Personality and Everyday Social Justice Behavior:

"A Broader Set of Acts"

by

Samantha A. Montgomery

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Psychology and Women's Studies)
in the University of Michigan
2014**

Doctoral Committee

Professor Abigail J. Stewart, Chair
Professor Lorraine M. Gutiérrez
Professor Denise J. Sekaquaptewa
Professor David G. Winter

Dedication

For Mom

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been completed without the support and guidance of many people. While I am ultimately responsible for the final product, this research was informed by the work of scholars who have come before me and refined over time by the insights of many colleagues and mentors. As with any piece of knowledge contribution, it required collective effort to make possible.

First and foremost, it has been an absolute privilege to work with my academic advisor and dissertation chair, Abby Stewart. She consistently provided thorough and thoughtful feedback on chapter drafts, statistical output, and half-baked ideas. Her level of commitment and care is truly remarkable. Abby is a brilliant and dedicated mentor and I am lucky to know her.

My other committee members—Lorraine Gutiérrez, Denise Sekaquaptewa, and David Winter—were extremely helpful throughout the entire writing process. Their insights challenged me to think more deeply about my research, ask new questions, and consider alternatives. Thank you for pushing me.

I have had the good fortune of encountering many other mentors throughout my academic career, including Lilia Cortina, Liz Cole, Sara McClelland, Maria Cotera, Kevin Lanning, Wairimu Njambi, Jeff Buller, and Shereen Siddiqui. I am a better researcher and teacher because of them.

All of the faculty, students, and staff in the Psychology and Women's Studies departments have marked my graduate school experience in one way or another. I am especially grateful to the members of the Gender and Personality in Context and Gender and Respect in

Organizations research lab groups, both past and present. Thank you for providing a safe space to share ideas and learn from each other.

To all of my comrades in the Graduate Employees' Organization—thank you for being friends in the struggle. Solidarity Forever!

I would not be where I am without the love and support of my family and friends. Mom, Rob, Sara—thank you for your enduring patience, kindness, and warmth. It keeps me going.

Finally, I wish to thank all of the research participants for their time, effort and wisdom. To all those working to promote social justice, whether in big ways or small, you inspire me each and every day.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Abstract

This dissertation contributes to the growing body of literature exploring activist behaviors intended to promote social justice. Across 3 studies, a new measure of social justice behavior was created and validated using the Act Frequency Approach (Buss and Craik, 1980). Although existing measures of social justice behavior tend to narrowly define the construct as engagement in collective action, participants in Study 1 ($n = 137$) were encouraged to nominate and evaluate a broad set of acts also relevant to their daily lives. The final 22-item Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) scale reflects a range of global and domain-specific actions that were rated as prototypical by both 53 undergraduate novices and 20 activist experts in Study 2. Participants in study 3 ($n = 388$) were then asked to self-rate how frequently they perform each of the items in the ESJB scale, along with a series of other measures of proposed correlates.

Consistent with Hypothesis 1, both membership in marginalized groups (e.g. women, sexual minorities) and holding a political orientation on the left side of the spectrum were positively related to scores on the ESJB scale. Moreover, confirming Hypothesis 2, ESJB scores were positively related to structural attributions of social change, intersectional awareness, beliefs about the importance and confidence in taking action, openness to experience, extraversion and empathy, and negatively related to social dominance orientation, system justification, and the need for cognitive closure Furthermore, consistent with Hypothesis 3, ESJB was correlated moderately with another established measure of progressive activist engagement, suggesting that they are related, yet distinct measures of social justice behavior. Finally, confirming Hypothesis 4, there were significant group differences between participants who

scored high on both ESJB and Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ) as compared to

participants who scored high on only one measure or low on both. Overall, the findings affirm

the benefits of the Act Frequency Approach to behavioral measure development and the value of

using it to explore the relationships between individual differences and social justice behaviors.

Chapter 1:

Introduction

> I don't think we should ever let a question of, "Is this one act actually doing anything?" be the only way to judge activism. Plenty of acts which we see as genuine activism—protest acts—could be said to not have in that moment or in that direct sense achieved the goal…They are part of a broader set of acts and the broader politics and the struggle. ~Stephen Ward

The quotation above is from a recent article in the *Michigan Daily* (Goldberg, 2013), a University of Michigan student newspaper, which asked how student activism has changed on campus over the years. By addressing whether or not 'slacktivism,' or activist engagement through the Internet and social media, is a 'real' form of activism, Ward touches upon a long-standing debate in the field. Some scholars have argued that these alternative forms of social engagement have little impact on society (Morozov, 2009), whereas others have acknowledged the promising possibilities of multiple and varied types of social justice activism (Christensen, 2011). Indeed, identifying exactly what 'counts' as activism is often unclear, or ambiguous at best. Just as activist behaviors may or may not achieve the goal of changing the status quo, behaviors intended to change the status quo may or may not promote social justice (e.g. activist engagement for reactionary causes). This dissertation defines activist behaviors as behaviors intended to promote social justice, allowing for a broader set of acts to be identified.

The Psychology of Social Justice Behavior

According to Rawls' Theory of Justice (1971), there are two main principles undergirding our understandings of fairness in the contemporary social contract. The *liberty principle* posits that each individual has the right to the same basic liberties as every other

individual, whereas the *difference principle* promotes equality of opportunity among individuals. Within social and organizational psychological research, the topic of justice has often been explored in terms of perceptions of procedural, as opposed to outcome-based, fairness in the workplace or other social settings (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Others have examined justice in terms of behavior, often exploring collective action engagement to promote progressive social change. For example, social identity theorists (Reicher, 1984; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) have studied the relationship between common social identifications (e.g. politicized identification on the basis of gender, race, sexual orientation, etc.) and social justice behavior, using engagement in collective action as the primary outcome of interest. Indeed, Van Zomeren et al (2008) have proposed the Social Identity Model of Collective Action (SIMCA), which posits that perceived injustice, politicized identity, and experiences of disadvantage all predict engagement in collective action. Similarly, Duncan (1999) studied how group consciousness motivates actions that undermine institutionalized power inequities, including behaviors ranging from signing a petition to attending a rally or demonstration. However, social justice behaviors may not be limited to collective actions, but instead may encompass a broader range of behaviors, including any action that promotes fairness and/or confronts prejudice.

In fact, behavior intended to create social change may occur in interpersonal, everyday contexts. According to Philomena Essed (1991), "in our everyday lives sociological distinctions between 'institutional' and 'interactional,' between ideology and discourse, between 'private' and 'public' spheres of influence merge and form a complex of social relations and situations" (3). Although everyday resistance to social inequities may seem trivial in comparison to broader social movements, it may nevertheless affect individuals in profound ways. Confronting microagressions (Sue et al., 2007), for example, may be characterized by micro level

interruptions of the status quo that violate normative assumptions (e.g. consciously using gender-neutral language, objecting to sexist or racist jokes, providing support to a friend who "comes out" as lesbian or gay, etc.). For example, Essed (1991) has studied the ways in which Black women have confronted the "everyday racism" they experience, noting the ways in which confronting this type of discrimination may in fact be more taxing and seem more risky to individuals than confronting systemic inequities.

It is important to note that people who promote social justice on a daily basis do not always engage in collective action. For example, a low-wage worker who may advocate forming a union to her coworkers may not have the means to attend a rally at the state capitol to defend worker's rights. Social movement activism often requires individuals to have time, resources, and access to networks pertaining to the cause they are interested in (Cook, 1983; Stewart, Settles, & Winter, 1998). Similarly, individuals who engage in collective action may not always challenge inequities in their day-to-day lives; indeed their interpersonal interactions may sometimes replicate the power structures that activists work to resist when fighting for a "cause." That is, activists in progressive social movements can still hold normative assumptions that lead them to privilege certain groups over others in their thoughts and actions. For example, Evans (1980) chronicles how women in the new left movement of the 1960s and 1970s often faced sexism from their male counterparts, leading to internal conflicts and dissatisfaction with the cause. Moreover, during the height of the second wave of the women's movement, some of these same women treated sexual minority feminists or feminists of color in the same dismissive manner, reinforcing power relations based on race and sexual orientation (Collins, 1989, 1990; Crenshaw, 1991). Indeed, individual behavior may not be consistent across all situations; it is therefore

important to examine the factors associated with social justice behavior in multiple domains and contexts.

Ultimately, there are many actions that may challenge the status quo and promote social justice. A student may stand up to a bully, a friend may share a petition on FaceBook, a colleague may help to make the workplace more inviting to underrepresented minorities, or an individual could do her best to avoid derogatory language across situations. It is difficult to draw a boundary around the phenomenon of social justice behavior, since it may arise in multiple arenas, involve different kinds of actions, and address different forms of inequity (e.g. based on gender, race, class, etc.). According to Kelly's (1963) range corollary, a construct is only "convenient for the anticipation of a finite range of events," (p. 68). Many of the existing measures of social justice behavior focus on a narrow range of the construct, neglecting to capture important elements of everyday activism. It is therefore important to develop a new measure of social justice behavior that includes a wider range of actions that fall under the construct. While there are a variety of approaches to scale development (e.g. theory-based, item-differentiation between exemplars, etc.), one strategy for developing a broad measure of social justice behavior is to identify a range of social justice actions in which an individual may engage, which in turn may be motivated by a variety of traits, motives, goals, or intentions. Overall, this dissertation seeks empirically to define and expand the construct of social justice behavior for broader use within psychological research.

The Act Frequency Approach

Developed by Buss & Craik (1980), the Act Frequency Approach, or AFA, is one available method for developing a broader measure of social justice behavior with strong content validity. Originally used in the development of a measure for the personality disposition of dominance,

the AFA was designed to allow researchers to develop measures for constructs with "fuzzy categories" (Buss & Craik, 1983). Over three stages, the AFA attempts to systematically define constructs that are otherwise difficult to operationalize for comparison against other established measures. Participants are first asked to nominate actions that best represent the construct of interest, which generates a wide range of items that can be commonly nominated or unique to a single participant. After incorporating lay knowledge about the construct through the act nomination procedure, the AFA then provides an opportunity to refine the construct through expert and novice prototypicality ratings. After the most prototypical items are selected, participants are asked to rate how frequently they themselves perform the actions and complete other measures of interest. The relationship between the scale and its correlates is then tested and checked against other established measures for validity.

Of course, constructs that are difficult to specify in terms of concrete actions (e.g., personality traits) may not lend themselves well to this method. Indeed, the Act Frequency Approach has been frequently criticized for its use in the assessment of personality traits (Block, 1989; Moser, 1989), where specific behaviors may be reflections or expressions of multiple traits. Although the Act Frequency Approach may not be entirely useful for producing valid measures of personality dispositions, it may be more successfully used to identify a range of actions which fall under a "fuzzy" *behavioral* construct. Contemporary studies have used the AFA to provide operational definitions of ambiguous behavioral constructs with more promising results. For example, Icevic (2007) used the AFA to define differences between artistic and everyday creativity in terms of specific behavior. After participants nominated examples for both types of creativity, Icevic (2007) found differences in the correlates of the two measures. Other studies have similarly used the AFA to define the behavioral content of ideal mating strategies

(Jonason, Li, & Cason, 2009), patient empowerment (Faulkner, 2001), social intelligence (Willmann, Feldt, & Amelang, 1997), impulsivity (Romero et al, 1994), generativity (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992), and organizational change (Szamosi & Duxbury, 2002). Ultimately, the AFA seems to be a viable method for operationalizing behavioral constructs into measures with strong content validity.

Personality Correlates of Social Justice Behavior

Research on social justice behavior in psychology has previously explored the relationships between personality dispositions and beliefs about social inequities and commitment to social change (Cole & Stewart, 1996; Duncan & Stewart, 1995; Gurin, 1985; Gurin, Miller, & Gurin, 1980; Henderson-King & Stewart, 1997; Kay & Jost, 2003; Sidanius & Pratto, 2001; Snyder, Peeler, & May, 2008). This research includes studies of the importance of group identification and consciousness (Gurin, Miller, and Gurin, 1980). Indeed, membership in a marginalized group has been linked to greater rates of own-group and ally activism (Curtin, 2011; Swank & Fahs, 2013). For example, Montgomery and Stewart (2012) found that not only were heterosexual women more likely than heterosexual men to recognize their own heterosexual privilege; they were also more likely than heterosexual men to resist heteronormativity. Although heterosexual men and women engaged in comparable levels of ally activism for lesbian and gay rights, heterosexual men who resisted heteronormativity were more likely to behave like allies than heterosexual men who accepted the status quo. Members of stigmatized groups like women or sexual minorities may be more readily able to recognize and identify with targets of normative assumptions, whereas members of dominant groups may rely on other factors to motivate them to action. Moreover, membership in a marginalized group may predict participation in multiple forms of social justice behavior, such as higher levels of

interpersonal interaction and support. Political orientations have also been linked to various types of activist engagement (Cole & Stewart, 1996), yet not much is known about the importance of political leanings in everyday social justice behavior.

Indeed, psychological approaches often view social justice behavior as an outcome of individual differences, including social attitudes. For example, structural awareness, or the ability to recognize institutionalized power inequities, has been associated with social justice behaviors (Kluegel, 1990). Structural awareness can be learned; Lopez, Gurin & Nagda (1998) found that students who more actively participated in a course on intergroup relations were more likely to provide structural causal attributions of intergroup conflict and targets of change. Of course, beliefs about the merits of social inequities, or refusal to acknowledge problems with the status quo, should negatively relate to commitment to social change (Kay & Jost, 2003; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994), whereas awareness of the interconnectedness of oppression (Collins, 1989; Crenshaw, 1991; Curtin, Stewart, & Cole, under review; Greenwood, 2008) should broaden individual engagement in social justice behaviors. Moreover, recognizing the importance of reducing prejudice and promoting diversity, as well as feeling confident about one's individual ability to act, are logical precursors to engaging in social justice behavior (Nagda, Kim & Truelove, 2004).

The personality trait of Openness to Experience (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991) has also been linked to political engagement, as has Personal Political Salience, or PPS (Duncan & Stewart, 2007). Indeed, Curtin, Stewart, and Duncan (2010) argued that openness leads people both to attach personal meaning to political events (indicated by PPS) and to engage in social activism. Need for Cognitive Closure, on the other hand, is negatively related to Openness to Experience (Roets & van Hiel, 2011) and may predict lower levels of social justice behavior.

7

Openness is a relatively stable trait (McAdams & Pals, 2006) and may be present among those who engage in a variety of social justice behaviors. It is less clear how other personality traits like extraversion may operate in relationship to various forms of social justice behavior. Extraverts may be more likely to engage in all types of social justice behavior, or extraversion may be more necessary for certain behaviors, such as interpersonal confrontation. Other research has explored the importance of empathy (Hoffman, 1990), emotional closeness with stigmatized groups (Fingerhut, 2011), and other affective predictors in motivating social justice action, yet it is unclear whether this relationship holds for all forms of social justice behaviors. Ultimately, it is important to understand how individual differences may differentially relate to social justice behaviors.

Overall Research Questions and Hypotheses

Across three studies, the Act Frequency Approach (Buss & Craik, 1980) will be used to create and validate a new measure of social justice behavior that captures a broad range of actions. Using the Act Nomination Procedure, the first study will explore the following research question:

R1: What are the different ways in which people promote fairness, inclusion, and equity or challenge unfairness, exclusion, and inequity?

Using the list of multiple acts generated by Study 1, the second study will ask novice and expert raters the following question:

R2: Which of the actions promoting fairness, inclusion, and equity are the most prototypical social justice behaviors?

After producing a final scale from the typicality ratings in Study 2, participants in Study 3 will be asked to rate how frequently they engage in each of the social justice behaviors and complete a series of related measures. The following hypotheses will be tested:

H1: Membership in a marginalized group and left political orientation should relate to scores on the social justice behavior scale.

H2: Reporting social justice behaviors should be positively related to structural attributions of social change, intersectional awareness, beliefs about the importance and confidence in taking action, openness to experience, extraversion and empathy, and negatively related to social dominance orientation, system justification, and the need for cognitive closure.

H3: Reporting social justice behaviors should correlate moderately with other established measures of progressive activist engagement, suggesting that they are related, yet distinct measures.

H4: Participants who score high on multiple measures of social justice behavior will be significantly different from participants who score high on only one measure of social justice behavior or low on both.

Chapter 2:

Study 1

The Act Nomination Procedure

The first step of the Act Frequency Approach (Buss & Craik, 1980) is the act nomination procedure; in this step, participants nominate good examples of actions that reflect the construct of interest. Increasing the number of participants who nominate acts should increases the range and diversity of responses. Therefore, in studies using the AFA, actions are usually nominated by a relatively large number of people who may think of some similar but also some different actions that reflect the construct (Faulkner, 2001; Icevic, 2007; Jonason, Li, & Cason, 2009; McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992; Szamosi & Duxbury, 2002; Romero et al, 1994; Willmann, Feldt, & Amelang, 1997). By compiling every nominated unique act into a single list, or "multiple act composite," the AFA can result in a more comprehensive measure that taps into layperson understandings of ambiguous constructs (Buss & Craik, 1980).

For the first study of this dissertation, the act nomination procedure of the AFA was used to produce a broad list of social justice behaviors. Since it is difficult to define precisely what should count as "social justice actions," participants were asked to nominate examples of social justice actions both "in general" and in terms of specific domains (e.g., with respect to race, gender, sexuality, etc.). The inclusion of specific domains was intended to prompt responses that may not have otherwise been captured by the general prompt.

Method

Participants were asked to generate a list of ways in which people may promote fairness, inclusion, and equity or challenge unfairness, exclusion and inequity. The text of the Global Justice prompt read,

> "Think of people you have observed who promote fairness, inclusion and equity among different people. The people you think of may include people you know well (family members, other students) or people you know less well (teachers, coaches, etc.).

> What are some of the things they do? List as many as you can."

Using the same instructions, participants were also asked to generate a list of ways in which people may promote fairness, inclusion, and equity in one of the following specific domains: 1) in relation to men and women, 2) in relation to people of different racial or ethnic groups, 3) in relation to people of different socioeconomic or social class backgrounds, 4) in relation to people of different ages, 5) in relation to people of different sexual orientations, or 6) in relation to people of different physical, mental, or emotional abilities and limitations. Particular domains were assigned to participants randomly. Finally, participants were asked to answer a series of demographic questions about their age, gender, class standing, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, ability status, socioeconomic background, political orientation, and whether or not they identified as an activist (Appendix A).

Participants

Participants in this study included 137 University students recruited via the undergraduate Introduction to Psychology subject pool and graduate student email lists. The sample was mostly first year students (60%), and only 2% of the sample ($n = 3$) was enrolled in graduate studies. On average, the participants were 18.84 years old, and 56.4% ($n = 75$) self-identified as female.

The sample was predominantly white: 73% self-identified as White-European, 18% self-identified as Asian, 7% self-identified as Black-African, 2% self-identified as Latino/a, 1% self-identified as Middle Eastern, and 2% self-identified as other. No participants in the sample self-identified as Native American. The sample was also predominantly heterosexual: 90% self-identified as completely heterosexual and 7% self-identified as "mostly heterosexual." Only 7% of the sample self-identified as having a disability, reporting both visible and invisible types of disabilities.

The majority of respondents reported economic security when they were growing up: 54% described their family situation as "well to do" or "extremely well to do," while 30% reported having "more than enough to get by." Participants were also asked to compare their current social standing, relative to other people in the United States, on a scale of 0 (people who are the "worst off") to 100 (people who are the "best off"). Scores on this measure ranged from 8 to 100, with an average score of 68.0 (SD = 19.08).

The sample was politically moderate; on a scale of 1 (liberal) to 7 (conservative), the average score on political orientation was 3.59 (n = 133). Finally, the majority of the sample did not identify as activists (56%), while a substantial portion of the sample (39%) were "unsure." For those who did self-identify as an activist, participants reported a variety of reasons why they identified that way, including that they work on "many issues of social justice," believe in "equality for all," or "actively standing up for what they believe in."

Results

In order to derive the final list of actions reflecting social justice behaviors, both global and domain-specific act nominations were included. On average, participants nominated 3.34 acts in response to the Global Justice prompt (n = 137, SD = 1.81). In response to the domain-

specific prompts, participants on average nominated 2.68 acts promoting Gender Justice ($n = 25$,

$SD = 1.34$), 2.41 acts promoting Race/Ethnicity Justice ($n = 22$, $SD = 1.56$), 2.33 acts promoting

Social Class Justice ($n = 30$, $SD = 0.99$), 2.35 acts promoting Age Justice ($n = 20$, $SD = 1.60$),

2.92 acts promoting Sexual Orientation Justice ($n = 13$, $SD = 1.50$), and 2.52 acts promoting

Disability Justice ($n = 21$, $SD = 1.12$). Consistent with the norms of AFA research, both

commonly named actions (e.g. "make it a point to include everyone in activities," "give

everyone equal opportunities," "treat everybody equally," etc.) and unique actions (e.g. "protest

things you believe are wrong,""present racism in an ironic or comical fashion in an attempt to

enlighten the stupidity of it," "give up privileges to be fair," etc.) were included in the final list,

but responses that did not really provide specific actions (e.g. "my mother", "they are

intelligent," "they are people of integrity," etc.) were eliminated, as were actions that were

redundant.

Using this procedure, a total of 71 different social justice actions that were nominated by

participants were identified, and grouped into Global and Domain-Specific Justice categories.

Each of the nominated actions, along with their frequency of nomination, is reported in Table 1.

Table 1.

Final List of Nominated Social Justice Behaviors

Nominated Actions	Frequency
Global Justice Actions ($n = 46$)	
1. Make it a point to include everyone in activities.	19
2. Give everyone equal opportunities.	15
3. Treat everybody equally.	15

4. Be open to new ideas and thoughts.	12
5. Treat everyone with the same standards.	10
6. Look at things from more than one point of view.	9
7. Treat people with respect.	9
8. Don't choose favorites.	9
9. Encourage participation by everyone.	8
10. Create an environment in which everyone can express their ideas.	7
11. Be friendly to everyone around you.	6
12. Be kind to everyone.	6
13. Avoid discriminating in any way.	6
14. Try to get different people involved in conversation by asking questions.	6
15. Act as a mediator for people with different opinions.	5
16. Put others before yourself.	4
17. Accept people for their differences.	4
18. Avoid making assumptions about people by what they are wearing or how they look.	4
19. Stand up for what you believe in.	4
20. Use politically correct language.	3
21. Avoid stereotyping.	3
22. Go out of your way to sit with people different from you.	3
23. Think of the needs of other people before you think of yourself.	2
24. Empathize with people who have different views.	2
25. Participate in rallies and organize events.	2

26. Promote respect.	2
27. Discourage use of harsh words that attack a specific group.	2
28. Volunteer to work with people who are not like you.	2
29. Stand up for other people when they are being talked about.	2
30. Listen to everyone closely with equal attention.	2
31. Stand up for people who are being treated unfairly.	1
32. Protest things you believe are wrong.	1
33. Discourage prejudice.	1
34. Take action when you see something unfair happening.	1
35. Appreciate diversity.	1
36. Publicize the facts of inequality.	1
37. Give up privileges to be fair.	1
38. Treat everyone the same no matter what their background is.	1
39. Encourage the passing of laws to make others more equal.	1
40. Contribute to fundraisers to gather money to address inequities.	1
41. Put yourself in another person's shoes.	1
42. Join clubs and organizations that support equality.	1
43. Don't participate in anything that could put others down.	1
44. Write songs about fairness.	1
45. Create expressive artwork about the struggle for equality.	1
46. Create a safe environment.	1

Gender Justice Actions (*n* = 7)	
47. Avoid judging people based on traditional stereotypes of their gender.	2
48. Avoid making sexist remarks.	1
49. Avoid letting others make sexist jokes.	1
50. Join groups that work to promote equity between men and women.	1
51. Call attention to the problems of sexism.	1
52. Learn about how different social systems (like the education system and criminal justice system and the workplace etc.) vary for each gender.	1
53. Promote equal pay.	1
Race/Ethnicity Justice Actions (*n* = 6)	
54. Include everyone in events regardless of their race.	3
55. Speak out against racism.	3
56. Learn about other people's cultures.	2
57. Tell people racist jokes are not funny.	1
58. Present racism in an ironic or comical fashion in an attempt to enlighten the stupidity of it.	1
59. Stand-up for people who are victims of racism.	1
Sexual Orientation Justice Actions (*n* = 5)	
60. Befriend people who are of different sexual orientations.	2
61. Work to eliminate bullying.	1
62. Challenge homophobic ideas.	1

63. Stop others from making jokes about sexual orientation.	1
64. Speak out against using the word "gay" as an adjective with a negative connotation.	1
Social Class Justice Actions (*n* = 4)	
65. Avoid giving people an advantage due to their social status.	1
66. Volunteer in areas of lower socioeconomic status.	1
67. Share the wealth/experiences you have had with people of lower socioeconomic backgrounds.	1
68. Donate money and time to help people with inadequate resources.	1
Disability Justice Actions (*n* = 2)	
69. Bridge communication gaps between people with limitations and those without.	1
70. Avoid calling people "retarded".	1
Age Justice Actions (*n* = 1)	
71. Allow people of all ages to participate in activities.	1

Very few participants reported domain-specific actions in response to the Global prompt.

Similarly, for many of the domain-specific prompts, participants repeated actions from the

Global Justice category without reference to the specific domain (e.g. "discourage prejudice").

The majority of social justice actions therefore fall under the Global Justice category (n = 46). Of

the remaining domain-specific social justice actions, participants nominated more unique actions

in certain categories than others. For example, participants nominated 7 unique actions about

Gender Justice, but only 1 unique action about Age Justice. All domain-specific nominated actions were included to improve the content validity of the list.

Discussion

The AFA was successfully employed to produce a list of actions that are viewed by college students as social justice behaviors, both in general and in the particular domains sampled. Although a total of 71 actions were identified, over half were global actions that did not pertain to a particular domain (such as "put yourself in another person's shoes," "write songs about fairness," and "protest things you believe are wrong."). In six domains, 30 specific actions were identified as pertinent to social justice action in that domain, ranging from a low of 1 with respect to Age, and 7 with respect to Gender.

Across the nominated actions of Social Justice Behavior, items reflected different perceptions of justice among the participants. Many actions referred to equality of access (e.g. "Make it a point to include everyone in activities," "Bridge communication gaps between people with limitations and those without," etc.), while some actions referred to equality of opportunity (e.g. "give everyone equal opportunities." "Give up privileges to be fair," etc.). Moreover, actions referring to procedural fairness (e.g. "treat everyone equally," "treat everyone with the same standards," etc.) tended to be more frequently nominated than actions referring to fairness in outcomes (e.g. "encourage the passing of laws to make others more equal").

Although it was not surprising that the undergraduate sample nominated few acts of social justice behavior pertaining to certain domains (e.g. age, disability, social class, etc.), it was surprising that participants did not mention any acts pertaining to activism through social media, or other typical "slacktivist" activities (e.g. wearing a ribbon to support a cause). Of course, many of the nominated acts could occur as public acts of token support (e.g. "Challenge

homophobic ideas" by sharing a viral video on FaceBook or Twitter); however, these platforms were not explicitly mentioned by participants.

Ultimately, this first stage of the AFA—the act nomination procedure—helped to answer the first research question (R1). Social justice behaviors included a broad range of actions that emphasized promoting respect for others and avoiding discriminatory behavior. The second research question was "which of the actions promoting fairness, inclusion, and equity are the most prototypical social justice behaviors?" Study 2 was designed to address this question, allowing a final list of actions useful for research assessing social justice behavior to be created and subsequently validated in Study 3.

Chapter 3:

Study 2

Assessing Prototypicality of Social Justice Behaviors

In the second stage of the Act Frequency Approach, as outlined by Buss & Craik (1980), participants are asked to assess the prototypicality of items generated by the Act Nomination Procedure. There are many acts that may reflect social justice behavior; however, some may be more representative than the rest. For example, some people nominated acts of social justice behavior that could be highly idiosyncratic. Other people nominated acts that may only be peripherally related to the construct of social justice. By asking participants to rate each item on the basis of prototypicality and social desirability, a final scale of Social Justice Behavior with strong content validity was created.

It is important to note that certain types of participants may rate different acts of social justice behavior as more prototypical than others. For example, people who are already active in social justice organizations may view traditional collective action behaviors as more prototypical than people who have never participated in social justice movements. Indeed, previous research has explored differences between "experts" and "novices," including distinctions in knowledge categories (Chi, Feltovich, & Glaser, 1981), language use (Kim et al, 2011), and problem-solving (Larkin et al, 1980). Obviously experts by definition can provide prototypical acts. However, given that the final scale of Social Justice Behavior will be validated among a sample of college undergraduates in study 3, it is important to identify items that *students* identify as prototypical. Just as relying entirely upon undergraduate raters might fail to create a scale that holds content

validity among activist experts, relying entirely upon expert ratings could fail to capture the

behaviors that undergraduates actually do. Therefore, it is important to have both viewpoints

represented.

Method

Consistent with the Act Frequency Approach (Buss & Craik, 1980), participants in Study

2 assessed the prototypicality of the list of 71 behavioral acts of social justice generated in Study

1 (Table 1). Participants were asked to rate the entire list of social justice-related actions in terms

of their prototypicality and social desirability, each on a scale from 1 (least) to 5 (most). In order

to provide participants with easily-understood instructions, the original directions recommended

by Rosch and Mervis (1975) and used by Buss and Craik (1980) were adapted to eliminate terms

like "prototypicality" and to read as follows:

> "For this study you are asked to judge how good an example of a category various specific actions are. The category is *social justice behavior, or behavior that promotes fairness, inclusion and equity*.

> Below 71 actions are listed. For each action, please rate how good an example, or how typical it is of social justice behavior. Please also separately rate how desirable it is when other people engage in it.

> For typicality, you are asked to rate how good an example of that category each action is on a 5-point scale. A "5" means that you feel the action is a very good example of your idea of what social justice behavior is; a "1" means you feel the action fits very poorly with your idea of what social justice behavior is (or is not a member of that category at all). A "3" means you feel the action fits moderately well. Use the other numbers of the 5-point scale to indicate intermediate judgments.

> For desirability, you are asked to rate the desirability or undesirability of the actions in the same manner. Remember that you are to judge the actions in terms of whether you consider them desirable or undesirable in others.

> Be sure to make a judgment about each action."

Additionally, participants were asked to answer the same series of demographic questions as the participants in Study 1 (Appendix A). However, due to the different academic and occupational status of non-undergraduate participants in Study 2, the single question about academic class standing was replaced with one about highest level of education completed.

Participants

Consistent with previous research using the AFA (Buss & Craik, 1980; Icevic, 2007), only 20-100 experts are needed to assess the prototypicality of the nominated social behavior acts. Participants in this study included 53 students recruited for a new sample, from the undergraduate Introduction to Psychology subject pool, and 20 academic and activist "social justice experts" recruited from a variety of activist organizations and relevant academic departments at the University of Michigan for a total of 73 raters.[1] None of the participants who nominated acts in Study 1 were included in the data analysis for Study 2.

The majority of the undergraduate sample had only completed "some college" (63%), whereas all participants in the expert sample had obtained at least a 4-year bachelor's degree and reported occupations ranging from a graduate student instructor in social work to a union organizer. On average, participants in the undergraduate sample were 19.3 years old, whereas participants in the expert sample ranged in age from 23 to 79 ($x = 43.1$). Only 30.8% ($n = 16$) of the undergraduate sample self-identified as female, whereas 50% ($n = 10$) of the expert sample self-identified as female.

---

[1] A recruitment email was sent to approximately 100 members of the Students of Color at Rackham (SCOR), 40 members of the Graduate Employees' Organization stewards council, 200 members of the LGBT advocacy group Spectrum, 30 members of the group Allies for Disability Awareness, and 300 graduate students and faculty from the Psychology, Women's Studies, American Culture, and Social Work departments.

Both samples were predominantly white: 74% of the undergraduates and 70% of the experts self-identified as White-European. Ninety-eight percent of the undergraduate sample and 85% of the expert sample self-identified as completely heterosexual. 6% of the undergraduate sample and 15% of the expert sample self-identified as having a disability, reporting both visible and invisible types of disabilities.

The majority of undergraduate respondents reported economic security when they were growing up: 54% described their family situation as "well to do" or "extremely well to do," while 26% reported having "more than enough to get by." In contrast, only 5% of the experts described their families as well-to-do or extremely well-to-do, and 45 % reported having "more than enough to get by." Participants were also asked to compare their current social standing, relative to other people in the United States, on a scale of 0 (people who are the "worst off") to 100 (people who are the "best off"). Here self-ratings tended to converge for the two groups: scores on this measure for undergraduates averaged 69.44 (SD = 18.3), whereas scores for experts averaged 67.33 (SD = 18.23).

The undergraduate sample was politically moderate, while the experts were skewed left; on a scale of 1 (liberal) to 7 (conservative), the average score on political orientation was 3.45 (SD = 2.44) for undergraduates and 1.17 (SD = .15) for the experts. Finally, verifying the expert-novice distinction, the majority of the undergraduate sample did not identify as activists (57%), while a substantial portion of the sample (17%) were "unsure." In contrast, 90% of the expert sample self-identified as an activist. For those undergraduates who did self-identify as an activist, participants reported a variety of reasons why they identified that way, including "I run an environmental group promoting the usage of reusable water bottles on campus" and "I have a strong passion for politics and advocate for the plethora of causes I believe in." Experts also gave

a variety of reasons, including "I speak up and actively support causes that are important to me such as promoting diversity, equity and inclusion" and "I do activisty [sic] things on a regular basis."

Results and Discussion

For both samples, the mean typicality and social desirability scores were calculated for each of the 71 items produced by Study 1 (Table 2). For both students and activists, typicality ratings were highly correlated with social desirability ratings ($r = .90$ and $.93$, respectively). The correlation between student and activist typicality ratings on all of the items was a statistically significant, but relatively moderate, $.34$, confirming the expectation that students and activists would have different perspectives on the prototypicality of social justice behaviors.

Table 2.

Item Means for Student and Expert Ratings

#	Question	Student N	Student Typicality Average	Student Social Desirability Average	Activist N	Activist Typicality Average	Activist Social Desirability Average
1	Make it a point to include everyone in activities	56	3.95	4.44	19	4.37	4.47
2	Give everyone equal opportunities	55	4.18	4.58	19	4.74	4.74
3	Treat everybody equally	54	3.89	4.65	19	4.37	4.42
4	Be open to new ideas and thoughts	54	4.09	4.63	20	4.4	4.32

24

5	Treat everyone with the same standards	56	3.8	4.53	20	3.9	3.95
6	Look at things from more than one point of view	54	3.91	4.76	20	4.25	4.47
7	Treat people with respect	53	4.36	4.8	20	4.55	4.63
8	Don't choose favorites	54	3.33	4.07	18	3.17	3.58
9	Encourage participation by everyone	55	4.02	4.31	19	4.47	4.53
10	Create an environment in which everyone can express their ideas	55	4.22	4.69	19	4.58	4.47
11	Be friendly to everyone around you	55	4.09	4.63	19	3.16	4.16
12	Be kind to everyone	55	4.09	4.51	20	3.55	4.26
13	Avoid discriminating in any way	54	3.83	4.52	20	4.2	4.37
14	Try to get different people involved in conversation by asking them questions	55	3.95	4.38	19	3.95	4.26

15	Act as a mediator for people with different opinions	55	3.96	4.37	19	3.68	3.84
16	Put others before yourself	55	3.35	4.19	19	3.32	3.89
17	Accept people for their differences	54	3.98	4.62	20	4.75	4.79
18	Avoid making assumptions about people by what they are wearing or how they look	55	3.51	4.24	20	4.5	4.84
19	Stand up for what you believe in	54	4.28	4.74	20	4.45	4.53
20	Use politically correct language	54	3.41	4	20	3.5	3.47
21	Avoid stereotyping.	56	3.79	4.48	20	4.75	4.89
22	Go out of your way to sit with people different from you	56	2.84	3.76	19	3.63	3.79
23	Think of the needs of other people before you think of yourself	54	3.44	4.19	19	3.21	3.74

24	Empathize with people who have different views.	53	3.81	4.58	20	3.9	4.21
25	Participate in rallies and organize events	56	3.05	3.83	20	4.45	4.42
26	Promote respect	54	4.31	4.8	20	4.4	4.37
27	Discourage use of harsh words that attack a specific group	55	3.85	4.34	20	4.8	4.89
28	Stand up for other people when they are being talked about	55	3.93	4.48	20	4.3	4.47
28	Volunteer to work with people who are not like you	54	3.81	4.26	19	3.79	4.16
30	Listen to everyone closely with equal attention	53	3.96	4.35	19	3.74	3.89
31	Stand up for people who are being treated unfairly	54	4.17	4.72	20	4.95	4.95
32	Protest things you believe are wrong.	54	3.65	4.04	20	4.5	4.37

33	Discourage prejudice	55	4.02	4.61	20	4.65	4.56
34	Take action when you see something unfair happening	54	3.63	4.5	20	4.6	4.53
35	Appreciate diversity	54	4.06	4.61	20	4.35	4.58
36	Publicize the facts of inequality	54	3.37	4.06	20	4.7	4.58
37	Give up privileges to be fair	55	3.15	3.81	20	4.25	4.37
38	Treat everyone the same no matter what their background is	54	3.94	4.48	20	4.15	4.05
39	Encourage the passing of laws to make others more equal	54	3.74	4.22	20	4.85	4.84
40	Contribute to fundraisers to gather money to address inequities	54	3.61	4.11	20	4	4.21
41	Put yourself in another person's shoes	55	4	4.49	20	4.25	4.32
42	Join clubs and organizations that support	55	3.62	4.13	19	4.63	4.53

	equality.					
43	Don't participate in anything that could put others down.	55	3.78	4.39	20	4.25	4.32
44	Write songs about fairness.	55	2.87	3.33	19	2.89	3.26
45	Create expressive artwork about the struggle for equality.	55	3.11	3.5	19	3.53	3.89
46	Create a safe environme nt	54	4.31	4.63	19	4.74	4.79
47	Avoid judging people based on traditional stereotypes of their gender	55	3.87	4.52	20	4.9	4.89
48	Avoid making sexist remarks	55	3.67	4.43	20	4.8	4.89
49	Avoid letting others make sexist jokes	55	3.33	3.96	20	4.3	4.26

50	Join groups that work to promote equity between men and women	55	3.24	4.06	19	4.84	4.63
51	Call attention to the problems of sexism	54	3.46	3.98	20	4.75	4.68
52	Learn about how different social systems (e.g. the education system, the criminal justice system, the workplace, etc.) vary for each gender.	55	3.47	4.09	21	4.62	4.74
53	Promote equal pay for equal work	55	3.75	4.5	20	4.9	4.89
54	Include everyone in events regardless of their race	54	4.28	4.67	22	4.55	4.65
55	Speak out against racism.	54	4.13	4.44	20	4.9	4.84
56	Learn about other people's cultures	54	4.06	4.56	20	4	4.26

57	Tell people racist jokes are not funny	54	3.46	3.87	20	4.2	4.21
58	Present racism in an ironic or comical fashion in an attempt to enlighten the stupidity of it.	55	3.53	3.78	19	2.32	2.79
59	Stand-up for people who are victims of racism.	54	4.17	4.58	20	4.75	4.74
60	Befriend people who are of different sexual orientations	54	3.74	4.28	19	4.26	4.21
61	Work to eliminate bullying	54	4.19	4.7	20	4.6	4.47
62	Challenge homophobic ideas	54	3.72	4.23	20	4.9	4.84
63	Stop others from making jokes about sexual orientation	54	3.43	4.08	20	4.5	4.53
64	Speak out against using the word "gay" as an adjective with a negative	55	3.73	4.13	20	4.6	4.58

	connotation					
65	Avoid giving people an advantage due to their social status	55	3.56	4.19	20	4.7	4.74
66	Volunteer in areas of lower socioeconomic status	55	3.78	4.46	19	4.16	4.16
67	Share the wealth/experiences you have had with people of lower socioeconomic backgrounds.	55	3.65	4.23	21	4.05	4.05
68	Donate money and time to help people with inadequate resources	55	3.8	4.52	19	4	4.21
69	Bridge communication gaps between people with limitations and those without.	55	3.91	4.28	19	4.11	4.26

70	Avoid calling people "retarded"	56	3.82	4.33	20	4.85	4.95
71	Allow people of all ages to participate in activities	55	3.33	3.91	19	3.89	3.72
		Mean	**3.75**	**4.32**	**Mean**	**4.26**	**4.37**

In order to create a final scale of social justice behavior, acts that were rated as very typical examples of social behavior among both the undergraduate and activist expert samples were selected. All of the acts that were rated above the median on typicality by both students and activists were included ($n = 17$). Items that were rated as very typical examples of social justice behavior for only one of the two groups were subsequently dropped and are listed in Appendix B. However, there were 5 items that received higher typicality scores from expert raters that also reflected a range of domain-specific social justice behaviors not covered by the other items (items 5, 27, 31, 48 and 49). In order to capture a broader range of domains, these 5 items were selected for inclusion in the final social justice behavior scale, yielding a total of 22 items (Table 3). The final 22 prototypical social justice behaviors were also rated as highly social desirable; scores ranged between 3.81 to 4.74 for students and between 4.21 and 4.95 for activist experts.

Table 3.

Final Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) Scale (22 Items)

#	Item
2	Give everyone equal opportunities
4	Be open to new ideas and thoughts
7	Treat people with respect
9	Encourage participation by everyone
10	Create an environment in which everyone can express their ideas
17	Accept people for their differences
19	Stand up for what you believe in
27	Discourage use of harsh words that attack a specific group
31	Stand up for people who are being treated unfairly
33	Discourage prejudice
37	Give up privileges to be fair
46	Create a safe environment
47	Avoid judging people based on traditional stereotypes of their gender
48	Avoid making sexist remarks
54	Include everyone in events regardless of their race
55	Speak out against racism.
59	Stand-up for people who are victims of racism.
60	Befriend people who are of different sexual orientations
61	Work to eliminate bullying
62	Challenge homophobic ideas
65	Avoid giving people an advantage due to their social status
70	Avoid calling people "retarded"

General Discussion

As indicated by the correlation of rating scores between groups, undergraduate and expert raters had somewhat differing views of what "counts" as typical social justice behavior. While 17 items scored above the median for both groups, there were just as many items rated highly by undergraduates, but not experts, and vice versa. The items on which students and activists converged include behaviors that promote fairness, equity, and inclusion (e.g. "Stand up for people who are being treated unfairly", "Give everyone equal opportunities", "Create a safe environment", etc.) and discourage prejudice or discrimination across contexts (e.g. "Speak out against racism", "Discourage use of harsh words that attack a specific group", etc.). This indicates that the shared view of typical social justice behavior encompasses a broad range of actions that emphasizes respectful interpersonal interaction and working towards broader structural change.

In contrast, undergraduates tended to view behaviors of general proactive inclusion (e.g. "Be kind to everyone" and "Appreciate diversity") as more typical of social justice than the experts. Experts rated items of domain-specific behaviors higher in terms of typicality than the undergraduates, particularly those items pertaining to gender and sexuality (e.g. "Avoid making sexist remarks" and "Challenge homophobic ideas"). Not surprisingly, activist experts also tended to rate items of traditional collective action (e.g. "Participate in rallies and organize events" and "Join clubs and organizations that support equality") as more typical of social justice behavior than did students. Other items scored low in typicality for both students and activists, including several items reflecting personal and/or financial sacrifice (e.g. "Put others before yourself," "Give up privileges to be fair," "Donate money and time to help people with inadequate resources," etc.). Just as more actions pertaining to procedural fairness were

35

nominated in Study 1, these items tended to be rated as more prototypical examples of social justice behavior than items related to fairness in outcomes.

Overall, the results of Study 2 helped to identify 22 unique social justice behaviors for inclusion in the final scale. By assessing each item in terms of typicality, these two groups of raters helped to refine the list of acts of social justice behavior produced by the Act Nomination procedure in Study 1. Moreover, they helped to identify idiosyncrasies in social justice behavior by scoring certain acts lower on typicality (e.g. "Write songs about fairness" and "Present racism in an ironic or comical fashion in an attempt to highlight the stupidity of it"). It is important to note that the final list of social justice behaviors is highly correlated with social desirability for both students ($r = .92$) and activists ($r = .93$), suggesting that both groups viewed prototypical actions promoting social justice as socially desirable.

Furthermore, the range of behaviors represented by the 22 items reflects a different set of acts than what is typically captured by measures of collective action. Although variations of some of the items used by Duncan (1999) were nominated in Study 1 (e.g. "Participate in rallies and organize events", "Join clubs and organizations that support equality." "Donate money and time to help people with inadequate resources," etc.), none of these behaviors were included in the final scale of typical social justice behavior.

Overall, across the 22 items, there was a strong emphasis on interpersonal actions that promote fairness in one's day-to-day life (e.g. "befriend people of different sexual orientations," "create an environment in which everyone can express their ideas," "treat people with respect," etc.). Although some of the items reflect possible participation in collective action (e.g. "speak out against racism," "work to eliminate bullying," "stand up for people who are being treated

unfairly," etc.), their wording was flexible enough to encompass alternative actions.

Accordingly, the final scale was named the Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) scale.

Chapter 4:

Study 3

Validation of the Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) Scale

Consistent with the third stage of the Act Frequency Approach (Buss & Craik, 1980), participants in this study were asked to self-rate how frequently they perform each of the acts generated by the Act Nomination Procedure (Study 1) that were assessed for prototypicality in Study 2. In order to establish the construct validity of the 22-item Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) Scale that emerged from this process, participants were also asked to rate themselves on a variety of existing measures that should be related to the construct of everyday social justice behavior. Moreover, participants were asked to complete measures that should be unrelated to ESJB in order to establish discriminant validity. Furthermore, by asking participants to also report how frequently they engage in progressive collective action, the correlates of the ESJB scale could be compared to those of a more established measure of a related, yet distinct, type of social justice behavior. Indeed, engagement in progressive activism is traditionally measured by participation in collective action, rather than interpersonal promotion of fairness, equality, and inclusion. These two related but distinct constructs may therefore share some correlates, but not others. Finally, participants who engaged in both ESJB and Collective Action Social Justice Behavior (CASJB) were compared to participants who engaged in only one form of social justice behavior or scored low on both.

Establishing Construct Validity of the 22-item ESJB scale

First, several individual attributes may be related to self-ratings on the ESJB scale and should be tested as potential covariates. For example, self-identification as a member of a traditionally marginalized group (e.g. women, racial/ethnic minority, LGBTQ, etc.) has been shown to relate to traditional, collective behaviors undertaken to promote justice on behalf of that group (Fahs, 2007; Gurin, Miller, & Gurin, 1980; Montgomery and Stewart, 2012; Swank & Fahs, 2011). It is therefore reasonable to expect that women would score higher on the ESJB scale than men, racial/ethnic minorities would score higher than whites, sexual minorities would score higher than heterosexuals, people who self-identify as having a disability would score higher than people without a disability, and people who report lower relative social standing would score higher than people who report higher relative social standings. Political orientations on the left side of the spectrum have also been linked to activism in progressive causes (Cole & Stewart, 1996). Indeed, individuals who self-identify as liberal should be more likely to promote fairness, equality, and inclusion in their everyday lives than individuals who self-identify as conservative.

As demonstrated by Lopez, Gurin, and Nagda (1998), participants reporting higher levels of social justice behavior are more likely to identify structural causes of intergroup conflict, as opposed to individual causes. Indeed, participants with higher ESJB scores should be more likely to hold structural targets accountable for social change than those who score lower on the measure. Moreover, the tendency to reject the superiority of certain groups, oppose the inequities of the status quo, and recognize the interconnectedness of oppression should also correlate with behavior promoting fairness and equality. Individuals who are low in Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994), low in System Justification (Kay and

Jost, 2003), and high in Intersectional Awareness (Curtin, Stewart, and Cole, under review) should therefore report more behaviors promoting everyday social justice.

Moreover, beliefs about the merits of social action and self-confidence about taking social action should correspond to self-reports of social justice behavior (Nagda, Kim, & Truelove, 2004). The personality trait of Openness to Experience has also been shown to relate to activist behaviors on behalf of one's own group, as well as ally activism (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). However, the need for cognitive closure (NfCC) has been linked to higher levels of system justification and lower levels of openness to experience (Roets & van Hiel, 2011), suggesting that it should be negatively related to ESJB. Extraversion has been linked to social justice behaviors, such as AIDS activism and civic engagement (Omoto, Snyder, & Hackett, 2010), while previous research has demonstrated a relationship between empathy and traditional, collective social justice behavior (Fingerhut, 2011; Hoffman, 1990).

Of course, not all individual differences should be related to everyday social justice behavior. For example, although intelligence (or academic achievement) is related to Openness to Experience (Harris, 2004), it does not necessarily relate to behavior promoting fairness and equality. Undergraduate GPA could be used as a proxy indicator of intelligence (and perhaps a direct measure of academic achievement) and should be unrelated to scores on the ESJB scale. Other participant demographics such as age, undergraduate class standing, and whether one lives on or off campus should also be expected to be unrelated to social justice behavior.

Moreover, although ESJB should be positively correlated with progressive activism, it should have some correlates in common with it and some that are different. For example, openness is related to positive curious interactions with people who are different from oneself, and therefore may be related to overall interest in all kinds of people experiencing fairness.

However, empathy may be more important for everyday social justice behaviors that are often based upon interpersonal interactions than for collective activities that are centered on causes. It is therefore important to assess how ESJB is related to, yet distinct from, other measures of social justice actions.

Finally, individuals who engage in everyday social justice behaviors may not engage in other forms of progressive activism, or vice versa. It is important to assess predictors of engagement in multiple types of behavior.

The following hypotheses were therefore tested:

Hypothesis 1: Gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, perceived social standing, disability status and political orientation should relate to Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB), whereas age, GPA, undergraduate class standing and campus residence should be unrelated to scores on the ESJB scale.

Hypothesis 2: Scores on the ESJB scale should be positively related to structural attributions of social change, the importance and confidence in taking action, intersectional awareness, openness to experience, extraversion and empathy, and negatively related to Social Dominance Orientation, System Justification, and the Need for Cognitive Closure.

Hypothesis 3: The ESJB scale will correlate moderately with Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ), suggesting that it is a distinct measure of social justice behavior.

Hypothesis 4: Participants who score high on both ESJB and CASJ will be significantly different from participants who score high on only one measure of social justice behavior or none at all.

Method

Consistent with the third stage of the Act Frequency Approach (Buss & Craik, 1980), participants in Study 3 self-rated the final 22 items of Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) scale produced in Study 2 (Table 3). First participants read about three situations reflecting intergroup conflict on campus and then evaluated 1) the cause of the conflict, and 2) how to address the problem. Participants then completed a series of measures assessing their personality and attitudes (see below). In order to avoid priming responses to these measures in terms of the outcome of interest, participants completed the ESJB scale towards the end of the survey. Finally, participants were asked to identify their age, GPA, class standing, whether they live on or off campus, gender, race, sexual orientation, ability status, social class background, political orientation, and whether or not they identify as an activist (Appendix A). This packet of questionnaires took about 40 minutes to complete.

Participants

Participants in this study were a new sample of 388 college students recruited via the undergraduate subject pool and introductory psychology courses. None of the participants who nominated acts of social justice behavior (Study 1) or assessed acts in terms of their prototypicality (Study 2) were included in the analysis of Study 3.

On average, participants in the sample were 19.7 years old, and ranged in age from 18 to 48. On a scale of 1 to 4, the average GPA for the sample was 3.18. Participants ranged in undergraduate class standing: 28.8% of the sample were first-year students, 44.8% of the sample were sophomores, 14.5% of the sample were juniors, and 11.8% of the sample were seniors. The majority of participants lived in on-campus housing (55.9%), while 34.7% reported living off campus and 9.4% reported living in a fraternity or a sorority.

The majority of participants self-identified as female (69.1%), while 30.6% of the sample self-identified as male. Only one participant self-identified as genderqueer. The sample was predominantly white: 73.4% of participants self-identified as White-European, 13.6% of participants self-identified as Asian, 5.4% of participants self-identified as Black, 2.7% of participants self-identified as Middle Eastern, 1.8% of participants self-identified as Latino/a, an .9 of participants self-identified as Native American. Due to the small number of students in several racial categories, the variable was dichotomized into "white" and "non-white" for subsequent analyses. Eight-four% of the sample self-identified as completely heterosexual, 9.7% of the sample self-identified as mostly heterosexual, 2.7% of the sample self-identified as bisexual, .9% of the sample self-identified as mostly lesbian/gay, .9% of the sample self-identified as completely lesbian/gay, and 1.2% of the sample self-identified as "other." As with race, sexual orientation was dichotomized into "completely heterosexual" and "not completely heterosexual" for subsequent statistical analyses. Combining both visible and invisible types of disabilities, 3.6% of the sample self-identified as having a disability.

The majority of undergraduate respondents reported economic security when they were growing up: 44.4% described their family situation as "well to do" or "extremely well to do," while 31.9% reported having "more than enough to get by." Some participants reported that they "had enough to get by but not many extras" (17.6%), while 6.1% had "barely enough to get by." Participants were also asked to compare their current social standing, relative to other people in the United States, on a scale of 0 (people who are the "worst off") to 100 (people who are the "best off"). Scores on this measure ranged from 9 to 100 and the average score was 64.13 ($SD =$ 19.81).

The sample was politically moderate, though somewhat left of center; on a scale of 1 (liberal) to 7 (conservative), the average score on political orientation was 3.29 ($SD = 2.10$). Finally, the majority of the undergraduate sample did not identify as activists (79.8%), while a substantial portion of the sample (15.1%) were "unsure." For those participants who did self-identify as an activist, participants reported a variety of reasons why they identified that way, including "I take part in the student government to promote positive change", "I argue on promoting vegetarianism and fight for animal rights. Do volunteer services at animal shelters," and "I dedicate a large part of my life to promoting equality and social justice."

Measures

Structural Attributions for Targets of Social Change. Lopez, Gurin, & Nagda (1998) found that students more actively engaged in a course about intergroup relations were more likely to provide structural attributions for conflict and targets of change when confronted with hypothetical situations. As noted above, participants were asked to respond to three vignettes modified from those used in Lopez, Gurin & Nagda (1998, Appendix C). Each of the vignettes outlined a situation in which an interpersonal conflict could be addressed with a variety of resolutions, ranging from "All things considered, there is really nothing that can be done to deal with this problem" to "Certain aspects of the wider society would have to change." For example, after having his funding request for an Asian Pacific American Heritage Month event ignored by the President of the Student Government, Jiang could "try to be less sensitive" (individual) or make others aware of the conflict "by distributing flyers, writing a letter in the school newspaper, or organizing a workshop on the issue." For each vignette, the number of structural targets of change identified by participants could range from 0 to 3. A mean score was then calculated for

each participant across the 3 vignettes. The overall mean score for the sample was 0.32 (*SD* = 0.39). Cronbach's alpha was .80 for the sample.

Social Dominance Orientation. Social Dominance Orientation was measured by eight items taken from Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle (1994, Appendix D) who found that high scores on SDO positively relate to political conservatism and opposition to social policies designed to promote equality. Conversely, low scores on SDO have been shown to relate to empathic concern for others, altruism, and communality (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Sample items include: "Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups" and "We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible" (Reverse-scored). A mean score was calculated for each participant. The overall mean score for the sample was 2.28 (*SD* = 0.65). Cronbach's alpha was .75 for the sample.

System Justification. System Justification was measured by eight items taken from Kay & Jost (2003, Appendix E). Previous research has found high internal consistency on this measure (Cronbach's alpha =.87), and that it positively relates to Social Dominance Orientation (Jost & Thompson, 2000), low Openness to Experience (Jost & Hunyady, 2005), and political conservatism (Jost, Glaser, et al, 2003). Sample items include: "Most policies serve the greater good" and "Our society is getting worse every year" (reverse-scored). A mean score was calculated for each participant. The overall mean score for the sample was 2.84 (*SD* = .65). Cronbach's alpha was .80 for the sample.

Intersectional Awareness. Awareness of intersectionality was measured by 17 items adapted from Greenwood (2008) and used by Curtin (2011, Appendix F). The measure has previously been found to be internally consistent (Cronbach's alphas range from .71 to .83), and high scores on this measure have been linked to higher levels of openness to experience,

perspective taking, and intentions to engage in social action behaviors (Curtin, Stewart, & Cole, under review). Sample items include: "All oppressions are tied together" and "People don't think enough about how connections between social class, race, gender and sexuality affect individuals." A mean score was calculated for each participant. The overall mean score for the sample was 3.69 (*SD* = .48). Cronbach's alpha was .84 for the sample.

The Importance and Confidence in Taking Action. The Importance and Confidence in Taking Action was measured by eleven items taken from Nagda, Kim, & Truelove (2004, Appendix G). Sample items include: "refrain from repeating statements or rumors that reinforce prejudice or bias" and "Make efforts to get to know individuals from diverse backgrounds." For each of the eleven items describing social action, participants were asked to report how important it is for them do it and how confident they feel about their ability to do it. For importance, participants were asked, "How important is it for you to . . . ?" on a scale of 1 (not at all important) to 4 (of crucial importance). For confidence, participants were asked "How confident do you feel about your ability to . . . ?" on a scale of 1 (not at all confident) to 4 (extremely confident). For both questions, participants responded to the same list of items. Mean scores for action importance and action confidence were calculated for each participant. The overall mean score for action importance was 3.21 (*SD* = .55) for the sample, while the overall mean score for action confidence was 2.87 (*SD* = .51) for the sample. Cronbach's alpha for action importance was .89 for the sample, while Cronbach's alpha for action confidence was .82 for the sample.

Need for Cognitive Closure. Need for Cognitive Closure was measured using 15 items from Roets and van Hiel (2011, Appendix H, Cronbach's alpha =.87). The need for closure has previously been linked to dogmatism, authoritarianism, and intolerance for ambiguity (Webster

& Kruglanski, 1994). Sample items include: "I dislike questions which could be answered in many different ways" and "I feel irritated when one person disagrees with what everyone else in a group believes." A mean score was calculated for each participant. The overall mean score for the sample was 3.32 (*SD* = .60). Cronbach's alpha was .87 for the sample.

Openness to Experience. The personality trait of openness was measured using 10 items from the Big Five Inventory (John & Srivastava, 1999, Appendix I). Openness has previously been found to have strong internal consistency (Cronbach's alphas ranged from .80 to .85 in Curtin, Stewart & Duncan, 2010) and has been linked to a variety of liberal social attitudes (Carney, Jost, Gosling, & Potter, 2008; van Hiel, Kossowska, & Mervielde, 2000; van Hiel & Mervielde, 2004). Sample items include: "is inventive" and "likes to reflect, play with ideas." A mean score for openness was calculated for each participant. The overall mean score for the sample was 3.42 (*SD* = .63). Cronbach's alpha was .82 for the sample.

Extraversion. The personality trait of extraversion was measured using 7 items from the Big Five Inventory (John & Srivastava, 1999, Appendix I). Extraversion has been previously linked to political behavior, such as attending public meetings or election rallies (Mondak et al, 2010, Cronbach's alpha = .79). Sample items include: "has an assertive personality" and "is reserved (reversed)." A mean score was calculated for each participant. The overall mean score for the sample was 3.19 (*SD* = .82). Cronbach's alpha was .88 for the sample.

Empathy. The personality trait of empathy was measured by 14 items reflecting the Empathic Concern (EC) and Perspective Taking (PT) subscales from the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980, Appendix J). Original standard alpha coefficients were reported between .68 and .75. Empathic concern has been shown to relate to a non-selfish concern for other people, while perspective taking has been shown to relate to elements of better social functioning and

higher self-esteem (Davis, 1983). Sample items include: "I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me" (EC) and "I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective" (PT). A mean score for each subscale was calculated for each participant. The overall mean score for EC was 3.72 (*SD* = .58) for the sample. Cronbach's alpha was .79 for the sample. The overall mean score for PT was 3.59 (*SD* = .55) for the sample. Cronbach's alpha was .75 for the sample.

Collective Action for Social Justice. Previous engagement in Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ) was assessed using a measure from previous research on activism (Duncan, 1999; Curtin, Stewart, & Duncan, 2010; Montgomery & Stewart, 2012; Appendix K). Participants were asked to indicate the types of activities in which they were involved for a variety of causes: signing a petition, contributing money, attending a meeting, writing a letter to and/or calling a public official, being an active member in an organization, and/or attending a rally or demonstration. For each of these six kinds of engagement, participants could receive a score of 0 (was not active) or 1 (was active). A summed score of 0-6 was calculated for participation in each cause. Seventeen of the causes were included in the final measure of Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ): AIDS, adoption rights for Lesbians and Gay men, anti-racism, anti-war, civil rights, disability rights, ending age discrimination, ending LGBT bullying/hate crimes, environmental, homeless, prochoice, support for gay marriage, women's rights, and worker's rights activism. An overall mean score summarizing participation in all progressive activism was then calculated for each participant. The overall mean score for the sample was .25 (*SD* = .40). Cronbach's alpha was .86 for the sample.

Everyday Social Justice Behavior. Participants reported the frequency in which they do each of the 71 behaviors generated by the act nomination procedure (Table 1). Responses were

on a scale of 1 (Never) to 5 (Very Often). Table 4 shows the average frequency for each of the

22 items of the final Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) scale generated in Study 2,

ordered from most frequently endorsed item to least. The most frequently endorsed item was

"Treat people with respect" ($x = 4.56$, $SD = .63$), while the least frequently endorsed item was

"Give up privileges to be fair" $(x = 2.60$, $SD = 1.16)$. The overall mean score for ESJB for the

sample was 3.77 ($SD = .59$). Cronbach's alpha was .90 for the sample.

The factor structure of the 22 ESJB items was examined. Principal Components Analysis

showed that the first factor accounted for nearly 35% of the variance, the second factor 10% of

the variance, the third 7.5% and the fourth factor 5%. Two, three, and four factor solutions were

examined, using varimax rotation of the factor loading matrix. However, each of this multiple

factor solutions failed to contribute to a simple factor structure with little to no cross-loadings, so

the unifactorial solution was ultimately chosen.

Table 4.

Frequency of Everyday Social Justice Behaviors- 22 items

#	Item	n	x	SD
7	Treat people with respect	334	4.56	.63
54	Include everyone in events regardless of their race	336	4.49	.73
17	Accept people for their differences	334	4.36	.72
2	Give everyone equal opportunities	336	4.26	.83
4	Be open to new ideas and thoughts	335	4.22	.77
33	Discourage prejudice	335	4.01	.87
19	Stand up for what you believe in	334	3.97	.89
48	Avoid making sexist remarks	334	3.90	1.06
65	Avoid giving people an advantage due to their social status	336	3.85	1.10
47	Avoid judging people based on traditional stereotypes of their gender	335	3.83	.92
70	Avoid calling people "retarded"	334	3.82	1.25
10	Create an environment in which everyone can express their ideas	332	3.82	1.02
60	Befriend people who are of different sexual orientations	332	3.80	1.16
46	Create a safe environment	330	3.79	.95
31	Stand up for people who are being treated unfairly	336	3.73	.98
9	Encourage participation by everyone	333	3.71	1.07
62	Challenge homophobic ideas	332	3.59	1.27
27	Discourage use of harsh words that attack a specific group	333	3.46	1.18
61	Work to eliminate bullying	333	3.31	1.19
59	Stand-up for people who are victims of racism.	333	3.03	1.17
55	Speak out against racism.	332	2.87	1.21
37	Give up privileges to be fair	331	2.60	1.16

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for all of the predictors are reported in Table 5. As shown in Table 6, many of the predictors were moderately correlated with each other.

Table 5.

Descriptive Statistics of Measures

	n	*α*	*x*	*SD*	Min	Max
Structural Targets of Social Justice	330	.80	.32	.39	0.00	1.00
Social Dominance Orientation	333	.75	2.28	.65	1.00	4.25
System Justification	333	.80	2.84	.65	1.25	4.88
Intersectional Awareness	388	.84	3.69	.48	2.18	5.00
Importance of Taking Action	330	.89	3.21	.55	1.00	4.00
Confidence in Taking Action	329	.82	2.87	.51	1.36	4.00
Need for Cognitive Closure	328	.87	3.32	.60	1.60	5.00
Openness to Experience	330	.82	3.42	.63	1.50	5.00
Extraversion	330	.88	3.19	.82	1.14	5.00
Perspective Taking	328	.75	3.59	.55	2.00	5.00
Empathic Concern	328	.79	3.72	.58	2.00	5.00
Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ)	388	.86	.25	.40	.00	2.36
Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB)	337	.90	3.77	.59	1.00	5.00

Table 6.

Correlations among predictors

	Struc. Targ.	SDO	Sys. Just.	Inter Awar	Imp. Act.	Conf. Act.	NfCC	Open.	Extra.	Pers. Take	Emp Con.
Structural Targets of Social Justice	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)	-.17**	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
System Justifi-cation	-.26***	.35***	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intersect-ional Awareness	.25***	-.50***	-.25***	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Importance of Taking Action	.19***	-.36***	-.27***	.49***	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Confidence in Taking Action	.09	-.18**	-.12*	.26***	.42***	1.0	-	-	-	-	-
Need for Cognitive Closure (NfCC)	.10	.12*	.01	-.07	-.06	-.08	1.0	-	-	-	-
Openness	-.03	-.07	-.08	.20***	-.19***	.27***	-.37**	1.0	-	-	-
Extravers.ion	-.08	.07	.08	-.00	-.01	.12*	-.14*	.14*	1.0	-	-
Perspective Taking	.08	-.31***	-.05	.31***	.19***	.28***	-.25**	.34***	.07	1.0	-
Empathic Concern	.13*	-.45***	-.13*	.37***	.33***	.16**	-.09	.11	.12*	.45***	1.0

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Construct Validity for the Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) scale

As predicted, women and sexual minorities scored higher on the Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) scale than men and individuals who self-identified as "completely heterosexual," respectively, whereas individuals who self-identified as more conservative scored lower on ESJB than individuals who self-identified as liberal (Table 7). However, race, perceived social standing, and ability status were unrelated to ESJB contrary to Hypothesis 1.

ESJB was negatively related to Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), System Justification, and the Need for Cognitive Closure (NfCC), confirming Hypothesis 2. Equally important confirmation of Hypothesis 2, ESJB was positively related to structural attributions of social change targets, the importance and confidence in taking action, intersectional awareness, openness, extraversion and empathy.

Ultimately, ESJB was moderately correlated with Collective Action for Social Justice ($r = .37, p < .001$), confirming Hypothesis 3.

Table 7.

Correlates of Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) and Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ)

	Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB)	Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ)
Gender	.17**	.15**
Race[a]	.08	.02
Sexual Orientation[b]	-.11*	-.16**
Social Standing	.08	.04
Ability Status	-.00	.00
Political Orientation	-.23***	-.32***
Structural Targets of Social Justice	.13*	.28***
Social Dominance Orientation	-.42***	-.22***
System Justification	-.24***	-.26***
Intersectional Awareness	.46***	.28***
Importance of Taking Action	.63***	.26***
Confidence in Taking Action	.51***	.17***
Need for Cognitive Closure	-.19**	-.23***
Openness to Experience	.37***	.24***
Extraversion	.20***	.05
Perspective Taking	.36***	.18**
Empathic Concern	.40***	.22***

Note[a]. Sexual Orientation has been dichotomized into "not completely heterosexul" (1) and "completely heterosexual" (2).

Note[b]. Race has been dichotomized into non-white (1) and white (2).

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Although there were similar patterns of relationships between most of the correlates and both ESJB and CASJ, Hotelling's t-tests (Meng, Rosenthal, & Rubin, 1992) indicated several significant differences between the bivariate correlations.

Among the indicators of support for the status quo,

- Social Dominance Orientation was significantly more strongly related to ESJB than to CASJ ($t = -3.53$, $p < .001$).

Among the indicators of criticism or opposition to the status quo,

- Intersectional Awareness ($t = 3.25$, $p < .01$), the Importance of Taking Action ($t = 7.51$, $p < .001$), and Confidence in Taking Action ($t = 6.30$, $p < .001$) were more strongly positively related to ESJB than to CASJ.

Finally, among the personality traits often associated with progressive political views,

- Openness to Experience ($t = 2.25$, $p < .05$), Extraversion ($t = 2.46$, $p < .05$), Perspective Taking ($t = 3.09$, $p < .01$), and Empathic Concern ($t = 3.15$, $p < .01$) were all significantly more strongly positively related to ESJB than to CASJ.

In contrast, Structural Targets for Social Justice was more strongly related to CASJ than ESJB ($t = -2.51$, $p < .05$).

Finally, as predicted, ESJB was not significantly correlated with age, GPA, undergraduate class standing, or type of residence, thereby contributing to discriminant validity of the measure (Table 8).

Table 8.

Discriminant Validity of Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) and Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ)

	Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB)	Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ)
Age	-.03	-.02
GPA	.09	.09
Class Standing	.02	-.02
Campus Residence	-.01	-.05

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Predictors of Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB)

In order to avoid problems with multicollinearity in multivariate analyses, composite measures were created for some of the variables used as predictors in multiple regressions. A mean score combining structural targets of social change, social dominance orientation (reverse-scored), system justification (reverse-scored), and intersectional awareness yielded a composite measure of Structural Awareness *(x = 10.93, SD = 1.52, Cronbach's alpha = .62).* Further, scores on Importance of Taking Action and Confidence in Taking Action were averaged to make a composite Taking Action variable *(x = 3.03, SD = .45, Cronbach's alpha = .59).* Moreover, scores on Openness to Experience and Need for Cognitive Closure (reverse-scored) were averaged to create a composite measure of Openness *(x = 3.05, SD =.51, Cronbach's alpha = .54),* while Extraversion remained a separate variable. Finally, scores on the Perspective Taking and Empathic Concern subscales of the IRI were averaged to produce a composite measure of Empathy *(x = 7.30, SD = .97, Cronbach's alpha = .62).*

A multiple regression tested whether structural awareness, taking action, openness, extraversion, and empathy jointly and separately predicted Everyday Social Justice Behavior (Table 9), when in the same analysis. Results confirmed there were significant main effects for each of these five variables, even after controlling for gender, sexual orientation, and political orientation. There were no significant interactions between any of the predictors or controls in relationships with ESJB.

Table 9.

Multiple Regression Predicting Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB; N = 316).

	b	SE b	β
Constant	-.51	.28	
Gender	-.01	.05	-.00
Sexual Orientation[a]	-.00	.06	-.00
Political Orientation	-.02	.01	-.05
Structural Awareness[b]	.25	.07	.16***
Taking Action[c]	.69	.05	.53***
Openness[c]	.17	.05	.14***
Extraversion	.10	.03	.14***
Empathy[e]	.20	.05	.16***

R^2 = .61 ($p < .001$).

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

Note[a]. Sexual Orientation has been dichotomized into "sexual minorities" (1) and "completely heterosexual" (2).

Note[b]. Structural Awareness is a composite measure of Social Dominance Orientation (reverse-scored), System Justification (reverse-scored), Intersectional Awareness, and Structural Targets of Social Justice Behavior. (Cronbach's alpha = -.62)

Note[c]. Taking Action is a composite measure of the Importance of Taking Action and Confidence in Taking Action. (Cronbach's alpha =. 59)

Note[d]. Openness is a composite measure of Openness to Experience and the Need for Cognitive Closure (reverse-scored) (Cronbach's alpha = .54).

Note[e]. Empathy is a composite measure of the Perspective Taking and Empathic Concern subscales of the IRI. (Cronbach's alpha = -.62).

In order to assess the distinctiveness of EJSB from progressive activism, a second multiple regression tested whether structural awareness, taking action, openness, extraversion, and empathy also predicted Collective Action for Social Justice (Table 10). After controlling for gender, sexual orientation, and political orientation, there were only significant main effects for structural awareness and openness to experience. Thus, three of the five significant predictors of ESJB—Taking Action, Extraversion and Empathy—did not predict CASJ in the regression.

Table 10.

Multiple Regression Predicting Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ, N = 316).

	b	SE b	β
Constant	-1.14	.28	
Gender	.07	.05	.08
Sexual Orientation	-.05	.06	-.04
Political Orientation	-.05	.01	-.18**
Structural Awareness[b]	.23	.07	.21**
Taking Action[c]	.06	.05	.06
Openness[d]	.19	.05	.23***
Extraversion	.01	.03	.02
Empathy[e]	.04	.05	.04

R^2 = .25 ($p < .001$).

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

Note[a]. Sexual Orientation has been dichotomized into "sexual minorities" (1) and "completely heterosexual" (2).

Note[b]. Structural Awareness is a composite measure of Social Dominance Orientation (reverse-scored), System Justification (reverse-scored), Intersectional Awareness, and Structural Targets of Social Justice Behavior. (Cronbach's alpha = -.62)

Note[c]. Taking Action is a composite measure of the Importance of Taking Action and Confidence in Taking Action. (Cronbach's alpha = .59)

Note[d]. Openness is a composite measure of Openness to Experience and the Need for Cognitive Closure (reverse-scored) (Cronbach's alpha = .54).

Note[e]. Empathy is a composite measure of the Perspective Taking and Empathic Concern subscales of the IRI. (Cronbach's alpha = -.62).

Group Comparisons Between Measures of Social Justice Behaviors

In order to consider how individuals who engaged both in interpersonal social justice behavior (EJSB) and collective action (CASJ), individuals were identified who were above the median on both the measures of social justice behavior, scores on ESJB and Collective Action

for Social Justice (CASJ). Use of median splits to define this group was justified by the fact that CASJ is strongly skewed, with most participants reporting no collective acts, and a relatively small number reporting any.

Scores for the High ESJB, High CASJ group were recoded into a new dichotomous variable (1 = Yes, 0 = No). A binary logistic regression was used to test whether the correlates of interest significantly predicted membership in this group as opposed to high engagement in only one type of social justice behavior or low engagement on both. Results showed that people in this group tended to hold a left political orientation and were more likely to report openness to experience, empathy, and the importance and confidence in taking action (Table 12).

Table 11.

Binary Logistic Regression Predicting Higher Levels of Participation in Both Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) and Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ; n = 317).

	β	SE b	Wald's χ^2 (df =1)	Expβ
Constant	-18.61	2.64	49.73	.00
Gender	.29	.36	.64	1.34
Sexual Orientation[a]	-.10	.41	.06	.91
Political Orientation	-.23	.11	4.15	.79*
Structural Awareness[b]	.74	.53	1.98	2.10
Taking Action[c]	2.65	.46	33.14	14.17***
Openness[d]	1.11	.34	10.72	3.02**
Extraversion	.01	.18	1.5	1.25
Empathy[e]	.04	.36	8.99	2.99***

*p < .05, ** p < .01, ***p < .001

Note[a]. Sexual Orientation has been dichotomized into "sexual minorities" (1) and "completely heterosexual" (2).

Note[b]. Structural Awareness is a composite measure of Social Dominance Orientation (reverse-scored), System Justification (reverse-scored), Intersectional Awareness, and Structural Targets of Social Justice Behavior. (Cronbach's alpha = -.62)

Note[c]. Taking Action is a composite measure of the Importance of Taking Action and Confidence in Taking Action. (Cronbach's alpha = .59)

Note[d]. Openness is a composite measure of Openness to Experience and the Need for Cognitive Closure (reverse-scored) (Cronbach's alpha = .54).

Note[e]. Empathy is a composite measure of the Perspective Taking and Empathic Concern subscales of the IRI. (Cronbach's alpha = -.62).

Ruling Out an Alternative Explanation

Since all of the measures used in this study were self-reported, and all of them were viewed by the nominators of acts as socially desirable, it might be that the relationships reported here were a result of shared social desirability variance. In order to assess the likelihood that this accounted for these findings, another sample of 115 participants was recruited to complete the measures in this study with a 17-item measure of social desirability included (Stober, 2001, Appendix L). Participants were recruited via the University of Michigan undergraduate Psychology subject pool and were demographically similar to the original sample in most respects. The overall mean score for SDS-17 was 3.29 (*SD* = .47, Cronbach's alpha = .72), while the overall mean score for ESJB was 3.69 (*SD* = .62 Cronbach's alpha = .92). As expected, the correlation between SDS-17 and the 22-item ESJB scale was .44 (*p* < .001); however, there was not a significant correlation between SDS-17 and CASJ. Including SDS-17 as a control did not change the pattern of relationships between the predictors and ESJB, suggesting that the findings cannot be attributed to social desirability (Table 12.

Table 12.

Partial Correlations of Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) Controlling for Social Desirability (n = 111)

	Original Correlation with ESJB	Controlling for Social Desirability
Gender	.31**	.30**
Sexual Orientation[a]	-.15	-.11
Political Orientation	-.34***	-.37***
Structural Awareness[b]	.52***	.46***
Taking Action[c]	.65***	.57***
Openness[d]	.31**	.33***
Extraversion	.06	.20*
Empathy[e]	.55***	.45***

p < .05, ** *p* < .01, *** *p* < .001

Note[a]. Sexual Orientation has been dichotomized into "sexual minorities" (1) and "completely heterosexual" (2).

Note[b]. Structural Awareness is a composite measure of Social Dominance Orientation (reverse-scored), System Justification (reverse-scored), Intersectional Awareness, and Structural Targets of Social Justice Behavior.

Note[c]. Taking Action is a composite measure of the Importance of Taking Action and Confidence in Taking Action.

Note[d]. Openness is a composite measure of Openness to Experience and the Need for Cognitive Closure (reverse-scored).

Note[e]. Empathy is a composite measure of the Perspective Taking and Empathic Concern subscales of the IRI.

Discussion

After testing the relationship between the 22-item Everyday Social Justice Behavior scale and all of its hypothesized correlates, the measure appears to have strong construct validity. While women, sexual minorities, and self-identified liberals reported higher levels of promoting equality and inclusion in their everyday lives as expected, it was surprising that race, perceived social standing, and ability status were unrelated to both ESJB and Collective Action for Social Justice. Just as there may not have been enough people of color or people with disabilities in the sample to effectively demonstrate a relationship, the lack of working class students, or students who have developed class-consciousness, could be responsible for the lack of a correlation. Nevertheless, the evidence is that other forms of social and political identity (gender, sexual orientation and political perspective) do appear to matter to Everyday Social Justice Behavior.

Of course, ESJB should not hold a significant relationship with every kind of individual difference. Indeed, undergraduate GPA should not correspond to everyday social justice behavior, nor should one's age, year in school, or campus residence. In fact, ESJB was unrelated to demographic variables that should have no relationship to behaviors promoting fairness and equality, thereby providing initial evidence supporting its discriminant validity.

As predicted, participants who scored higher on ESJB scores were more likely to hold structural targets accountable for social change than those who scored lower on the measure. Moreover, the tendency to reject the superiority of certain groups (low SDO), oppose the inequities of the status quo (low system justification), and recognize the interconnectedness of oppression (high intersectional awareness) were all positively related to ESJB, as hypothesized. Taken together, the relationship of these constructs to ESJB reflects the importance of structural awareness to behaviors promoting fairness, equity and inclusion in everyday life.

Results also affirm the importance of beliefs about the merits of social action and self-confidence about taking social action to engagement in everyday social justice behavior. These, along with the personality traits of Openness to Experience and Extraversion, as well as Empathic Concern and Perspective Taking, were all positively linked to ESJB, as predicted. Indeed, just as beliefs about the importance of taking action and one's own self-efficacy are logical precursors to social justice behavior, individual differences in personality also matter to the promotion of fairness, equity, and inclusion in everyday life. Equally, as predicted, the Need for Cognitive Closure (NfCC) was negatively related to ESJB, reflecting the limiting role of rigidity of cognition to social justice behaviors.

Overall, ESJB is related to a broad and diverse set of measures previously linked to other measures of progressive activism, such as Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ). It is no surprise that ESJB and CASJ are therefore also correlated; however, the moderate strength of their relationship suggests that while they are related, they are distinct constructs. While structural awareness and openness to experience are significant predictors of both measures, only ESJB was also predicted by empathy, extraversion, and believing in the importance of taking action. Perhaps these differences reflect the fact that everyday social justice behavior depends on more interpersonal interaction, even sometimes confrontation, than does traditional collective effort of progressive activists. For example, interrupting a sexist joke may require more perspective taking, extraversion, and belief in the importance of the action than signing a petition in support of women's rights.

Moreover, although the composite measure of structural awareness predicts both CASJ and ESJB, its individual components relate differently to each outcome. For example, low Social Dominance Orientation and high Intersectional Awareness are more strongly related to ESJB

than CASJ, whereas attributing structural targets of social change is more strongly related to CASJ than ESJB. Perhaps this explains how people who can sign petitions advocating in favor of marriage equality may not fully support their friends who "come out" as lesbian and gay, or vice versa. Although both actions are related, some individuals may only do one, rather than both or neither.

Further analysis of the correlates revealed significant group differences between participants who scored high on both ESJB and CASJ, as compared to participants who scored high on only one measure or low on both. Indeed, the results highlight the conditions under which individuals may be more likely to engage in both everyday social justice behavior and collective action, rather than choose to "specialize" in one. Since structural analysis was significantly higher among people who score high on both measures of social justice behavior, for example, interventions designed to educate people about intersecting modes of oppression and to question the status quo could be one tool to increase social justice behavior more broadly.

Chapter 5:

General Discussion

Summary of Results

Across 3 studies, a new measure of social justice behavior was created and validated using the Act Frequency Approach (Buss and Craik, 1980). The final 22-item Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB) scale reflects a range of global and domain-specific actions that were rated as prototypical by both undergraduate novices and activist experts. The items tended to reflect notions of procedural, as opposed to distributive, justice as there was an overall focus on inclusion, respectful treatment, and equality of access. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, both membership in marginalized groups (e.g. women, sexual minorities) and holding a political orientation on the left side of the spectrum were positively related to scores on the ESJB scale. Moreover, ESJB scores were positively related to structural attributions of social change, intersectional awareness, beliefs about the importance and confidence in taking action, openness to experience, extraversion and empathy, and negatively related to social dominance orientation, system justification, and the need for cognitive closure, confirming Hypothesis 2. Furthermore, ESJB was correlated moderately with another established measure of progressive activist engagement, suggesting that they are related, yet distinct measures of social justice behavior (Hypothesis 3). Finally, there were significant group differences between participants who scored high on both ESJB and Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ), as compared to participants who scored high on only one measure or low on both, confirming Hypothesis 4. Overall, the findings affirm the benefits of the Act Frequency Approach to behavioral measure

development and the value of using it to explore the relationships between individual differences and social justice behaviors.

Contributions of the Research

This dissertation contributes to the growing body of literature exploring activist behaviors intended to promote social justice. By allowing participants to nominate and evaluate a broader set of acts, the research generated a new measure of social justice behavior that can be used to expand the work of scholars in this area. For example, social identity theorists could test to see whether the models used to predict engagement in collective action (e.g. SIMCA; Van Zomeren et al, 2008) also predict Everyday Social Justice Behavior (ESJB). Moreover, microagression researchers (e.g. Hyers, 2010; Sue et al, 2007) could explore whether different forms of everyday discrimination (e.g. Essed, 1991) are related to different scores on ESJB. By attempting to replicate previous findings with respect to collective activism with the 22-item measure of the Everyday Social Justice Behavior Scale, psychologists could make worthwhile contributions to the empirical study of social justice activism.

Furthermore, this dissertation has successfully applied the Act Frequency Approach (Buss & Craik, 1981) to develop a measure of a social justice behavior. This research is consistent with other studies that have used the AFA to provide operational definitions of ambiguous behavioral constructs (Faulkner, 2001; Icevic, 2007; Jonason, Li, & Cason, 2009; McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992; Szamosi & Duxbury, 2002; Romero et al, 1994; Willmann, Feldt, & Amelang, 1997). Ultimately, the AFA seems to be a viable method for operationalizing behavioral constructs into measures with strong content validity.

Finally, the research joins a long line of studies demonstrating the importance of individual differences to social justice behavior (Cole & Stewart, 1996; Duncan & Stewart,

1995; Gurin, 1985; Gurin, Miller, & Gurin, 1980; Henderson-King & Stewart, 1997; Kay & Jost, 2003; Sidanius & Pratto, 2001; Snyder, Peeler, & May, 2008). It also assesses the differential relationships between personality and attitudinal indicators and different measures of social justice behavior, highlighting the important nuances across different contexts.

Limitations and Future Directions

As with any study, there are several limitations that should be addressed. First, although both undergraduate and activist expert raters refined the ESJB scale, it was only validated among an undergraduate sample. Although younger participants may be less worried about the potential ramifications of promoting fairness, inclusion and equity and be more likely to engage in social justice promotion in their everyday lives, they may not have had very many opportunities to do other acts of engagement in their life experience, potentially leading to skewed self-reports of participation. Indeed, participants in Study 3 reported higher frequencies of ESJB than traditional types of progressive activism. Moreover, very few participants self-identified as activists, despite evidence of their prosocial behavior. It would be worthwhile to test these patterns of relationships among other samples with different backgrounds, including older age groups and self-identified activists, to explore whether the findings here generalize to those groups.

Unfortunately, there was a lack of demographic variation at each stage in the development of the ESJB scale, specifically in terms of age, race, sexual orientation, and ability status. Indeed, each of the studies had samples of relatively privileged participants. It is likely that greater diversity among participants could have lead to greater diversity in nominated acts or different ratings of act prototypicality. For example, regional origin of participants was not assessed or manipulated in this study, yet it could nevertheless affect the social context under which participants nominated, rated, and engaged in social justice behaviors. While the current

ESJB scale reflects an important snapshot of social justice behaviors among undergraduate students enrolled in the Midwest, items could differ depending on the background and experience of the participants asked to nominate actions and rate them for prototypicality.

Although race, ability status, and social class situation were not significantly related to ESJB in this sample, it would be worthwhile to test the pattern of relationships in more diverse samples of participants. It is important to note that even though there was greater variation in self-reports of family socio-economic situations growing up, participants may still not have internalized class-consciousness in ways which could affect their social group identification. Priming underrepresented minorities to contemplate the meaning of their social identities could potentially affect the pattern of relationships. For example, racial minority participants primed to think about the centrality and salience of race to their lives (Sellers et al, 2008) may report even higher levels of intersectional awareness or lower levels of social dominance orientation. They may also engage in more experimental social justice behavior outcomes, even if they did not self-report higher frequencies of past everyday social justice behavior or progressive activism. Currently, this remains an empirical question.

Indeed, it is a limitation that both of the behavioral outcomes in Study 3 are self-reported. Future studies could include experimental behavioral outcomes to address concerns about common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). For example, after completing ESJB and its corresponding measures, participants could be approached with an opportunity to donate their incentive payment to a worthwhile cause. Whether participants choose to give to the cause, or give greater amounts to the cause, should positively relate to scores on ESJB.

Further, the cross-sectional design of Study 3 means that causal attributions about the pattern of relationships cannot be inferred. It is unclear whether higher levels of empathy lead to

more engagement in everyday social justice behavior, or whether engagement in everyday social justice behavior may make one more empathic. Experimental or longitudinal study designs would help to resolve concerns about causal inferences.

Nevertheless, the findings hold important implications for the psychological literature on personality and social justice behavior. Future studies could explore other potential correlates of the ESJB scale, such as group consciousness (Duncan, 1999) or awareness of social identity privilege (Montgomery &Stewart, 2012). Past encounters with microagressions (Sue et al, 2007) such as selective incivility (Cortina et al, 2011) could predict social justice behavior, particularly if individuals perceive the pervasiveness of discrimination (Foster, 2009).

Given the differential importance of beliefs about the importance and confidence in taking action, extraversion, and empathy to ESJB and Collective Action for Social Justice (CASJ), future research could explore other ways in which individuals who engage in everyday social justice behavior may differ from those who engage in collective action. For example, people who avoid engagement in broader social movements may not have the time, resources, or social networks to participate in collective actions, whereas people who avoid everyday social justice engagement may feel "burnt out" from their activist engagements. Indeed, participation in certain types of social justice promotion may be more psychologically taxing for individuals.

Previous research has explored the perceived riskiness of social justice behavior and its effects on individual well-being. Foster (2013) examined the longitudinal effects of interpersonal confrontation against discrimination on individual well-being. Although indirect confrontation initially predicted greater well-being than angered confrontation among women, continued use of indirect confrontation decreased well-being over time and continued use of angered confrontation increased well-being over time. Indeed, certain types of social justice promotion

may prove more sustainable than others over time, even if they do not appear to be the easiest forms of engagement at first.

Overall, participants were far more likely to engage in everyday social justice behavior than more traditional behaviors of collective action. Revisiting the debate around "slacktivism," previous scholars have articulated fears that acts of everyday social justice promotion, such as liking a campaign on FaceBook or wearing a ribbon associated with a cause, might lead people to engage less in collective action and mobilization (Morozov, 2009). While it is likely that everyday social justice behavior is simply more accessible for people, particularly undergraduates, there is evidence to suggest that engagement in one type of social justice promotion might preclude engagement in others. Over 5 studies, Kristofferson, White, and Peloza (2013) found that public acts of token support, as opposed to private acts of token support, were related to less meaningful subsequent support of the cause. They theorize that public acts of token support are more about impression-management and less about connection to the cause. Fortunately, they also found that asking participants to connect their individual values to the cause they had previously publicly supported moderates the effect, providing hope for online campaigns and "slacktivists" alike.

Would other interventions lead to greater engagement in more meaningful social justice behavior? Many scholars have discussed the ways in which teaching students about their privilege can increase prosocial behaviors (Gillespie, Ashbaugh, & Defiore, 2002; McIntosh, 1988; Tatum, 1994). While activists are routinely taught strategies for effective mobilization, should activists also be trained to "check their privilege" in order to be better allies in their day-to-day lives? For example, actor and comedian Russell Brand was recently lauded for comments he made in a taped interview in which he railed against contemporary social inequities and called

for widespread changes to the status quo (BBC Newsnight, 2013). Almost as quickly as the video went viral, some media outlets began to question whether Brand should be held up as a revolutionary role model, particularly given his notoriously sexist comedy routines and problematic interactions with women (Ditum, 2013; Okwonga, 2013). Just as people who believe in the need to confront inequality may need a little push to take further action, social justice activists may need reminders about the importance of enacting their values on the ground. Future studies should explore effective interventions for increasing ESJB among new and experienced activists.

Ultimately, this dissertation concludes that social justice behavior is an important construct for continued exploration. While previous research has largely focused on the importance of understanding engagement in collective action, there is a broader set of acts that reflect and support efforts to increase social justice. By empirically operationalizing social justice behavior into a new measure with strong content validity, the Act Frequency Approach proved to be an effective method for scale development. Further, testing the relationships between measures of individual difference and prosocial behavior affirmed the importance of personality research in political psychology.

Appendix A: Demographic Questions

1) Age:

2) Gender:

3) What is your ethnicity/race (select ALL that apply):
      Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander
      Black, African, or African American
      Latino/a, Hispanic or Hispanic American
      Middle Eastern, Arab, or Arab American
      Native American or Alaskan Native
      White, European, or European American
      Other (please specify):

4) In general, how do you characterize your political views? (1=Liberal, 7 =Conservative)

5) Class standing:
      Freshman
      Sophomore
      Junior
      Senior
      Graduate Student

6) Which of the following statements best describes your family situation growing up? **Please check one:**
      Very poor, not enough to get by
      Barely enough to get by
      Had enough to get by but not many "extras"
      Had more than enough to get by
      Well to do
      Extremely well to do

7) Think of the scale below as representing where people stand in the United States.

At the **right** of the scale are the people who are the best off-- those who have the most money, the most education, and the most respected jobs. At the **left** are the people who are the worst off-- who have the least money, least education, and the least respected jobs or no job. The higher up you are on this scale, the closer you are to the people at the very top; the lower you are, the closer you are to the people at the very bottom.

Where would you place yourself on this scale?

Drag the bar to where you think you stand at this time in your life, relative to other people in the United States.

8) How would you describe your sexual orientation?
        Completely homosexual, lesbian, or gay
        Mostly homosexual, lesbian or gay
        Bisexual
        Mostly heterosexual
        Completely heterosexual
        Other (please specify):

9) Do you identify as a person with a disability?
        Yes
        No

10) If you identify as a person with a disability, what is/are the type(s) of disability you have?

11) Do you consider yourself to be an activist?
        Yes
        No
        Unsure

12) If you identify as an activist, what are some of the reasons you identify this way?

Appendix B. Highly Prototypical Social Justice Behaviors By Group

	Students Only		Activists Only
#	**Item**	**#**	**Item**
6	Be friendly to everyone around you	3	Avoid making assumptions about people by what they are wearing or how they look
8	Make it a point to include everyone in activities	5	Avoid giving people an advantage due to their social status
9	Be kind to everyone	19	Protest things you believe are wrong.
10	Avoid discriminating in any way	20	Treat people with respect
13	Treat everybody equally	21	Avoid stereotyping.
17	Look at things from more than one point of view	25	Take action when you see something unfair happening
18	Empathize with people who have different views.	27	Avoid making sexist remarks
26	Appreciate diversity	29	Join groups that work to promote equity between men and women
39	Treat everyone the same no matter what their background is	30	Publicize the facts of inequality
44	Promote respect	32	Call attention to the problems of sexism
47	Put yourself in another person's shoes	34	Participate in rallies and organize events

53	Bridge communication gaps between people with limitations and those without.	36	Learn about how different social systems (e.g. the education system, the criminal justice system, the workplace, etc.) vary for each gender.
54	Volunteer to work with people who are not like you	37	Promote equal pay for equal work
55	Stand up for other people when they are being talked about	41	Encourage the passing of laws to make others more equal
61	Learn about other people's cultures	48	Challenge homophobic ideas
67	Listen to everyone closely with equal attention	50	Stop others from making jokes about sexual orientation
68	Act as a mediator for people with different opinions	51	Join clubs and organizations that support equality.
69	Try to get different people involved in conversation by asking them questions	65	Speak out against using the word "gay" as an adjective with a negative connotation

Appendix C: Vignette Measures (modified from Lopez, Gurin, & Nagda, 1999)

For the first part of the survey, you will read short vignettes about a conflict on campus. For each situation, please evaluate who is responsible for causing the conflict and what should be done about it.

Tim is a student journalist for the Michigan Daily. He writes an editorial about Women's Studies classes and "reverse sexism" on campus. In the article he argues that women and men have already reached equality and that the Women's Studies department should be defunded. Rosa is a Women's Studies major and sends a letter to the Editor highlighting the problems with Tim's argument. Rosa and her fellow Women's Studies students are shocked and frustrated when the Daily never publishes her letter.

For each item, please rate the responsibility for causing the conflict on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (totally).

1) Tim
2) Rosa
3) The Michigan Daily Editor
4) The larger university
5) The larger society as a whole

What should be done about the conflict? (Select all that apply)

1) All things considered, there is really nothing that can be done to deal with this problem.
2) Rosa should try to be less sensitive.
3) Rosa should try to talk to the Editor about it.
4) Tim should be less sexist.
5) Rosa should talk to another University authority about it.
6) Rosa should make others aware of it by distributing flyers, writing a letter to a different newspaper, or organizing a workshop on the issue.
7) The general "climate" at the University would have to change.
8) Certain aspects of the wider society would have to change.
9) Other:

Jeff and Janet put posters on the walls of their residence hall to announce a workshop on homophobia. Three students tore them down and replaced them with a new poster declaring the 21st century the century of "heterosexual pride." Jeff and Janet went to the residence hall director who said, "That's really unfortunate. Take down the new posters before other students see them."

For each item, please rate the responsibility for causing the conflict on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (totally).

1) Jeff and Janet
2) The three other students
3) The residence hall director
4) The larger university
5) The larger society as a whole

What should be done about the conflict? (Select all that apply)

1) All things considered, there is really nothing that can be done to deal with this problem.
2) Jeff and Janet should try to be less sensitive.
3) Jeff and Janet should try to talk to the three other students about it.
4) The three other students should be less homophobic.
5) Jeff and Janet should talk to another University authority about it.
6) Jeff and Janet should make others aware of it by distributing flyers, writing a letter in the school newspaper, or organizing a workshop on the issue.
7) The general "climate" at the University would have to change.
8) Certain aspects of the wider society would have to change.
9) Other:

Jiang is a representative on Central Student Government. He wants to put together an event for Asian Pacific American Heritage Month and submits a request for funding that gets ignored. When he asks Angela, the President of CSG, about why his request was not addressed, she tells him that "there are too many diversity events on campus already" and asks him if "anyone actually cares about Asian Pacific American Heritage Month?"

For each item, please rate the responsibility for causing the conflict on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (totally).

1) Jiang
2) Angela
3) CSG
4) The larger university
5) The larger society as a whole

What should be done about the conflict? (Select all that apply)

1) All things considered, there is really nothing that can be done to deal with this problem.
2) Jiang should try to be less sensitive.
3) Jiang should try to talk to the other CSG representatives about it.
4) Angela should be less racist.
5) Jiang should talk to another University authority about it.
6) Jiang should make others aware of it by distributing flyers, writing a letter in the school newspaper, or organizing a workshop on the issue.
7) The general "climate" at the University would have to change.
8) Certain aspects of the wider society would have to change.
9) Other:

Appendix D: Social Dominance Orientation Items (Sidanius & Pratto, 2001)

1. We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible. (R)
2. It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.
3. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups. (R)
4. It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and others are at the bottom.
5. We would have fewer problems if groups were treated more equally. (R)
6. In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.
7. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.
8. No one group should dominate in society. (R)

Appendix E: System Justification Items (Kay & Jost, 2003)

On a scale of 1(strongly agree) to 9 (strongly disagree), how do you rate the following?

1. "In general, you find society to be fair."
2. "In general, the American political system operates as it should."
3. "American society needs to be radically restructured" (reverse-scored).
4. "The United States is the best country in the world to live in."
5. "Most policies serve the greater good."
6. "Everyone has a fair shot at wealth and happiness,"
7. "Our society is getting worse every year" (reverse-scored).
8. "Society is set up so that people usually get what they deserve."

Appendix F: Intersectional Awareness Items (modified from Curtin, 2011)

1. Understanding the experiences of women from different ethnic groups is important.
2. We must understand racism as well as sexism.
3. Homophobia and heterosexism affect the lives of heterosexual people as well as gay men, lesbians and bisexuals.
4. People can belong to multiple social groups.
5. Black and White women experience sexism in different ways.
6. Sex and race are inseparable issues in the lives of women.
7. All oppressions are tied together.
8. Women of color are often forgotten about when people talk about race.
9. While there are important differences in how different kinds of oppression work; there are also important similarities
10. Women of color are often forgotten about when people talk about gender.
11. Racism impacts the lives of white women as well as women of color.
12. People who belong to more than one oppressed social group (eg, lesbians who are also ethnic minorities) have experiences that differ from people who belong to only one such group.
13. People don't think enough about how connections between social class, race, gender and sexuality affect individuals.
14. Homophobia and heterosexism affect the lives of gay men, lesbians, and bisexual people.
15. Homophobia and heterosexism affect the lives of heterosexual people.
16. Racism affects the lives of white women.
17. There are important similarities in how different kinds of oppression work.

Appendix G: Importance and Confidence in Taking Action Items (Nagda, Kim & Truelove, 2004)

"On a scale of 1 (not at all important) to 4 (of crucial importance), how important is it for you to…?"

"On a scale of 1 (not at all confident) to 4 (extremely confident), how confident do you feel about your ability to…?"

Prejudice Reduction:

1) Think about the impact of my comments and actions before I speak or act.
2) Refuse to participate in jokes that are derogatory to any group.
3) Refrain from repeating statements or rumors that reinforce prejudice or bias.
4) Recognize and challenge the biases that affect my own thinking.
5) Avoid using language that reinforces negative stereotypes.
6) Say something such as 'I think that's inappropriate,' when I think something indicates prejudice.

Promoting Diversity:

7) Challenge other on racial/ethnic/sexually derogatory comments.
8) Reinforce others for behaviors that support cultural diversity.
9) Make efforts to educate myself about other groups (for example, other ethnic groups, genders, or sexual orientations).
10) Call, write, or in some way protest when a book, newspaper, television show, or some branch of media perpetuates or reinforces a bias or prejudice.
11) Make efforts to get to know individuals from diverse backgrounds.

Appendix H: Need for Cognitive Closure Items (Roets & van Hiel, 2011)

1. I don't like situations that are uncertain.
2. I dislike questions which could be answered in many different ways.
3. I find that a well-ordered life with regular hours suits my temperament.
4. I feel uncomfortable when I don't understand the reason why an event occurred in my life.
5. I feel irritated when one person disagrees with what everyone else in a group believes.
6. I don't like going into a situation without knowing what I can expect from it.
7. When I have made a decision, I feel relieved.
8. When I am confronted with a problem, I'm dying to reach a solution very quickly.
9. I would quickly become impatient and irritated if I would not find a solution to a problem immediately.
10. I don't like to be with people who are capable of unexpected actions.
11. I dislike it when a person's statement could mean many different things.
12. I find that establishing a consistent routine enables me to enjoy life more.
13. I enjoy having a clear and structured mode of life.
14. I do not usually consult many different opinions before forming my own view.
15. I dislike unpredictable situations.

Appendix I: Big Five Inventory Items (John & Srivastava, 1999)

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

I am someone who…

1. Is talkative
2. Tends to find fault with others
3. Does a thorough job
4. Is depressed, blue
5. Is original, comes up with new ideas
6. Is reserved
7. Is helpful and unselfish with others
8. Can be somewhat careless
9. Is relaxed, handles stress well.
10. Is curious about many different thing
11. Is full of energy
12. Starts quarrels with others
13. Is a reliable worker
14. Can be tense.
15. Is ingenious, a deep thinker
16. Generates a lot of enthusiasm
17. Has a forgiving nature
18. Tends to be disorganized
19. Worries a lot
20. Has an active imagination
21. Tends to be quiet
22. Is generally trusting
23. Tends to be lazy
24. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset
25. Is inventive
26. Has an assertive personality
27. Can be cold and aloof
28. Perseveres until the task is finished
29. Can be moody
30. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences
31. Is sometimes shy, inhibited
32. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone
33. Does things efficiently
34. Remains calm in tense situations
35. Prefers work that is routine
36. Is outgoing, sociable
37. Is sometimes rude to others
38. Makes plans and follows through with them
39. Gets nervous easily
40. Likes to reflect, play with ideas
41. Has few artistic interests
42. Likes to cooperate with others
43. Is easily distracted
44. Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature

Appendix J: Interpersonal Reactivity Index Subscales (Davis, 1980)

The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree according to the scale.

1. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me. (EC)
2. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other guy's" point of view. (PT) (-)
3. Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems. (EC) (-)
4. I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision. (PT).
5. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them. (EC)
6. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective. (PT)
7. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. (EC) (-)
8. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments. (PT) (-)
9. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them. (EC) (-)
10. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen. (EC)
11. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both. (PT)
12. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person. (EC)
13. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in his shoes" for a while. (PT)
14. Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place. (PT)

NOTE: (-) denotes item to be scored in reverse fashion

        PT = perspective-taking scale
        EC = empathic concern scale

Appendix K: Previous Activist Engagement Measure (modified from Duncan, 1999)

From the following list please indicate any causes you may have been involved in at any time in the past and the type of activity that best describes your involvement. Check all that apply.

	None	Signed a petition	Contributed money	Attended a meeting	Wrote a letter, called, or called on a public official	Was an active member of an organization	Attended a rally or a demonstration
AIDS							
Adoption rights for gay men and lesbians							
Anti-Racism							
Anti-war/Peace							
Business/ Professional							
Childcare							
Civil Rights							
Crime/Neighborhood Watch							
Democratic Party							
Ending Hate Crimes against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people							
Environmental Issues							

Homeless						
Moral Majority						
Opposition to Gay Marriage						
Pro-Choice						
Pro-Life						
PTA/PTO						
Republican Party						
Support for Gay Marriage						
War Support/Troop						
Women's Rights						
Workers Rights						
Other (please specify):						

Appendix L: Social Desirability Scale-17 (Stober, 2001)

1. I sometimes litter. (reverse-scored)
2. I always admit my mistakes openly and face the potential negative consequences.
3. In traffic I am always polite and considerate of others.
4. I have tried illegal drugs (for example, marijuana, cocaine, etc.). (reverse-scored)
5. I always accept others' opinions, even when they don't agree with my own.
6. I take out my bad moods on others now and then. (reverse-scored)
7. There has been an occasion when I took advantage of someone else. (reverse-scored)
8. In conversations I always listen attentively and let others finish their sentences.
9. I never hesitate to help someone in case of emergency.
10. When I have made a promise, I keep it—no ifs, ands or buts.
11. I occasionally speak badly of others behind their back. (reverse-scored)
12. I would never live off other people.
13. I always stay friendly and courteous with other people, even when I am stressed out.
14. During arguments I always stay objective and matter-of-fact.
15. There has been at least one occasion when I failed to return an item that I borrowed. (reverse-scored)
16. I always eat a healthy diet.
17. Sometimes I only help because I expect something in return. (reverse-scored)

References

BBC Newsnight. (2013 October 22). Russell Brand: I've never voted, never will [video file].

Retrieved from: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-24648651

Block, J. (1989). Critique of the Act Frequency Approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56 (2)*, 234-245. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.234

Buss, D. M & Craik, K. H. (1980). The frequency concept of disposition: dominance and prototypically dominant acts. *Journal of Personality, 48 (3)*, pp. 379-392. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1980.tb00840.x

Buss, D. M. & Craik, K. H. (1983). The act frequency approach to personality. *Psychological Review, 2*, pp. 105-126. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.90.2.105

Carney, D. R., Jost, J. T., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2008). The secret lives of liberals and conservatives: Personality profiles, interaction styles, and the things they leave behind. *Political Psychology, 29*, 807–840. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00668.x

Christensen, H. S. (2011). Political activities on the Internet: Slacktivism or political participation by other means? *First Monday, 16 (2)*, http://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/3336/2767

Chi, M. T. H, Feltovich, P. J., and Glaser, R. (1981). Categorization and representation of physics problems by experts and novices. *Cognitive Science, 5 (2)*, pp. 121-152. DOI: 10.1207/s15516709cog0502_2

Cole, E. R. & Stewart, A. J. (1996). Meanings of political participation among black and white women: Political identity and social responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71(1)*, pp. 130-140. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.71.1.130

Collins, P. H. (1989). The social construction of black feminist thought. *Signs, 14*(4), 745-773.

Retrieved at:

http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/3174683?uid=2&uid=4&sid=21102948795823

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., Magley, V. J. (2011). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. *Journal of Management*, available at

http://jom.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/08/25/0149206311418835, retrieved at 11 November 2013.

Cook, J. R. (1983). Citizen response in a neighborhood under threat. *American Journal Of Community Psychology, 11(4),* 459-471. doi:10.1007/BF00894059

Crenshaw, K. W. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43 (6),* pp 1241-1299. Retrieve at:

http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/1229039?uid=2&uid=4&sid=21102948795823

Curtin, N., Stewart, A. J. & Duncan, L. E. (2010). What makes the political personal? Openness, Personal Political Salience, and activism. *Journal of Personality, 78*: pp. 943–968. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00638.x

Curtin, N. Stewart, A. & Cole, E. (under review). *Challenging the status quo: The role of intersectional awareness in pro-social intergroup attitudes and collective action for social change*.

Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 10,* pp. 85. Retrieved at:

http://www.uv.es/~friasnav/Davis_1980.pdf

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a

multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*, pp. 113-

126. Retrieved at:

http://www.nips.ac.jp/fmritms/conference/references/Mano/Davis1983.pdf

Ditum, S. (2013 June 19). If only Russell Brand could use his cleverness for more than

humiliation. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from:

http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/jun/19/russell-brand-msnbc-morning-

joe-humiliation

Duncan, L. E. (1999). Motivation for collective action: Group consciousness as mediator of

personality, life experiences, and women's rights activism. *Political Psychology, 20*, 611-

635. doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00159

Duncan, L., & Stewart, A. J. (1995). Still bringing the Vietnam War home: Sources of

contemporary student activism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 914–924.

DOIs: 10.1177/0146167295219006

Duncan, L. E. & Stewart, A. J. (2007). Personal Political Salience: The role of personality in

collective identity and action. *Political Psychology, 28*, pp. 143–164.

doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2007.00560.x

Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. Newbury Park,

CA: Sage Publications.

Evans, S. (1980). *Personal politics: The roots of women's liberation in the Civil Rights*

movement and the New Left. New York: Vintage Books.

Fahs B. (2007). Second shifts and political awakenings: Divorce and the political socialization of

middle-aged women. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage. 47(3–4),* pp. 43–66.

DOI: 10.1300/J087v47n03_03

Faulkner, M. (2001). A measure of patient empowerment in hospital environments catering for

older people. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 34 (5)*, pp. 676-686.

DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2648.2001.01797.x

Fingerhut, A. W. (2011). Straight allies: What predicts heterosexuals' alliance with the LGBT

community? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 41 (9)*, pp. 2230–2248.

DOI: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00807.x

Foster, M. (2009). Perceiving pervasive discrimination over time: Implications for coping.

Psychology of Women Quarterly, 33 (2), pp. 172-182.

DOI: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01487.x

Foster, M. (2013). Everyday confrontation of discrimination: The well-being costs and benefits

to women over time. *International Journal of Psychological Studies, 5(3)*, pp. 135-154.

doi: 10.5539/ijps.v5n3p135

Gillespie, D., Ashbaugh, L., Defiore, J. (2002). White women teaching white women about white

privilege, race cognizance and social action: Toward a pedagogical pragmatics. *Race,*

Ethnicity, and Education, 5(3), pp. 237-253. **DOI:**10.1080/1361332022000004841

Goldberg, H. (2013, September 3). Conversations: How has student activism changed at the

University? *The Michigan Daily*. Retrieved from:

https://www.michigandaily.com/article/conversations-how-has-student-activism-

changed-university?page=0,0

Greenwood, R. (2008). Intersectional political consciousness: Appreciation for intragroup

differences and solidarity in diverse groups. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *32*(1), 36-

47. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00405.x

Gurin, P. (1985). Women's gender consciousness. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 49,* 143–163.

    doi: 10.1086/268911

Gurin, P., Miller, A. H., & Gurin, G. (1980). Stratum identification and consciousness. *Social*

    Psychology Quarterly, 43 (1), pp. 30-47. Retrieved from:

    http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/3033746?uid=2&uid=4&sid=21102948795823

Harris, J. A. Measured intelligence, achievement, openness to experience and creativity.

    Personality and Individual Differences, 36 (4), pp. 913-929.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00161-2.

Henderson-King, D., & Stewart, A. J. (1997). Feminist consciousness: Perspectives on women's

    experience. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 415–426.

    doi: 10.1177/0146167297234007

Hoffman, M. L. (1990). Empathy and justice motivation. Motivation and Emotion, 14(2), pp.

    151-172. DOI: 10.1007/BF00991641

Hyers, L. L. (2010). Alternatives to silence in face-to-face encounters with everyday

    heterosexism: Activism on the interpersonal front. *Journal Of Homosexuality, 57(4),* 539-

    565. doi:10.1080/00918361003608749

Icevic, Z. (2007). Artistic and Everyday Creativity: An Act-Frequency Approach. *Journal of*

    Creative Behavior, 41 (4), pp. 271-290. DOI: 10.1002/j.2162-6057.2007.tb01074.x

John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory--Versions 4a and*

    54. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social

    Research.

John, O. P. & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and

 theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality:*

 Theory and research (Vol. 2, pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.

Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P, & Cason, M. J. (2009): The "Booty Call": A compromise between

 men's and women's ideal mating strategies. *Journal of Sex Research, 46 (5),* pp. 460-470.

 doi: 10.1080/00224490902775827.

Jost, J.T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A.W., & Sulloway, F. (2003). Political conservatism as

 motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin, 129,* 339–375.

Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying

 ideologies. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*(5), 260-265.

 DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.3.339

Jost, J.T., & Thompson, E.P. (2000). Group-based dominance and opposition to equality as

 independent predictors of self-esteem, ethnocentrism, and social policy attitudes among

 African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social*

 Psychology, 36, 209–232. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1999.1403

Kay, A. C. & Jost, J. T. (2003). Complementary justice: Effects of "poor but happy" and "poor

 but honest" stereotype exemplars on system justification and implicit activation of the

 justice motive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85 (5),* pp. 823-837.

 DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.823

Kelly, G. A. (1963). *A theory of personality: The Psychology of personal constructs*. New York,

 NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Kim, K., Bae, J, Nho, M., & Lee, C. H. (2011). How do experts and novices differ? Relation

versus attribute and thinking versus feeling in language use. *Psychology of Aesthetics*

Creativity and the Arts, *5(4)*, pp. 379-388. DOI:10.1037/a0024748

Kluegel, J. R. (1990). Trends in whites' explanations of the black-white gap in socioeconomic

status. *American Sociological Review, 55(4),* pp. 512-525. Stable URL:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/2095804 .

Kristofferson, K., White, K., & Peloza, J. (forthcoming). The nature of Slacktivism: How the

social observability of an initial act of token support affects subsequent prosocial action.

Journal of Consumer Research. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/674137

Larkin, J., McDermott, J., Simon, D. P., & Simon, H. A. (1980). Expert and novice

performance in solving physics problems. *Science*, *208*, 1335– 1342. Retrieved from:

http://doi.library.cmu.edu/10.1184/pmc/simon/box00013/fld00909/bdl0001/do   c0001

Lind, E.A. & Tyler, T.R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice.* N.Y.: Plenum

Lopez, G. E., Gurin, P., & Nagda, B. A. (1998). Education and understanding structural causes

for group inequities. *Political Psychology, 19 (2),* pp. 305-329. Stable URL:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/3792050

McAdams, D. P. & de St. Aubin, E. (1992). A theory of generativity and its assessment through

self-report, behavioral acts, and narrative themes in autobiography. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 62(5), pp. 1003-1015.

doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.62.6.1003

McAdams, D. P & Pals, J. L. (2006). A new Big Five: Fundamental principles for an integrative

science of personality. *American Psychologist, 61(3),* pp. 204-217. doi: 10.1037/0003-

066X.61.3.204

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to

    see correspondences through work in women's studies (Working Paper No. 189).

    Wellesley, MA: Wellesley Centers for Women. Retrieved from:

    http://www.iub.edu/~tchsotl/part2/McIntosh%20White%20Privilege.pdf

Meng, X., Rosenthal, R., Rubin, D. B. (1992). Comparing correlated correlation coefficients.

    Psychological Bulletin, 111(1), pp. 172-175. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.111.1.172

Mondak, J. J., Hibbing, M. V., Canache, D., Seligson, M. A., & Anderson, M. R. (2010).

    Personality and civic engagement: An integrative framework for the study of trait effects

    on political behavior. *American Political Science Review, 104 (1)*, pp. 85-110.

    doi:10.1017/S0003055409990359

Montgomery, S. A. & Stewart, A. J. (2012). Privileged allies in Lesbian and Gay Rights

    activism: Gender, generation, and resistance to heteronormativity. *Journal of Social*

    Issues, 68(1), pp.162-177. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01742.x.

Morozov, E. (2009, May 19). The brave new world of slacktivism. *Foreign Policy*. Retrieved

    from:http://neteffect.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/05/19/the_brave_new_world_of_slack

    tivism

Moser, K. (1989). The Act Frequency Approach: A conceptual critique. *Personality and Social*

    Psychology Bulletin, 15 (73), pp. 73-83. DOI: 10.1177/0146167289151007.

Nagda, B. A., Kim, C., & Truelove, Y. (2004). Learning about difference, learning with others,

    learning to transgress. *Journal of Social Issues, 60 (1),* pp. 195-214.

    DOI: 10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00106.x

Okwonga, M. (2013 October 24). *On Russell Brand and lazy sexism: Be wary of jumping on the*

    Brandwagon. Retrieved from: http://www.okwonga.com/?p=832

Omoto, A. M., Snyder, M., & Hackett, J. D. (2010). Personality and motivational antecedents of

    activism and civic engagement. *Journal of Personality, 78(6),* pp. 1703-1734.

    DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00667.x

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. (2003). Method biases in behavioral research: A

    critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied*

    Psychology, 88 (5), pp. 879-902. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M, & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A

    personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and*

    Social Psychology, 67 (4), pp. 741-763. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Reicher, S. D. (1984). The St. Pauls riot: An explanation of the limits of crowd action in terms of

    a social identity model. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 14*, 1–21.

    DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.2420140102

Roets, A. & van Hiel, A. (2011). Item selection and validation of a brief, 15-item version of the

    Need for Closure Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*, pp. 90-94.

    doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.004

Romero, M. E, Luengo, M. A., Carillo-De-La-Pena, T., & Otero-Lopez, J. M. (1994). The Act

    Frequency Approach to the study of impulsivity. *European Journal of Personality, 8(2),*

    pp. 119-133. DOI: 10.1002/per.2410080204

Rosch, E. & Mervis, C. B. (1975). Family resemblances: Studies in the internal structure of

    cateogories. *Cognitive Psychology, 7(4),* pp. 573-605.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(75)90024-9

Sellers, R. M., Smith, M. A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S. J., & Chavous, T M. (1998).

   Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American

   racial identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2,* 18-36. Retrieved from:

   http://141.213.232.243/bitstream/handle/2027.42/68695/10.1207_s15327957pspr0201_2.
   pdf?sequence=2

 Sidanius, J & Pratto, F. (2001). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy*

   and Oppression. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-80540-6.

Snyder, C., Peeler, J., & May, J. (2008). Combining human diversity and social justice

   education: a conceptual framework. *Journal of Social Work Education, 44*(1), 145-161.

   DOI: 10.5175/JSWE.2008.200700052

Stewart, A., & Healy, J. M. (1989). Linking individual development and social changes.

   American Psychologist, 44, 30–42. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.44.1.30

Stewart, A. J., Settles, I. H., & Winter, N. J. G. (1998). Women and the social movements of the

   1960s: Activists, engaged observers, and nonparticipants. *Political Psychology, 19, pp.* 63-

   94. Retrieved from:

   http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/3792115?uid=2129&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&sid=2
   1102949184353

Stober, J. (2001). The Social Desirability Scale-17: Convergent validity, discriminant validity,

   and relationship with age. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 17(3)*, pp.

   222-232. DOI: 10.1027//1015-5759.17.3.222

Swank, E., & Fahs, B. (2013). An intersectional analysis of gender and race for sexual

   minorities who engage in gay and lesbian rights activism. *Sex Roles, 68*, 660-674.

DOI: 10.1007/s11199-012-0168-9

Swank, E. & Fahs, B. (2011). Pathways to political activism among Americans who have same-

sex sexual contact. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 8 (2),* pp. 126-138. DOI:

10.1007/s13178-011-0034-5

Sue, D. W.; Capodilupo, C. M; Torino, G. C.; Bucceri, J. M.; Holder, A. M. B.; Nadal, K. L.,

Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical

practice. *American Psychologist, 62(4),* pp. 271-286. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271

Szamosi, L. T. & Duxbury, L. (2002). Development of a measure to assess organizational

change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 15 (2),* pp.184 – 201. DOI:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09534810210423107

Tajfel, H. (1978). The achievement of inter-group differentiation. In H. Tajfel (Ed.),

Differentiation between social groups (pp. 77–100). Lon- don: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of inter-group conflict. In W. G. Austin

& S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of inter-group relations* (pp. 33–47).

Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tatum, B. (1994). Teaching white students about racism: The search for white allies and the

restoration of hope. *Teachers College Record, 95(4),* pp. 462-476. Retrieved from:

http://web-prod.spu.edu/depts/csfd/documents/teachingwhitestudentsaboutracism.pdf

Van Hiel, A., Kossowska, M., & Mervielde, I. (2000). The relationship between Openness to

Experience and political ideology. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28,* 741–751.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00135-X

Van Hiel, A., & Mervielde, I. (2004). Openness to experience and boundaries in the mind:

    Relationships with cultural and economic conservative beliefs. *Journal of Personality,*

    72, 659–686. DOI: 10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00276.x

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),* pp. 504-535.

    DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.134.4.504

Webster, D. M., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1994). Individual differences in need for cognitive

    closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67(6),* 1049-1062.

    doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.1049

Willmann, E., Feldt, K., & Amelang, M. (1997). Prototypical behavior patterns of social

    intelligence: An intercultural comparison between Chinese and German subjects.

    International Journal of Psychology, 32 (5), pp. 329-346.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/002075997400692