale (IMS & EMS, Plant & Devine, 1998) was used to assess participants' motivation to respond without prejudice by replacing "Black people" with "people of color." Internal motivation items asked about motivation based on values and personal beliefs while external motivation items asked about motivation based on social desirability. There are five internal motivation items and five external motivation items responded to on nine-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. There is one reverse-coded item in internal motivation. Cronbach's alphas were .701 for the full scale, .587 for internal motivation items, and .843 for external motivation items. While Cronbach's alpha is low for internal motivation items, all items were retained for analyses since removal of items did not aid in improving reliability of the subscale.

Openness. The Openness to Diversity and Challenge Scale (ODCS; Pascarella et al., 1996) was used to assess students' openness to diversity and multiculturalism and being challenged by new ideas and perspectives. There are eight items (e.g., "I enjoy having discussions with people whose ideas and values are different than my own.") responded to on a 5-point scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree. Cronbach's alpha was .870.

Prejudice. The Pro- and Anti-Black Attitudes scale (Katz & Hass, 1988) was used to assess level of racial prejudice by using the anti-Black subscale, replacing "Black" with "people of color" and omitting several items with questionable wording when using people of color. Items in the anti-POC scale included questions that stated prejudicial statements about stereotypes about POC. After omitting items, there were seven anti-POC items (e.g., "one of the biggest problems for a lot of people of color is their lack of self-respect," "children of color would do better in school if their parents had better attitudes about learning")

responded to on a nine-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Cronbach's alpha was .721.

Privilege. The White Privilege Attitudes Scale (WPAS, Pinterits, Poteat, and Spanierman, 2009) was used to assess participants' understanding of and feelings about privilege. Non-White participants were informed they did not need to answer these questions. There are 28 items (e.g., "White people have it easier than people of color") responded to on a nine-point scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 9 = strongly agree. Cronbach's alpha was .938.

Racial/ethnic identity. The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure – Revised (MEIM-R; Phinney & Ong, 2007) was used to assess participants' sense of belonging to their individual racial/ethnic group. There are six items (e.g., "I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me") responded to on a five-point scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The wording was updated to read "racial/ethnic" instead of "ethnic." Cronbach's alpha was .915.

Social support. The emotional/informational support questions of the Medical Outcomes Study Social Support Survey (MOS-S; Sherbourne & Stewart, 1991) were used to assess participants' general emotional/informational social support. There were eight items (e.g., someone who understands your problems) responded to on a five-point scale from 1 = none of the time to 5 = all of the time were used. Cronbach's alpha was .958.

Racial justice social support. The emotional/informational support questions of the MOS-S were adjusted to be relevant to racial justice issues like dealing with racial injustice, prejudice, and understanding privilege. There are eight items (e.g., "someone to engage in racial justice activism with") responded to on a five-point scale from 1 = none of the time to 5 = all of the time. Cronbach's alpha was .954.

Statistical Analyses

The statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS Version 28. Hypothesis 1 was tested using independent samples t-tests. Hypothesis 2 was tested using ANOVA. Hypothesis 3 was tested using odds ratios. Hypotheses 4 and 5 were tested by comparing the zero-order Pearson and a z-test. Hypothesis 6 was assessed using the zero-order Pearson correlation. Hypothesis 7 was tested using multiple regression analyses. All analyses used an alpha of $p < .05$ for significance.

Results

Hypothesis 1

To test Hypothesis 1 that disadvantaged groups engage in higher levels of activism than advantaged groups, means on activism were compared between advantaged vs. disadvantaged group membership by race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and disability status. Welch t-tests were run due to unequal group sizes in each analysis with substantial differences in group size for each group.

Advantaged vs. disadvantaged groups for race and ethnicity was analyzed in three ways, by reported primary race (NHW vs. any other race/ethnicity), reported street race (NHW vs. any other race/ethnicity), and street race within Hispanic participants (HW vs. any other street race). When assessed based on primary race, NHW participants ($n = 44$, M = 3.04, SD = 1.60) reported higher levels of engagement in activism than those participants who reported any other race/ethnicity ($n = 105$, M = 2.44, SD = 1.22) with a statistically significant difference, M = 0.61, 95% CI [0.07, 1.14], t(64.882) = 2.252, $p = .028$, $d = .451$.

For sexual orientation and gender, results supported the hypothesis that disadvantaged groups participate more in racial justice activism. Female participants ($n = 114$, M = 2.77, SD

= 1.39) reported higher levels of engagement in activism than male participants (n = 35, M = 2.13, SD = 1.17) with a statistically significant difference, M = 0.63, 95% CI [0.16, 1.11], t(66.236) = 2.677, p = .009, d = .472. LGBTQ+ participants (n = 39, M = 3.39, SD = 1.39) reported higher levels of engagement than cisgender heterosexual participants (n = 110, M = 2.34, SD = 1.25) with a statistically significant difference, M = -1.05, 95% CI [-1.55, -0.54], t(61.195) = -4.145, p < .001, d = -.812. Thus, the first hypothesis was supported for gender and sexual orientation but not for racial and ethnic identity or disability status.

Hypothesis 2

To test the second hypothesis that level of engagement in racial justice activism differs based on social location, variables were created to identify social location by self-identified ethnicity and street race (Hispanic participants who report their street race as Latino/Hispanic, Black, American Indian or Alaska Native, Mexican, Middle Eastern/Arab, Asian or other race vs. Hispanic participants who report their street race as White vs. NHW participants) and gender (female vs. male). Thus, there were six groups (1) Hispanic, street race non-White, female (n = 39, M = 2.79, SD = 1.34), (2) Hispanic, street race non-White, male (n = 14, M = 1.93, SD = 0.64), (3) Hispanic, street race White, female (n = 18, M = 2.39, SD = 1.02), (4) Hispanic, street race White, male (n = 7, M = 2.19, SD = 1.31), (5) NHW, female (n = 37, M = 3.28, SD = 1.50), (6) NHW, male (n = 7, M = 2.72, SD = 1.38). The number of groups compared are limited to these six because the sample size did not allow for further subdividing according to additional forms of disadvantage. There were 27 non-Hispanic, non-White participants who were left out of these analyses since they did not fit in these groups and combining the multiple racial and ethnic identities of these participants would not make sense.

A one-way Welch ANOVA was conducted due to the difference in group sizes and because the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p < .001$). Level of activism was statistically significantly different for different social location groups, Welch's $F(5, 27.857) = 4.262$, $p = .005$. Games-Howell post hoc analysis revealed that the mean difference between non-Hispanic male participants who identified their street race as non-White was significantly different when compared to two other groups. Compared to Hispanic female participants that identified their street race as not White, the mean difference was statistically significant (0.85, 95% CI [0.04, 1.67], $p = .035$), as was compared to NHW female participants (1.35, 95% CI [0.46, 2.24], $p < .001$), with both groups reporting higher levels of activism than non-Hispanic male participants who identified their street race as non-White.

Hypothesis 3

To test the hypothesis that whether participants endorse any level of "true" for each item of the activism scale differs based on the social location groups created for the second hypothesis, odds ratios were calculated for each item of the activism scale and each social location. Table 1 lists the odds ratios and 95% confidence interval for each activism item in each social location group. Statistical significance was determined by the 95% confidence interval when the interval did not include 1 as a value (Tenny & Hoffman, 2021). Hispanic, street race non-White, male participants were statistically significantly less likely to endorse "true" to engaging in feminist work. Hispanic, street race White, female participants were statistically significantly less likely to endorse "true" to being involved in groups to address needs of other minority groups, being a member of racial justice groups, and planning or organizing activities for racial justice. Hispanic, street race White, male participants were

statistically significantly more likely to endorse “true” to voting for political candidates and being a member of organization or groups. NHW female participants were statistically more likely to endorse “true” to participating in demonstrations, attending activities, engaging in feminist work, being involved in organizations to address needs of other groups, being a member of racial justice organizations or groups, and actively participating in racial justice activities. NHW male participants were statistically significantly less likely to endorse “true” for educating others and reading literature about racial justice.

Table 2. *Odds Ratios of Responding "True" to Each Activism Item in Each Social Location Group (Hypothesis 3)*

	Hispanic, non-White, Female N=39		Hispanic, non-White, Male N=14		Hispanic, White, Female N=18		Hispanic, White, Male N=7		non-Hispanic, White, Female N=37		non-Hispanic, White, Male N=7	
Item	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI.
Write to politicians	1.16	.53, 2.56	.26	.06, 1.23	.46	.14, 1.49	1.35	.29, 6.35	1.83	.83, 4.03	1.35	.29, 6.35
Educate others	.94	.30, 2.98	1.96	.24, 16.14	.61	.15, 2.43	.84	.09, 7.50	3.20	.69, 14.99	.16*	.03, .79
Participate in demonstrations	1.01	.47, 2.18	.64	.20, 2.02	.57	.21, 1.57	.57	.12, 2.64	2.36*	1.04, 5.39	.57	.12, 2.64
Attend conferences, etc.	.99	.46, 2.11	.83	.27, 2.53	1.07	.39, 2.93	.13	.02, 1.10	1.89	.85, 4.20	.62	.13, 2.89
Attend activities, etc.	1.04	.48, 2.24	.77	.25, 2.35	.59	.21, 1.61	.30	.06, 1.60	2.42*	1.06, 5.51	.58	.12, 2.70
Feminist work	1.08	.50, 2.33	.24*	.06, .90	.40	.14, 1.13	.34	.06, 1.83	4.90*	2.00, 12.02	.66	.14, 3.10
Antiracist in political activities	.66	.31, 1.42	.95	.31, 2.94	.88	.32, 2.42	.52	.11, 2.42	2.10	.92, 4.79	.96	.20, 4.47
Research, writing, or speaking	1.25	.58, 2.67	.40	.12, 1.35	.50	.18, 1.43	1.51	.32, 7.03	1.70	.78, 3.71	.82	.18, 3.82
Involved in organizations to address needs of other minority groups	1.08	.50, 2.31	.72	.34, 2.22	.33*	.11, 0.99	.38	.07, 2.04	2.84*	1.26, 6.39	.74	.16, 3.44
Planning/organizing events and activities	1.65	.73, 3.76	.99	.29, 3.41	.12*	.02, 0.95	.40	.05, 3.42	1.86	.81, 4.24	.40	.05, 3.42
Vote for political candidates	1.55	.52, 4.61	.44	.12, 1.59	1.00	.26, 3.84	1.21*	1.11, 1.32	1.41	.47, 4.22	.24	.05, 1.15
Donate money	.85	.40, 1.82	.83	.27, 2.53	.83	.30, 2.25	.62	.13, 2.89	1.89	.85, 4.20	.62	.13, 2.89
Teaching or mentoring	1.27	.58, 2.78	.42	.11, 1.60	.61	.20, 1.83	1.29	.27, 6.03	1.55	.70, 3.42	.66	.12, 3.55
Member of organization or groups	1.71	.76, 3.83	.90	.26, 3.07	.11*	.01, 0.86	1.48*	1.30, 1.68	2.29*	1.01, 5.17	.44	.05, 3.89
Read literature	1.75	.77, 4.00	1.05	.33, 3.35	1.19	.41, 3.42	.56	.11, 2.91	.93	.42. 2.07	.10*	.01, .92
Member of listserv	1.21	.53, 2.74	.90	.26, 3.07	.24	.05, 1.12	.36	.04, 3.11	2.05	.90, 4.65	.90	.17, 4.88
Actively participate	.98	.46, 2.10	.93	.31, 2.83	.55	.20, 1.52	.35	.07, 1.90	2.58*	1.15, 5.79	.35	.07, 1.90

Hypotheses 4

To test the hypothesis that internal motivation to respond without prejudice will be more strongly related to activism than external motivation to respond without prejudice, a Pearson product-moment correlation was run to assess the relationship between activism and both measures of motivation to respond without prejudice. A preliminary linear relationship was evaluated graphically instead of the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality due to a sample size over 50. There was a statistically significant, moderate positive correlation between internal motivation to respond without prejudice and engagement in racial justice activism, $r(147) = .31$, $p < .001$. There was no statistically significant correlation between external motivation to respond without prejudice and engagement in activism, $r(147) = -.14$, $p = .090$.

A Fisher's z-test was conducted using Lee & Preacher (2013, September) to determine if the differences between the correlations were significant. The difference in the correlations for internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice were significantly different, $z = 3.998$, $p < .001$.

Hypothesis 5

To test the hypothesis that activism-specific social support will be more strongly related to activism than general social support, the same analyses were completed as for Hypothesis 4. A Pearson product-moment correlation was run to assess the relationship between activism and both measures of social support. Sample had no further outliers as determined graphically. A preliminary linear relationship was evaluated graphically instead of the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality due to a sample size over 50. There was a statistically significant, strong positive correlation between activism-specific social support and engagement in racial justice activism, $r(147) = .22$, $p = .007$. There was no statistically

significant correlation between general social support and engagement in activism, r(147) = .03, *p* = .727.

A Fisher's z-test was conducted using Lee & Preacher (2013, September) to determine if the differences between the correlations were significant. The difference in the correlations for activism-specific and general social support were significantly different, z = 2.338, *p* = .019.

Hypothesis 6

To test the hypothesis that activism will be positively correlated with openness, empathy, multicultural experiences, allophilia, racial/ethnic identity, understanding privilege, both internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice, and both general and activism-specific social support and negatively correlated with authoritarianism and level of prejudice, correlations were assessed using zero-order Pearson correlation coefficients and was partially supported. Table 2 displays the correlations for all predictor variables and racial justice activism. Table 2 shows that the significant positive correlations with activism were largest for understanding privilege with a large effect size, followed by multicultural experience, openness, and internal motivation to respond without prejudice with medium effect sizes, and empathy, activism-specific social support, and allophilia with small effect sizes. In addition, the significant negative correlations with activism were largest for prejudice followed by authoritarianism with medium-large to medium effect sizes. The relationship between activism and external motivation to respond without prejudice, racial/ethnic identity, and social support did not achieve statistical significance.

Table 3. *Correlations between Activism and Related Factors (Hypothesis 6)*

	Act.	Allo.	ASC	IRI	MEQ	IMS	EMS	ODCS	Prej.	Priv.	MEIM	MOSS	Act. MOSS
Activism	---												
Allophilia	.184*	---											
Authoritarianism (ASC)	-.324**	-.119	---										
Empathy (IRI)	.230**	.214**	-.204*	---									
Multicultural Experiences (MEQ)	.382**	.341**	-.143	.314**	---								
Internal Motivation (IMS)	.313**	.299**	-.301**	.282**	.228**	---							
External Motivation (EMS)	-.139	-.163*	.157	-.207*	-.168*	-.004	---						
Openness (ODCS)	.314**	.307**	-.169*	.422**	.495**	.358**	-.155	---					
Prejudice	-.426**	-.324**	.392**	-.293**	-.254**	-.513**	.257**	-.334**	---				
Privilege	.602**	.344**	-.436**	.329**	.259**	.557**	-.219*	.373**	-.572**	---			
Racial/ethnic Identity (MEIM)	.171	-.034	-.048	.296**	.326**	.114	.025	.287**	-.097	.169	---		
Social Support (MOSS)	.029	.012	.096	.168*	.090	.082	-.056	.166*	-.028	.015	.116	---	
Activism-specific Social Support (Act. MOSS)	.219**	-.020	.152	.086	.218**	.110	.042	.132	.002	.022	.152	.502**	---

Note. N=103-149. ***p* < .01. **p* < .05.

Hypothesis 7

To test the hypothesis that the significantly correlated predictors will account for significant variance in activism, multiple regression analyses were run with the whole sample. Dummy variables were created for primary race (NHW vs. any other racial/ ethnicity group), gender (male vs. female), and sexual orientation (cisgender heterosexual participants vs. LGBTQ+ identified participants) and these were entered as independent variables since these had a significant difference determined by the t-tests in hypothesis 1. Allophilia, empathy, multicultural experiences, internal motivation to respond without prejudice, openness, activism-specific social support, authoritarianism, and level of prejudice were also entered as independent variables in the multiple regression analysis predicting activism in the whole sample due to significant correlations with activism. Due to the low Cronbach's alpha scores for the MEQ and IMS, analyses were run with and without these factors. While understanding of privilege had a significant correlation, it was not included in the analysis with the whole sample since only White participants were asked to answer that measure. Table 3 shows the regression coefficients and standard errors. Each of these multiple regression models significantly predicted engagement in activism with adjusted R-squared values between .261 and .293.

Table 4. *Multiple regression results for activism for whole sample (Hypothesis 7)*

Activism	including MEQ & IMS			MEQ only			IMS only			without MEQ & IMS		
	B	*SE B*	β	*B*	*SE B*	β	*B*	*SE B*	β	*B*	*SE B*	β
Overall sample (*n*=149)												
(Constant)	1.393	1.801		1.654	1.665		2.286	1.801		2.467	1.664	
Allophilia	-.052	.236	-.017	-.040	.233	-.013	.084	.234	.028	.092	.232	.030
Authoritarianism	-.570*	.247	-.184*	-.582*	.244	-.187	-.614*	.251	-.198	-.623*	.248	-.201
Empathy	-.002	.225	-.001	.003	.224	.001	.055	.228	.020	.058	.227	.021
Internal Motivation (IMS)	.039	.100	.033				.027	.102	.023			
Openness	.109	.177	.054	.119	.175	.059	.267	.169	.133	.274	.167	.136
Prejudice	-.388**	.140	-.246**	-.407**	.130	-.258	-.400**	.142	-.254	-.413**	.133	-.262
Act. Social Support	.235*	.090	.192*	.240**	.089	.196	.283**	.090	.232	.286**	.089	.234
Multicultural Exp. (MEQ)	.695*	.274	.215*	.690*	.273	.213						
Primary Race	-.313	.214	-.105	-.312	.213	-.104	-.330	.218	-.110	-.329	.217	-.110
Gender Identity	-.050	.243	-.015	-.058	.241	-.018	-.029	.247	-.009	-.036	.246	-.011
Variance Explained	R^2.337	ΔR^2.289***		R^2.336	ΔR^2.293***		R^2.306	ΔR^2.261***		R^2.305	ΔR^2.266***	

The limited sample size prevented this analysis for the six social location groups defined in hypothesis 2, so correlations were calculated for each social location. Understanding of privilege was included for the social location groups with street race as White. Table 4 shows the correlation coefficients for each group. Table 4 shows that multicultural experiences were statistically significant with activism for both Hispanic non-White and NHW female participants with a large effect size for both groups. Understanding privilege was statistically significant for Hispanic non-White (medium effect size), Hispanic White, and NHW female (large effect sizes) participants as well as NHW male participants (very large effect size). Prejudice was statistically significantly negatively correlated with activism for NHW participants, with a very large effect size for male participants and a medium effect size for female participants. Activism-specific social support was significantly positively correlated with activism in Hispanic non-White and NHW female participants with a large effect size. Internal motivation to respond without prejudice and openness were statistically significantly correlated with activism in the sample of NHW male participants with large effect sizes. Overall, the correlation coefficients appear different based on social location, though there are probably not significant differences since the sample sizes of the groups were relatively small.

Table 5. *Correlations between Activism and Factors by Social Location (Hypothesis 7)*

Factor	Hispanic, non-White, Female N=39	Hispanic, non-White, Male N=14	Hispanic, White, Female N=18	Hispanic, White, Male N=7	non-Hispanic, White. Female N=37	non-Hispanic. White. Male N=7
Allophilia	.189	-.311	-.183	.149	.039	.616
Authoritarianism	-.247	.250	-.353	-.736	-.302	.597
Empathy	.109	.105	.145	.048	.243	.734
Multicultural Experiences	.490**	-.199	.144	.166	.596***	.569
Internal Motivation	.169	-.148	-.005	.484	.159	.778*
External Motivation	-.187	-.109	-.343	.116	-.275	.159
Openness	.310	.069	.215	.171	.237	.789*
Prejudice	-.233	-.190	-.270	-.725	-.354*	-.878**
Privilege	.371*	.385	.523*	.615	.538***	.935**
Racial/Ethnic Identity	.201	.393	.174	-.406	---	---
Social Support	.014	.024	-.179	.140	.012	.453
Activism-Spec. Social Support	.241	.505	-.537*	.421	.507**	.646

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

Discussion

This study was designed as a preliminary study to examine factors related to activism including identity characteristics and social location. The first hypothesis that disadvantaged groups engage in higher levels of activism than advantaged groups was supported for gender and sexual orientation but not for racial and ethnic identity or disability status. The hypothesis related to social location was supported in that there were significant differences in reported level of activism based on social location, but the result that NHW female participants reported the highest levels of activism was surprising. Participants' likelihood of endorsing "true" for each item of the activism scale differed based on social location, indicating differences in ways that certain groups may engage in activism. Hypotheses 4 and

5 were supported, indicating that internal motivation to respond without prejudice and activism-specific social support have stronger relationships with activism than external motivation and general social support, respectively. Results of analyses for Hypothesis 6 indicate relationships in expected directions for most of the factors hypothesized to be related to activism, and results from Hypothesis 7 indicate that these factors account for significant variance in activism for the whole group. There were also different factors that were significantly correlated with activism when analyzed by social location.

Hypothesis 1

The hypothesis that disadvantaged groups would be higher on activism than advantaged groups was partially supported. When analyzed by primary race, there was a significant difference but in the opposite direction than hypothesized as NHW participants reported higher levels of engagement in activism than those participants with a disadvantaged racial or ethnic identity. There are several explanations for this, including the limitations of the study including the selection of students from psychology courses, small sample size with unequal distribution of participants in racial and ethnic categories and gender. This may be partially explained by membership in other disadvantaged groups as White allyship tends to be higher when White individuals are members of other disadvantaged groups (Williams & Sharif, 2021). The NHW participants were mostly female participants (84% female) compared to the remaining sample (54% female), so this may have also influenced this relationship.

It is also possible that White identification and group-based guilt may explain why this sample of NHW participants reported higher engagement in racial justice activism. Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, and Manstead (1998) found that those who have lower White

identification may have more group-based guilt and engage in activism to alleviate this guilt, especially when it is not possible to deny negative history of one's group. In the current climate of Black Lives Matter and another racial justice protests, it is difficult to deny active racism and White supremacy.

In addition, the location of data collection may also impact the level of activism of NHW allies due to increased multicultural experiences by White students who are attending a university that is situated in a state with a majority of Hispanic/Latino/a/x individuals and prides itself on Hispanic roots and culture. Multicultural experiences may have an effect on the level of White identification that NHW participants experience which may influence their engagement in activism. They may also influence the power dynamic between Hispanic/Latino/a/x individuals compared to NHW individuals. While White privilege is not overruled by being in a minority-majority state, it likely contributes to NHW individuals' experiences as White and lead to deeper understanding of White identity and lower White identification.

The hypothesis of higher engagement in activism among disadvantaged groups was supported by gender and sexual orientation. This may suggest that membership in these groups is a more significant predictor of racial justice activism than racial and ethnic identity. Replications with larger sample would be beneficial to explore this relationship.

Hypothesis 2

The hypothesis that engagement in racial justice activism differed based on social location was partially supported. NHW female participants had the highest reported engagement in activism, followed by Hispanic non-White female participants, NHW male participants, Hispanic White female participants, Hispanic White male participants, and

Hispanic non-White male participants. There were significant differences between NHW female participants and Hispanic non-White male participants and between Hispanic non-White female participants and Hispanic non-White male participants. While there are some significant differences between the social location groups, the results do not entirely align with hypothesized differences, which would be that Hispanic non-White female participants would report the highest levels of activism and NHW female participants would report lower levels. It is possible that White identification and group-based guilt may again explain some of this relationship as discussed for the results on primary race in Hypothesis 1. White identification and level of guilt may be impacted by the current racial justice climate and location of data collection. However, these results may have been more helpful with a larger sample size and more variables included for social location, such as income and LGBTQ+ or disability status. These results seem to indicate that gender is the most common identity factor related to activism when comparing activism by social location, supporting that intersectionality is much more complicated than adding levels of disadvantage.

Hypothesis 3

The likelihood of endorsing "true" for each item of the activism scale did differ based on social location groups. NHW female participants had the most items that they were statistically significantly more likely to endorse as "true" including participating in demonstrations, attending racial justice activities, engaging in feminist work, being involved in organizations that support other groups, being a member of racial justice organizations or groups, and actively participating in racial justice. This has a possible theme of being the more visible activities related to racial justice. Hispanic White male participants were significantly more likely to respond "true" to voting for political candidates and being a

member of an organization for racial justice, which may be related in the amount of effort required. Hispanic non-White male participants were statistically significantly less likely to engage in feminist work while NHW male participants were statistically significantly less likely to educate others or read literature related to social justice. Hispanic White female participants were statistically significantly less likely to be involved in organizations to address the needs of other minority groups, plan or organize events or activities, or be a member of a racial justice organization or group, all activities that appear to be time-consuming and involving group work. While a larger sample and additional questions may be helpful to understand these results, it suggests possible differences in ways to engage in racial justice work based on themes of visibility, social networking, level of effort, and required time.

Hypotheses 4 and 5

Hypotheses 4 and 5 were both supported with internal motivation to respond without prejudice and activism-related social support having a stronger and statistically significant relationship with activism while external motivation and general social support having no statistically significant relationship with activism. While the external motivation to appear politically correct and avoid offense due to social desirability can initiate and encourage change in perspective, there is a need to internalize one's desire to respond without prejudice and reduce one's prejudicial beliefs and actions in order to engage in activism. External motivation may start the process, but internal motivation consistent with one's desires and values may be a required step before an individual acts.

Social support is beneficial for mental health and may help prevent burnout for individuals engaging in social justice action (Sue, 2017; Tarakeli, 2007). However, given

one's social group, there can either be support and encouragement of activism or a lack of engagement or even prejudiced friends and colleagues. These preliminary findings indicate that, to encourage activism, it is important that there is social support focused on activism. Having friends or family as social support may not encourage racial justice activism and could theoretically discourage racial justice activism if one's social support is from individuals who do not value racial justice activism. These results support both Sue's (2017) and Tarakeli's (2007) suggestions that social support from other allies or activists may be the most important social support to encourage activism.

Hypotheses 6 and 7

Most of the hypothesized relationships between activism and the predictors were significant except for external motivation to respond without prejudice, general social support, and racial/ethnic identity. The former two further support hypotheses 4 and 5, that it is internal motivation to respond without prejudice and activism-related social support that encourage engagement in activism. These results support that internal motivation to respond without prejudice is important to NHW men and activism-specific social support is important for Hispanic White and NHW women. For racial/ethnic identity, analyses by social location did not support a relationship even among specific groups. It may be important to further narrow social location or collect a larger sample to determine if a participant's conceptualization of their racial/ethnic identity would relate to engagement in activism.

The predictors did account for significant variance in activism when examined in the overall sample. In addition, the factors that had a significant correlation with activism varied by social location, indicating that different factors may contribute to activism by social location. For example, understanding privilege was important for four out of the six social

location groups while multicultural experiences were significantly related to activism only among Hispanic non-White and non-Hispanic White female participants and both internal motivation to respond without prejudice and openness were only significantly related to activism in non-Hispanic White male participants.

Limitations

First, this study was cross-sectional and correlational. While the results are consistent with the theory that these factors contribute to racial justice activism, no definitive conclusions can be drawn about causality. However, the results regarding several hypotheses were consistent with the theory supporting the predictions. The benefits of this study are as preliminary analyses showing a relationship between these variables. To determine if increasing certain factors such as multicultural experiences, empathy, or openness to diversity would result in an increase in engagement in activism, a different study design that manipulates and evaluates levels of these variables over time would be needed.

It is also important to recognize that the sample here is not representative of the community at large. Traditional undergraduate students undoubtedly experience different pressures than older adults or adults in different situations, which likely shapes their engagement in activism. Also, studies support that attending college itself may reduce prejudice and increases activism (Pascarella et al., 1996). This study is limited to young adults in an undergraduate community. Factors may be different for individuals who have different education levels, access to higher education, or interest in higher education, or those who are non-traditional students. Even within samples of undergraduate students, this sample from a southwestern university has unique factors that allow for both advantages and disadvantages. A large population of Hispanic/Latino/a/x students contributes to a large

sample size for this group. However, results may not be generalizable to other universities with fewer Hispanic students and where the Hispanic presence is not so well established..

In addition to sample limitations of age and education level, the sample sizes for social locations were smaller than needed to run the analyses planned. Social location was also defined by street race, ethnicity, and gender, so it did not include class as would typically be expected. There also was not a large enough sample to further define social location by first generation and continuing generation students, income, sexual orientation, disability status, or other categorical variables of interest. This reduced the ability to classify participants by some of the important factors that may indicate social location.

Additionally, this study was completed during an unusual period in time that may have impacted the sample making the findings more unique or idiosyncratic. This data was collected during a pandemic and after a tumultuous election and an increase in racial justice protests and overt acts of racism. It is unclear how these factors may be different given a different set of circumstances.

Implications

The drive behind this study is determining how it is possible to encourage people to be more engaged in activism. Results of the study are limited but due suggest the importance of factors such as the internal motivation to respond without prejudice due to one's personal values and the benefits of activism-related social support. This could inform a focus in trainings on encouraging and heightening values work related to racial justice activism and then forming groups that have a focus on racial justice activism. There are also potential implications here to tailor trainings based on group identity and/or highlight different ways to engage in activism to broaden possible ways to get involved.

Future Research Directions

It would be beneficial to collect additional data with a larger and more diverse sample size, including collecting data on participants who are not receiving an undergraduate education. From this preliminary data, factors related to activism vary in significance and impact based on advantaged and disadvantaged identity and intersectional social location. This means that, in order to generalize findings outside of college, data would not only need to be collected on a larger sample, but also a more diverse sample in age and experience.

In addition, to assess the causal relationship between these factors and activism, it might be possible to use a randomized controlled trial where the experimental condition involves the manipulation of one or more factors. For example, openness to experience appears to increase with acceptance and commitment therapy and measures of prejudice and activism could be completed before and after treatment. There is also the possibility to introduce multicultural experiences and determine causality with measures of prejudice and activism.

Conclusions

This study supports hypotheses that multiple factors contribute to racial justice activism and differ by group identity and social location. Female vs. male participants and LGBTQ+ vs. cisgender heterosexual participants significantly differed in engagement in activism in the expected direction. However, some results were unexpected, such as NHW female participants reporting the highest levels of activism. Internal motivation to respond without prejudice and activism-specific social support had significant relationships with activism while external motivation and general social support did not. In addition, the preliminary results that a model including allophilia, authoritarianism, empathy, multicultural experiences, openness, and prejudice statistically significantly predicted engagement in activism support the hypotheses of multiple factors contributing to activism. However, differences in significance in different social location groups indicates the need to further evaluate what factors are most important to contribute to activism when and for whom.

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Oxford, England: Addison-Wesley.

Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2*, 113–133. doi:10.1207/s15327582ijpr0202_5

Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2011). Seeing the unseen: Attention to daily encounters with sexism as way to reduce sexist beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *35*(2), 227-242. doi:10.1177/0361684310397509

Bobo, L. D. (2017). Racism in Trump's America: Reflections on culture, sociology, and the 2016 US presidential election. *British Journal of Sociology*, *68*(S1), S85–S104. Retrieved from https://search-ebscohost-com.libproxy.unm.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2017-50599-005&login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Brandt, M. J., & Reyna, C. (2014). To love or hate thy neighbor: The role of authoritarianism and traditionalism in explaining the link between fundamentalism and racial prejudice. *Political Psychology*, *35*(2), 207-223.

Brown, K. T., & Ostrove, J. M. (2013). What does it mean to be an ally?: The perception of allies from the perspective of people of color. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *43*(11), 2211-2222.

Buhin, L., & Vera, E. M. (2009). Preventing racism and promoting social justice: Person-centered and environment-centered interventions. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, *30*(1), 43-59. doi:10.1007/s10935-008-0161-9

Butz, D. A., & Plant, E. A. (2009). Prejudice control and interracial relations: The role of motivation to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality, 77*(5), 1311–1341. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00583.x

Clarke, I., III, Flaherty, T. B., Wright, N. D., & McMillen, R. M. (2009). Student intercultural proficiency from study abroad programs. *Journal of Marketing Education, 31*(2), 173–181. https://doi-org.libproxy.unm.edu/10.1177/0273475309335583

Curtin, N., Kende, A., & Kende, J. (2016). Navigating multiple identities: The simultaneous influence of advantaged and disadvantaged identities on politicization and activism. *Journal of Social Issues*, *72*(2), 264-285.

Curtin, N., & McGarty, C. (2016). Expanding on psychological theories of engagement to understand activism in context (s). *Journal of Social Issues*, *72*(2), 227-241.

Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 10*. Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mark_Davis18/publication/34891073_Individual_differences_in_empathy__a_multidimensional_approach_/links/0046352dee2296ea54000000.pdf

Doosje, B., Branscombe, N. R., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1998). Guilty by association: When one's group has a negative history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*, 872–876.

Douthitt, S. S., Eby, L. T., & Simon, S. A. (1999). Diversity of life experiences: The development and validation of a biographical measure of receptiveness to dissimilar others. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *7*(2), 112-125.

Droogendyk, L., Wright, S. C., Lubensky, M., & Louis, W. R. (2016). Acting in solidarity: Cross-group contact between disadvantaged group members and advantaged group allies. *Journal of Social Issues*, *72*(2), 315-334.

Dunwoody, P. T., & Funke, F. (2016). The Aggression-Submission-Conventionalism Scale: Testing a New Three Factor Measure of Authoritarianism. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, *4*(2), 571-600. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v4i2.168

Frost, D. M., Fine, M., Torre, M. E., & Cabana, A. (2019). Minority Stress, Activism, and Health in the Context of Economic Precarity: Results from a National Participatory Action Survey of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Gender Non-Conforming Youth. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *63*(3/4), 511–526. https://doi-org.libproxy.unm.edu/10.1002/ajcp.12326

Gonzalez, K. A., Riggle, E. D., & Rostosky, S. S. (2015). Cultivating positive feelings and attitudes: A path to prejudice reduction and ally behavior. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science, 1*(4), 372.

Greenwood, R. M. (2015). Remembrance, responsibility, and reparations: The use of emotions in talk about the 1921 Tulsa Race Riot. *Journal of Social Issues, 71*(2), 338–355. doi: 10.1111/josi.12114

Hardiman, R. (1982, July). White identity development: A process-oriented model for describing the racial consciousness of White Americans. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 104.

Hayes, S. C., Luoma, J. B., Bond, F. W., Masuda, A., & Lillis, J. (2006). Acceptance and Commitment Therapy: Model, processes and outcomes. Behaviour Research & Therapy, 44(1), 1-25. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2005.06.006

Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY, England: Greenwood Press.

Hodson, G., & Dhont, K. (2015). The person-based nature of prejudice: Individual difference predictors of intergroup negativity. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *26*(1), 1-42.

Hope, E. C., Keels, M., & Durkee, M. I. (2016). Participation in Black Lives Matter and deferred action for childhood arrivals: Modern activism among Black and Latino college students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*(3), 203.

Jones, K. N., Brewster, M. E., & Jones, J. A. (2014). The creation and validation of the LGBT Ally Identity Measure. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, *1*(2), 181.

Jones, K. N., & Brewster, M. E. (2017). From awareness to action: Examining predictors of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) activism for heterosexual people. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *87*(6), 680.

Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *55*(6), 893.

Lensmire, T. J., McManimon, S. K., Tierney, J. D., Lee-Nichols, M. E., Casey, Z. A., Lensmire, A., & Davis, B. M. (2013). McIntosh as synecdoche: How teacher education's focus on White privilege undermines antiracism. *Harvard Educational Review*, *83*(3), 410-431. doi:10.17763/haer.83.3.35054h14l8230574

Levin, M. E., Luoma, J. B., Vilardaga, R., Lillis, J., Nobles, R., & Hayes, S. C. (2016). Examining the role of psychological inflexibility, perspective taking, and empathic

concern in generalized prejudice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *46*(3), 180-191. doi:10.1111/jasp.12355

López, N. (2013). Chapter 12. Contextualizing Lived Race-Gender and the Racialized-Gendered Social Determinants of Health. In L. Gómez & N. López (Ed.), *Mapping "Race"* (pp. 179-212). Ithaca, NY: Rutgers University Press. https://doi.org/10.36019/9780813561387-015

Lopez, N., Vargas, E. D., Juarez, M., Cacari-Stone, L., & Bettez, S. (2018). What's Your "Street Race"? Leveraging Multidimensional Measures of Race and Intersectionality for Examining Physical and Mental Health Status among Latinxs. *SOCIOLOGY OF RACE AND ETHNICITY*, *4*(1), 49–66. https://doi-org.libproxy.unm.edu/10.1177/2332649217708798

Mallinckrodt, B., Miles, J. R., Bhaskar, T., Chery, N., Choi, G., & Sung, M. R. (2014). Developing a comprehensive scale to assess college multicultural programming. *Journal of counseling psychology*, *61*(1), 133.

Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2013). *Motivational interviewing: Helping people change., 3rd edition*. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

Mussel, P., Winter, C., Gelléri, P., & Schuler, H. (2011). Explicating the openness to experience construct and its subdimensions and facets in a work setting. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *19*(2), 145–156. https://doi-org.libproxy.unm.edu/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2011.00542.x

Narvaez, D., & Hill, P. L. (2010). The relation of multicultural experiences to moral judgment and mindsets. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *3*(1), 43–55. https://doi-org.libproxy.unm.edu/10.1037/a0018780

Ostrove, J. M., & Brown, K. T. (2018). Are allies who we think they are?: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *48*(4), 195-204.

Pascarella, E. T., Edison, M., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L. S., & Terenzini, P. T. (1996). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the first year of college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *67*(2), 174-195.

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *35*(3), 271-280. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.001

Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *54*(3), 271–281. https://doi-org.libproxy.unm.edu/10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271

Pinterits, E. J., Poteat, V. P., & Spanierman, L. B. (2009). The White Privilege Attitudes Scale: Development and initial validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *56*, 417–429. https://doi.org/10.1037/ a0016274

Pittinsky, T. L., Rosenthal, S. A., & Montoya, R. M. (2011). Measuring positive attitudes toward outgroups: Development and validation of the Allophilia Scale. In L. Tropp & R. K. Mallett (Eds.), *Moving beyond prejudice reduction: Pathways to positive intergroup relations* (pp. 41–60), Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 811–832. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.3.811

Reason, R. D., Roosa Millar, E. A., & Scales, T. C. (2005). Toward a model of racial justice ally development. *Journal of College Student Development*, *46*(5), 530-546.

Rowe, W., Bennett, S. K., & Atkinson, D. R. (1994). White racial identity models: A critique and alternative proposal. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *22*(1), 129-146. doi:10.1177/0011000094221009

Sherbourne, C. D., & Stewart, A. L. (1991). The MOS social support survey. *Social science & medicine*, *32*(6), 705-714.

Sparkman, D. J., Eidelman, S., & Blanchar, J. C. (2016). Multicultural experiences reduce prejudice through personality shifts in Openness to Experience. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *46*(7), 840-853. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2189

Stein, H. F., & Allcorn, S. (2018). A fateful convergence: Animosity toward Obamacare, hatred of Obama, the rise of Donald Trump, and overt racism in America. *The Journal of Psychohistory*, *45*(4), 234–243. Retrieved from https://search-ebscohost-com.libproxy.unm.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2018-13423-001&login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2012). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice., 6th ed*. Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Sue, D. W. (2017). The challenges of becoming a White ally. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *45*(5), 706-716. doi:10.1177/0011000017719323

Swank, E., Woodford, M. R., & Lim, C. (2013). Antecedents of pro-LGBT advocacy among sexual minority and heterosexual college students. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, *10*(4), 317-332.

Szymanski, D. M. (2004). Relations among dimensions of feminism and internalized heterosexism in lesbians and bisexual women. *Sex Roles, 51,* 145 –159. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000037759.33014.55

Tarakali, V. (2007). Towards a psychology of unlearning racism: A case study of a Buddhist unlearning racism course for White people. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 68,* 654.

Tenny, S., & Hoffman, M. R. (2021, May 30). *Odds ratio*. StatPearls [Internet]. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK431098/.

White, A. M. (2006). Racial and gender attitudes as predictors of feminist activism among self-identified African American feminists. *Journal of Black Psychology, 32*(4), 455-478.

Williams, M., & Sharif, N. (2021). Racial allyship: Novel measurement and new insights. N*ew Ideas in Psychology, 62*. https://doi-

Zakrisson, I. (2005). Construction of a short version of the right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*(5), 863–872. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.02.026