"Tell Your Friends to Pull Up": Development and Validation of the Measure of Allyship Identity (MAI)

by

Erika Hanley

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
August 6, 2022

Keywords: allyship; identity development; social justice;
mixed-methods; scale development; scale validation

Approved by

Evelyn Hunter, Chair, Associate Professor of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling
Chippewa Thomas, Professor of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling
Malti Tuttle, Associate Professor of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling
Julia Charles-Linen, Associate Professor of English
Felicia Tuggle, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work

Abstract

The present study describes the development and validation of the Measure of Allyship Identity (MAI), an instrument intending to assess the development of one's identity as a social justice ally across a continuum. Items were constructed based on qualitative data gathered from focus groups conducted at a large Southeastern university. Thirty-four participants completed the focus group semi-structured interviews where they were asked to reflect on experiences and perceptions of allyship. Through grounded theory analysis process, fifteen themes emerged from the focus groups that contributed to the creation of a bank of 70 items to be reviewed for the MAI pilot measure. Seven subject matter area experts reviewed all 70 items to determine face validity whereby 13 items remained which spanned five of the initial themes: ally for whom or what; view of fairness and justice; relationship with privilege; ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors; and action. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with data from 218 participants yielded one factor. To evaluate for convergent and discriminant validity, participants completed the MAI along with a number of other measures that assessed favorable attitudes towards social justice activities, likelihood of engaging in social activism in the future, political solidarity, compassion for others, belief that the world is a just or fair place, belief in social dominance, and impression management. Although the statistical analyses did not support the MAI as a quantitative tool for assessing allyship identity development across a continuum, the results did support sound initial reliability and validity. A proposed model of allyship identity development, limitations, and implications for counseling psychology and training are discussed.

Acknowledgements

To Dr. Hunter, I am so appreciative to have had you as an advisor, chair, and mentor. Thank you for your guidance, patience, and advocacy. I am a better researcher, educator, and mental health professional because of you. Thank you to Dr. Thomas, Dr. Tuttle, Dr. Charles-Linen, and Dr. Tuggle for your time, effort, and contributions to this research and graduate school process. To Dr. Kluck, thank you for your continued support and encouragement throughout this journey. To Alexis Jones, your generous assistance and time were so greatly appreciated and valued.

To my friends, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for all your support and belief. I also thank you for the long phone, FaceTime, or Zoom calls that reminded me to breath and enjoy moments of connection and joy. To Sweet 'N Shady '16, much of this journey has been helped by sharing laughs and memories with you all. I appreciated the opportunity to share space and time with you. I am so proud of us. To my program-mates past and present, thank you for your wisdom and encouragement. To Rose and Zinnia, thank you for providing plenty of company during late night writing.

To my mom and dad, I am so proud to be your daughter. I thank you so very much for your support, your love, your encouragement, and your prayers as I went through this journey. There was never a moment in which you did not believe this was possible and for that I am grateful. To my family, thank you for your kind words of support and your excitement. To those ancestors who have since crossed over: while not here physically, your spirit and resilience remain within me, and it is my hope that I have made you proud.

Paciencia y Fe.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1. Introduction

Background

The hashtag #BlackLivesMatter, and subsequent Black Lives Matter Movement, was founded in 2013 by Alicia Garza, Patrisse Cullors, and Ayo Tometi, in response to the acquittal of George Zimmerman in the second degree murder of Black teenager Trayvon Martin. The movement challenges the structural anti-Black racism that permeates the United States as well as serves to affirm the humanity and validity of Black life and resilience (Garza, 2014). Public knowledge and support for Black Lives Matter has increased since 2013, with 67% of Americans indicating support for the movement (Parker et al., 2020). Although the movement has maintianed activity through marches in neighborhoods and cities, occupying establishments such as malls and city halls, and petitions, one of the largest swells in public support domestically and internationally occurred in May 2020. On May 26, 2020, the public killing of George Floyd, a Black resident of Minneapolis, Minnesota, by a law enforcement officer was circulated on the internet which gained worldwide attention with over 60 countries and 2,000 United States cities protesting for the Black Lives Matter Movement in the weeks that followed. What has additionally resulted in the mainstream attention garnered is an increase in non-Black people of color and White individuals wanting to engage in the Black Lives Matter movement, increase their anti-racism education, and develop social justice allyship. The benefits and limitations associated with involving non-Black people of color and White individuals in the Black Lives Matter movement, or any advantaged social group member in movements for disadvantaged group members, may depend on their degree of development as an ally.

Allyship. Systems of oppression and privilege operate on individual, interpersonal, institutional, and structural levels through beliefs and actions to exploit and disadvantage some individuals or groups while benefiting or advantaging others based on social group membership (Edwards, 2006). Individuals are categorized in social group membership based on social identities that identify them as members of oppressor groups, or "agents," and as members of oppressed groups, or "targets" (Gibson, 2014). Agents include social group such as White people, heterosexual people, and cisgender people whereas targets include social groups such as Black people, queer people, and transgender people. Agents benefit from privilege through unearned entitlements, things of value that all people should have, and conferred dominance, the power one group has over another (Edwards, 2006; McIntosh, 1988).

Systems of oppression are challenged via social justice and liberation movements which are led and supported by targeted social groups as well as agents. Members of an agent group who reject the dominant ideology that benefits them and take action against oppression out of the belief that eliminating oppression will improve the lives of agents and targets are known as social justice allies (Griffin, 1997). Allies are considered to be individauls who encompass anti-oppression actions and actively engage to support and uplift targeted groups (Anderson & Middleton, 2011).

Despite the common use of the term "ally" to describe privileged individuals intending to serve and support oppressed social groups, there is debate surrounding the appropriateness of this term and what determines ally identification. Alternative terms have been suggested to describe "allies" such as "accomplice," "co-conspirator," and "activist" (Accomplice, 2020; Curtin & McGarty 2016; Droogendyk et al., 2016; Hackman, 2015; Jackson et al., 2020; LeMaster, 2018; Move to End Violence, 2016; Powell & Kelly, 2017; Singh, 2019). The suggestion and use of

alternative terminology to describe allyship is due in part to attempts to cutlivate a better understanding of the role of allies, the actions they engage in, and the relationships they develop with those individuals they intend to advocate for.

Scholars have argued whether the identification as an ally is based on emotional connection, morality, action, behavior, or combinations of these concepts (Mathers et al., 2018). Toomey et al.,(2016) as well as LeMaster (2018) highlighted the importance of allyship being associated with action and to be identified as an ally means one is engaging in movement towards reducing oppression and and uplifting equity and liberation. Additionally, allies are intended to work alongside the social groups they are advocating for with a focus on centering the experiences of those social groups. Characteristics associated with the identification of allies have been outlined within models and frameworks of allyship.

Models of Allyship and Identity Devleopment. There are a variety of models of allyship originating from research on racial oppression (Broido, 2000; Giroux, 1997), that have been applied to education (Griffin, 1997) and social justice issues (Edwards, 2006; Reason et al., 2005). Such models have described common factors or charactistics that are associated with social justice allies. Gibson (2014) utilizes competencies typically found in multicultural practice to describe characteristics of alllies including: awareness, knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, feelings, actions, and skills. Awareness and knowledge includes individuals engaging in conscious knowing to which they self-reflect and gain a better understanding of their own social group identities (Gibson, 2014). Attitudes, beliefs, and feelings incorpate an individual's feelings about their own identities and how they may interact with other individuals with similar or differing identities (Gibson, 2014). Lastly, action and skills are the basis by which an individual engages

in action that assists in social justice movement and in the uprooting of oppression. Action and skills are informed by knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs (Gibson, 2014).

In addition to those models that describe specific common factors associated with allies, there are identity development models that describe individuals at different stages of allyship identity development. Identitiy development is known as the "process of becoming more complex in understanding person, social, or professional identities" (McEwen, 2003). Identity development models are important for understanding the process of allyship identity development as individuals' emotional and cognitive investment, motivaitonal factors, and actions increase in complexity as one develops (Edwards, 2006). Edwards' (2006) Social Justice Ally Identity Development model considers three forms of social justice allies: Aspiring Ally for Self-Interest, Aspiring Ally for Altruism, and Ally for Social Justice. Aspiring Allies for Self-Interest are motivated to protect those they care about from being hurt and may not always identify as an ally but rather define their behavior based on their relationships with others (Edwards, 2006). Aspiring Allies for Altruism are primarily motivated by an awareness of privilege and seeking to engage in advocacy as a means of dealing with guilt and shame from that awareness (Edwards, 2006). Lastly, Allies for Social Justice are motivated by the goal of ending oppression to benefit oppressed groups as well as liberate themselves by working with those from oppressed groups to end systems of oppression (Edwards, 2006). The development of one from self-interested to altruistic to a combination of the two underlies the motivation for an individual to become a social justice ally.

Purpose

The importance of developing allyship and advocating for as well as centering the experiences of historically marginalized individuals has been a central discussion within social justice-focused research and more broadly among individuals during interpersonal interactions. The title of this dissertation highlights a core takeaway message regarding allyship from a speech by Robyn Fenty, also known as the musician and businesswoman Rihanna, while receiving the President's Award during the 2020 NAACP Image Awards. She discussed the importance of recognizing social and political issues that predominately impact Black communities, as a problem for all races, ethnicities, genders, and religions, not just those being targeted by state violence, "so when we're marching, and protesting, and posting about the Michael Brown Junior's and Atatiana Jefferson's of the world, tell your friends to pull up" (BETNetworks, 2020). Considering that counseling psychology incorporates the goals of better advocating for oppressed groups and influencing social change, the purpose of this research was to create a tool for individuals to gain a better understanding of their development as it relates to advocacy and allyship so that they may more effectively contribute to social change (Rostosky & Riggle, 2011; Rubel & Ratts, 2011).

This research aimed to clarify the process by which individuals who self-identify as social justice allies develop across a continuum and shed light on how this development may impact the degree to which individuals interact with social justice knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. First, the research examined thoughts, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of self-identified social justice allies and individuals who do not self-identify as social justice allies through the use of focus groups. These groups highlighted the varying perspectives regarding social justice which were utilized to cultivate themes that contribute to a continuum of allyship

identity development. This research also assessed whether the Measure of Allyship Identity created from the focus groups was able to differentiate between individuals at distinct stages of development, in addition to whether it was associated with other established social justice-oriented scales. Finally, the research examined the role of belief in fairness, justice, and social dominance in predicting social justice ally development.

Significance of Research

This study is significant in that it will expand the literature on social justice allyship to include ally identity development. If the process of allyship identity development is better understood, it may assist in adapting social justice education and training and provide clarity on how to better engage individuals in developing allyship and advocacy. As it relates to psychology, the present study provides a method to further examine graduate programs in counseling psychology and their training values and curriculum. This research encourages enhancing the incorporation of social justice into the education, training, practice, as well as advocacy within counseling psychology programs (Asta & Vacha-Haase, 2013; Toporek et al., 2006). Asta and Vacha-Haase (2013) indicated that participants within their study specifically highlighted that they selected a counseling psychology program to attend compared to other training programs because of the value of social justice within the field. It would be significant if the results of this particular study would assist in upholding the value of social justice within counseling psychology by providing clarity regarding one's social justice allyship development to encourage further progression, education, and social justice action within and outside of counseling psychology.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study will examine the following question and hypotheses:

Study 1a

1. What are the components of allyship identity development?
2. What is the process of allyship identity development?

No specific hypotheses were developed for Study 1a as this is a qualitative study from a critical ideological paradigm.

Study 1b

3. How well does the Measure of Allyship Identity statistically differentiate between participants in different meaningful allyship identity categories?
    a. The Measure of Allyship Identity will statistically differentiate participants at distinct levels of identity development.
4. To what extent is the Measure of Allyship Identity measuring the constructs of allyship identity development identified in Study 1a?
    a. Using exploratory factor analysis (EFA), a model capturing the constructs of allyship identity development identified in Study 1a will emerge.
5. Does the Measure of Allyship Identity appropriately assess allyship identity development as demonstrated by convergence with validated social justice measures?
    a. The Measure of Allyship Identity will appropriately assess allyship identity development and demonstrate convergent validity with validated social justice measures and discriminant validity with an impression management subscale.
6. Does allyship identity development predict beliefs related to fairness, justice, and social dominance?

a. Greater development of one's allyship identity may be negatively associated with the belief that the world is a just or fair place and belief in social dominance.
b. Greater development of one's allyship identity may be positively associated with favorable attitudes towards social justice activities, likelihood of engaging in social activism in the future, and greater political solidarity.
c. Greater development of one's allyship identity may be positively associated with greater compassion for others.

Chapter 2. Literature Review

Allyship

Reliant on historical, social, and institutional power, oppression occurs when one group of individuals is able to enforce policies, practices, and traditions throughout society because it has the most access to social, cultural, and economic resources and is often backed by legal authority (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). While prejudice, judgments and assumptions created and projected onto a social group, primarily occurs at an individual level, oppression is often automatic and ingrained in a society as a whole (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017) Oppression has been commonly referred to as "power multiplied by prejudice" (Chen-Hayes, 2000). Dominant social groups (e.g., White people, cisgender people, men, straight people) are most valued in an oppressive system as they are the norm by which oppressed groups (e.g., Black people, non-binary people, women, queer people) are judged (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017).

Experiences of oppression have often been the catalyst for social movements which respond to inequity by calling for restructuring policy and behavior to reflect justice. Historically, leaders of such movements are those individuals who are part of the identity group targeted by systemic oppression (Powell & Kelly, 2017). Social movements, and broadly social justice, have additionally been supported by individuals who are members of the dominant groups who are not often direct targets of systemic oppression (Foster, 2011; Gibson, 2014). These individuals are commonly known as "allies" (Gibson, 2014). Social justice is enhanced by the inclusion of allies that act alongside or in support of oppressed social groups to disrupt oppressive, institutional systems which maintains inequity. Failure to act to upset oppressive institutions allows inequitable ideologies to persist that harm individuals and delay progression.

Defining "Ally." Literature has not decided on a comprehensive definition of what constitutes an "ally." Washington and Evans (1991, p. 195) defined an ally as "a person who is a member of the dominant or majority group who works to end oppression in his or her personal and professional life through support of, and as an advocate for, the oppressed population." Drury and Kaiser (2014) recognize an ally as "someone who aligns with a disadvantaged group by recognizing the need for further progress in the fight for equal rights." Allies are intended to work alongside disadvantaged group members in search of collective justice. Social justice allies, according to Broido (2000) as well as Hardiman, Jackson, and Griffin (2013), are "members of dominant social groups (e.g., men, White people, heterosexual people) who are working to end the system of oppression that give them greater privilege and power based on their social-group membership."

Recent research has also suggested the use of alternative terminology in replace of the word "ally." "Accomplice" has increasingly been involved in conversations involving social justice, equity, and liberation. Broadly, an "accomplice" is a "partner in some undertaking or a person who helps another commit a crime" (Accomplice, 2020). As it relates to social justice, an "accomplice" is an individual, commonly one who holds one or more dominant social group identities, who challenges systems of oppression by engaging in social justice action that supports oppressed populations by accepting risks to their personal, physical, and financial safety (Jackson et al., 2020). An example of accomplice-ship would be a White person placing their body physically between a Black person and a person intending to harm them at a protest for racial justice. Singh (2019) highlights the pairing of "accomplice" with direct action that challenges systems of oppression as accomplice-ship aims to leverage one's privilege immediately as a commitment to social justice.

"Co-conspirator" has been used by individuals involved in community organizing intended to address social justice (Hackman, 2015; Move to End Violence, 2016; Powell & Kelly, 2017). According to LeMaster (2018), co-conspiring allows for individuals to focus on self-identity along with centering the people, voices, and communities of oppressed identity groups. The term "activist" (Curtin & McGarty 2016; Droogendyk et al., 2016) has additionally been used consistently and is defined as those individuals who are "committed participants in a social movement with a relatively enduring orientation to the social issue problem." Activists are committed participants in action to improve the treatment or status of oppressed individuals and may dedicate their activism towards a variety of groups or center their activism around one specific group or concern such as workplace non-discrimination rights for LGBTQ+ individuals (Droogendyk et al., 2016).

Discussions surrounding allyship have additionally debated the use of the term as a noun or as a verb. For many, the belief is that "ally" is less of descriptor and more of a mark of the ways in which individuals engage in active movement towards equity. Toomey, McGeorge, and Carlson (2016) highlighted the importance of defining "ally" as a verb and focusing on the action of an individual. Theoretically, the belief is that allies should be acting in ways that reduce oppression and uplift marginalized populations. An "ally," as defined by Mathers, Sumerau, and Ueno (2018), is an individual that chooses to help others, free of emotional investment, which could lend credibility to those that are considered to be discredited. Despite the debate surrounding what defines an "ally" as well as whether "ally" is an appropriate term to identify individuals working towards social justice and liberation, scholars have agreed that allyship, co-conspiring, and accomplice-ship should be based on and include the action or behavior one engages in to decrease oppressive structures and progress towards a more equitable society

(Hackman, 2015; Jackson et al., 2020; Mathers et al., 2018; Move to End Violence, 2016; Powell & Kelly, 2017; Singh, 2019; Toomey et al., 2016).

In the present study, an "ally" is defined as someone who is a member of a dominant social identity group who rejects dominant and oppressive ideology while actively working to develop an understanding of the needs and experiences of individuals within historically oppressed identity groups and chooses to align with the social and political causes of those groups by engaging in direct action to dismantle systems of oppression with the belief that eliminating oppression benefits all (Broido, 2000; Griffin, 1997; Hackman, 2015; Hardiman et al., 2013; Jackson et al., 2020; Mathers et al., 2018; Powell & Kelly, 2017; Singh, 2019; Toomey et al., 2016) . An ally recognizes the roles that power, privilege and oppression play in creating and sustaining inequitable treatment and actively works to challenge the unfair treatment and systemic oppression toward these groups (Broido, 2000; Jones et al., 2014)

Motivations, Behaviors, and Expectations of an Ally. Prior to individuals engaging in the activism and advocacy associated with allyship, they are first motivated to want to be an ally. Personal interactions with significant others (e.g., friends, family members, partners) who are a part of a marginalized identity group is a common motivation for individuals to want to be allies (Brooks & Edwards, 2009). To further highlight the importance of interpersonal relationships and interactions as it relates to allyship, Brown and Ostrove (2013) examined the perspective of allies by people of color and one of the major themes was affirmation. Participants stressed the importance of allies being individuals who demonstrate understanding and offer support by respecting the experiences of people of color, expressing interest in building connection, and being nonjudgmental. Individual interpersonal contact is not only a common motivation for allies but also a necessary developmental stage frequently outlined in models of ally development such

as Poynter's (1997) Heterosexual Ally Development Model. Additionally, those individuals who consider social justice to be an important personal value would most likely engage in advocacy and allyship (Brooks & Edwards, 2009). Allies also pointed out their own personal disadvantaged identities as being helpful in understanding the potential concerns of other oppressed individuals and as a motivating factor in wanting to dismantle systems of oppression that negatively impacted them personally as well as others broadly (Brooks & Edwards, 2009).

Increased motivation fueled by commonality or shared desire to dismantle harmful social structures has been supported in literature as factors that contribute to more intervention and action taken to support individuals in troubling situations, therefore engaging in allyship behavior. For example, research regarding men involved in antiviolence work who considered themselves to be allies for gender equity, reported intervening when they heard problematic speech about women or gender-based violence (Casey & Ohler, 2012). Motivating factors for the intervention by self-identified allies included the context and norms of the situation as well as whether they shared a common social identity with other present bystanders or with the targeted identity group. Interventions by self-identified allies were also reported as occurring more often if there was familiarity or a relationship with a potential victim or targeted identity group (Casey & Ohler, 2012).

One way that individuals can become allies against oppression is by taking an active role in confronting oppression (Drury & Kaiser, 2014). Confrontations involve directly disapproving oppressive acts to the systems and individuals who perpetrate oppression (Drury & Kaiser, 2014). Confronting injustice and prejudice requires potential confronters to first recognize how an action is discriminatory (Drury & Kaiser, 2014; Ashburn-Nardo et al., 2008; Stangor et al., 2003). This may be difficult for some individuals of dominant or advantaged identity groups. For

example, studies have shown that men on average identify acts of sexism less than women at individual, interpersonal levels as well as at institutional levels (Blodorn et al., 2012; Drury & Kaiser, 2014; Rodin et al., 1990; Swim et al., 2001). As such, research supports the unlikeliness of men to act as allies due to failing to recognize when individual and institutional sexism occurs. Failure to identify acts of discrimination or oppression can maintain inequity, increase complacency, and decrease collective action to address inequity (Drury & Kaiser, 2014; Casey & Ohler, 2012). Furthermore, oppression and discrimination can take many forms (e.g., subtle forms such as benevolent sexism or overt forms such as use of slurs or causing physical harm). Lack of knowledge, and consequently sensitively, to oppressive behaviors can keep individuals from fulfilling their potential as allies against injustice (Drury & Kaiser, 2014).

Confrontation, both personally and towards other individuals, is a hallmark of engaging in advocacy and therefore cultivating an allyship identity. Literature addressing the costs and benefits of confrontation often highlight how confrontation of oppression by dominant group members is viewed as more legitimate because dominant group members do not directly benefit from the destruction of oppressive institutions (Drury & Kaiser, 2014; Mathers, Sumerau, and Ueno, 2018). Additionally, those within dominant identity groups are often in positions of power to influence how targeted identity groups are viewed (Broido, 2000; Drury & Kaiser, 2014). Literature has supported the role of allies being that they assist in reforming the way that society views individuals and human rights (LaMantia et al., 2015). Generally, individuals may desire to confront discriminatory behavior, however their actions may be inhibited by the costs experienced should they engage in confrontation. Research has indicated that dominant group members may accrue less cost compared to group members of the targeted group when confronting discrimination (Drury & Kaiser, 2014). For instance, research on men's

confrontations of sexism against women has suggested that men experience fewer costs after confronting sexism compared to women (Drury & Kaiser, 2014; Casey & Ohler, 2012). In addition, research on White individuals opposing racism suggests that White allies confronting racism is perceived as more appropriate criticisms compared to condemnations made by people of color (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Drury & Kaiser, 2014).

Another vital component of allyship beyond motivation and action is listening to feedback regarding the desires and needs of marginalized groups. Individuals who are a part of identity groups that experience oppression are aware of the needs they have concerning increased access to opportunities and resources (Anderson & Middleton, 2011). It is the role of the ally to listen to those experiences and necessities in order to then engage in the action needed to address the inequity. Yee (2009) discussed the behaviors and actions that allies can do to engage and support such as accepting efforts to collaborate, willingness to be vulnerable and accepting criticism in order to enact change in future behavior, and challenging personal prejudices.

Literature addressing more specific types of allyship, such as for gender and sexual minorities, has also discussed how individuals can be allies based on the feedback from individuals from specific targeted groups. For example, Brooks and Edwards (2009) discussed what LGBTQ+ employees wanted from LGBTQ+ allies in their workplace. Three primary needs were gathered based on qualitative interviews with LGBT employees including inclusion, safety, and equity. LGBTQ+ individuals expressed the desire for equal inclusion and perception of being an equal member of the workplace. Additionally, they requested that they not be treated differently compared to other employees which they considered to be an aspect of inclusion. LGBTQ+ employees also related wanting to feel safe enough to “come out” and to trust their

coworkers. Most commonly, LGBTQ+ employees expressed that they wished for allies to stand up and speak out on their behalf (Brooks & Edwards, 2009).

Criticisms of Allyship. While there are plenty of benefits to the involvement of allies in social movements, there has also been important literature concerning criticisms of allies, their intentions, actions, and impact. Literature indicates that positive group contact between allies from advantaged dominant groups and disadvantaged group members that is meant to reduce prejudice can simultaneously weaken the collective action within advocacy groups that have members of both advantaged group identities and disadvantaged group identities (Droogendyk et al., 2016). The belief is that intergroup contact can structure the focus of advocacy groups away from collective identity and action (Droogendyk et al., 2016).

Contact between advantaged group allies and disadvantaged group members could break down negative stereotypes of the advantaged group allies with the intention of disadvantaged group members cultivating a positive attitude towards advantaged group allies (Droogendyk et al., 2016). However, there is the possibility of disadvantaged group members holding a negative view of the allies (e.g., identifying the advantaged group as responsible for the oppression faced by the disadvantaged group) which maintains perceptions of injustice (Droogendyk et al., 2016). Additionally, should the negative perceptions persist, collective action is then focused on modifying the perception of advantaged group allies and not on improving personal, professional, and societal conditions for disadvantaged group members (Droogendyk et al., 2016).

Scholars suggest that it would be beneficial for allies to cultivate their allyship identity and undertake personal growth and development outside of their involvement in advocacy

groups as this may assist with maintaining the focus on collective action (Droogendyk et al., 2016). Advantaged group allies involved in activism may be motivated to be involved in collective action to restore the reputation of their in-group and relieve their own personal feelings of guilt (Droogendyk et al., 2016). Much of this can stem from privilege that is not yet processed or acknowledged with advantaged group members focusing on the plight and experiences of the advantaged rather than on the privilege possessed and the impact of that privilege (Anderson & Middleton, 2011; Droogendyk et al., 2016; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017). Helping can be inappropriate should it stem from failure to recognize privilege as it can lead to employing that privilege in activism spaces by expecting disadvantaged group members to exclusively listen and attend to concerns of advantaged group allies, offer executive positions or leadership to advantaged group individuals, and perceive advantaged group allies as valuable without having first demonstrated the value to the collective group (Droogendyk et al., 2016). However, there are misguided acts done by advantaged group individuals who do not believe in a sense of group superiority but have a lack of understanding of their role or privilege.

The difficulties of managing the creation of space for disadvantaged identity group members, advocating for disadvantaged identity groups, and acknowledging how advantaged identity group members' privilege and presence is beneficial within advocacy can be seen in the work of Mathers, Sumerau, and Ueno (2018). They discussed the experiences of an LGBTQ+ advocacy group, Allied Pride, with members who were sexual minorities and heterosexual. Advocacy group members spoke of the complications of managing the contradiction of advocating for LGBTQ+ people and acknowledging the benefits of the legitimacy granted to heterosexuals in society. Allied Pride members inadvertently reproduced sexual inequality that they sought to change by defining the group as established for and dependent upon the

membership of straight individuals (Mathers et al., 2018). Allied Pride provided straight members the opportunity and space to advocate for sexual minorities as they worked to construct their ally identities. Mathers et al. (2018) found that straight and sexual minority members privileged heterosexuality within their group in a variety of ways. The ways they did so included defining their group as explicitly for and dependent upon heterosexuals and sanctifying heterosexual allies by defining them as the ultimate saviors for sexual minorities that could one day provide sexual equality.

The risks that can be associated with allyship and the problematic perception of allies as "saviors" of individuals impacted by oppressive structures are part of ongoing criticism of allies. Anti-oppression group Indigenous Action Media (2015) critiqued the modern understanding of allyship by identifying the different forms that self-identified "allies" show up in that can contribute to the maintenance of oppression: Salvation, Exploitation, Confessional, Parachuters, Academics, Navigators, Floaters, and Acts of Resignation. "Salvation" allies are those individuals who view targeted communities as victims or tokens rather than people (Indigenous Action Media, 2015). Salvation allies are hyper-focused on "saving" oppressed groups to alleviate guilt and shame they feel due to their dominant group identity. "Exploitation" allies are individuals motivated by the advancement of their own personal or financial self-interest (Indigenous Action Media, 2015). Exploitation allies may establish organizations without interacting with the community they claim to be assisting and monetize trainings, workshops, or other "specialized expertise" without consulting or inquiring about the availability of these resources amongst the community. "Confessional" allies rely on posturing, presentation and treat involvement in activism as an extracurricular that can increase their standing as allies

(Indigenous Action Media, 2015). Often times, Confessional allies are inconsistent with their engagement in action and fail to establish meaningful relationships with targeted communities.

"Parachuter" allies, who can also fall within the Salvation and Confessional ally forms, are individuals who have been educated through workshops or trainings and claim to be experts as they move from one "hot spot" to another (Indigenous Action Media, 2015). Parachuters may claim to "know best" and employ a paternalistic attitude toward activist efforts without the consent of the communities they intend to assist. "Academic" allies are individuals who fixate on the process of "unlearning oppression" without engaging in action with local or national communities while additionally criticizing the actions of those who are organizing locally and nationally (Indigenous Action Media, 2015). Academics can also maintain institutional power through the use of university or grant resources that are not distributed to assist beyond their institution. "Gatekeeper" allies are those individuals who seek to have power over others and will engage in tactics to control and withhold resources, knowledge, and support (Indigenous Action Media, 2015). "Navigators" are self-identified allies who have familiarity and knowledge of oppression however do not participate in meaningful dialogue or action thereby upholding power structures (Indigenous Action Media, 2015).

"Floaters" are self-identified allies who do not commit to supporting a community or issue however desire recognition for "showing up" (Indigenous Action Media, 2015). Floaters are also known to resist accountability and can often put others at risk by engaging in harmful action that they will not take responsibility for (e.g., a White "ally" provoking law enforcement at a protest despite the greater likelihood that a Black individual could be harmed as a result). Lastly, "Acts of Resignation" include those individuals who do not plan ways to utilize their

privilege or resources to assist but rather distance themselves from that opportunity believing it makes them a “good ally” (Indigenous Action Media, 2015).

Allies, or in the case of the Indigenous Action Media (2015) provocation the preferred term “accomplices,” should not aspire to be “saviors” in the process of participating in social justice work. While the intention of individuals when beginning the process of anti-oppression efforts and engaging in allyship may be well-meaning, the Indigenous Action Media (2015) highlighted how the impact can be harmful and further support oppressive structures should individuals fail to be mindful of the ways they can maintain oppression. Direct action is the best way to not only learn of one’s role in the movement for social justice, but also in confronting and dismantling oppression (Indigenous Action Media, 2015). Furthermore, while direct action is a vital goal, individuals are highly encouraged to build trust, gain consent, and establish open communication before, during, and after action has taken place.

Droogendyk et al. (2016) spotlight the importance of clear and explicit communications in allyship. This communication improves positive cross-group interactions and does not undermine the experiences and engagement of targeted group members (Droogendyk et al., 2016). Moreover, recognition of privilege and communicating that openly could strengthen allyship identity and positive perceptions of allies. If injustice is apparent to those who directly benefit from it, this is perceived as convincing evidence of the reality of that injustice and validates the experiences of those negatively impacted by injustice (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Droogendyk et al., 2016).

Research Studies on Allyship Development

Literature discussing the development of social justice allyship addresses important concepts such as attitudes toward targeted groups, models of attitude change, theories of participating in social activism and advocacy, models of the development of altruism, and models of ally development (Broido, 2000). Theorists have studied the factors that contribute to ally identification (Bishop, 2002; Broido, 2000). Broido's research on the identification of allies led to the understanding of three components that assist in developing allies including increasing knowledge of information about social justice issues, engaging in the process of meaning-making, and building as well as having confidence in oneself. According to Broido, the types of information about social justice issues acquired by individuals who are intending to engage in allyship work can be categorized as the following: existence and impact of oppression; experience of oppressed and targeted group members; dynamics of forms of oppression; perspectives on social justice issues; benefits of diversity; privilege of dominant group members; how to act as an ally; existence of other social justice allies and activists; and importance of action (Broido, 2000). Commonly referred to sources for social justice information and knowledge can be attained from classrooms, target group members, dominant group peers, independent reading, and research, and traveling.

Meaning-making strategies assists in transforming information gathered into knowledge that supports the process of becoming an ally including gaining information, discussing it, thinking about it, and using it to take a perspective on a person or topic (Broido, 2000). Cultivating a perspective is facilitated by discussion with others and self-reflection. Discussion allows for individuals to hear other perspectives and experiences which can increase general knowledge and perspective-taking. Self-confidence refers to the comfort with one's identity and

internal loci of worth and approval (Broido, 2000). Self-confidence is importance for progression as social justice allies as it assists in articulating and supporting perspectives on social justice as well as willingness to act as allies (Broido, 2000). Self-confidence can be helpful in building acknowledgement of the role that privilege plays in society as well as in the personal lives of allies and those for which they are advocating. Allies require some degree of self-confidence in order to withstand threats to self-esteem, self-worth, physical safety, and identity as they engage in ally work (Broido, 2000).

Furthering Broido's (2000) research on allies which featured components necessary for the development of an ally, additional literature discusses the presence of action themes and attitude themes which also contributes to the development of an ally (Toomey et al., 2016). Action themes include an ally standing and speaking up for oppressed groups, supporting oppressed groups, and role modeling their behavior to others (Toomey et al., 2016). Standing and speaking up involves defending the rights of oppressed individuals. Supporting highlights the importance of providing active support to members of oppressed communities. Lastly, role modeling incorporates the belief that individuals with influence have a special responsibility to be an ally given their privilege and status within society. Attitude themes consist of acceptance of oppressed individuals, belief in equality and human rights, and providing a lack of judgment (Toomey et al., 2016). Acceptance incorporates acknowledging the identity and struggles of oppressed individuals and is considered to be a vital characteristic in the formation of ally identity. Equality and human rights focus on the notion that allies should believe oppressed individuals deserve the same rights and treatment as privileged persons. Non-judgment emphasizes the importance of not judging oppressed individuals and their identity or contextual factors that may impact their life circumstances.

Additional factors relevant to the development of allyship can include the social psychology understanding of how people influence each other's attitudes related to social justice concerns. Prior research has suggested that hearing others condemn discriminatory statements led others to condemn discriminatory statements more strongly (Blanchard et al., 1994). According to Drury and Kaiser (2014), there are factors that may heighten allies' sensitivity to discrimination. For example, male allies were found to be more sensitive to sexism due to their ability to reject legitimizing beliefs and engage in confrontation (Drury & Kraiser, 2014). Legitimizing beliefs search for the causes of the outcomes in individuals' lives within their personal effort and achievements. Examples can include the belief in individual mobility (e.g., belief that all individuals, irrespective of group membership, can rise to the top of social hierarchy through individual effort) and Protestant work ethic (e.g., the idea that hard work is rewarded). Individuals who support legitimizing beliefs often believe that those in higher status groups have earned their position whereas those in lower status groups have not worked hard enough to mobilize upward (Drury & Kraiser, 2014).

Those individuals who reject legitimizing beliefs understand how structural biases and systems restrict some individuals, especially those in marginalized groups, from opportunities (Drury & Kraiser, 2014). A pathway towards increasing one's sensitivity to discrimination to assist with the development of an allyship identity is by acknowledging one's legitimizing beliefs. Perceiving societal institutions as legitimate allows advantaged group members psychological and material benefits (Drury & Kraiser, 2014). Recognizing discrimination, such as sexism or racism, would involve acknowledging societal institutions and status as unjust and the advantages undeserved. Allies engage in this recognition by rejecting status-legitimizing beliefs and endorsing status-delegitimizing beliefs (Drury & Kraiser, 2014) which affirms the

unfairness inherent in institutions. High reasoning was also seen as a factor that can influence ally development as the ability to reason allows for one to be more aware of conflict between the values of culture and the realities of oppression (Broido, 2000). This development also assists individuals in challenging and acting against the norms that are unjust.

Ally Models and Frameworks. Identity development models are important for understanding the process of allyship identity development due to the understanding of aspiring allies' increased complexity of motivation. According to Edwards (2006), the development of one from self-interested to altruistic to a combination of the two underlies the motivation for an individual to become a social justice ally. Research has indicated that leadership identity also informs the development of ally identity. Leadership identity development is similar to ally identity development in that at the beginning of development, an individual may self-identify as a "leader" or "ally" but may not be effective in practicing that leadership or allyship that is defined in later development (Edwards, 2006). Edwards (2006) identified three types of allies, their motivation for engaging in allyship, and behaviors each aspiring ally is engaged in based on their developmental stage. The ally types include the Aspiring Allies for Self-Interest, Aspiring Allies for Altruism, and the Allies for Social Justice.

Aspiring Allies for Self-Interest are motivated to protect those they care about from being hurt. They often seek to be an ally to an individual with whom they have a personal relationship with rather than an entire group or issue (Edwards, 2006). They intervene on behalf of a specific individual from an oppressed group usually after consulting that individual. They do not always identify as an ally but define their behavior in terms of their relationship. Due to their focus being on the protection of their loved ones, these individuals may not be as likely to confront acts of oppression when the person they care about is not present and may join in oppressive

behaviors as long as their loved one is not harmed (Edwards, 2006). Their overall viewpoint is that the world is fair and just, and they can express outrage upon learning of discriminatory or oppressive behaviors occurring. These aspiring allies see overt acts of discrimination perpetrated by bad or immoral people however cannot see underlying systems of oppression that have been pervasive throughout history (Edwards, 2006).

Much of the focus of Aspiring Allies for Self-Interest's action is based on stopping "bad people" responsible for overt acts while maintaining the status quo which includes lack of acknowledgement of their own privilege (Edwards, 2006). Often these allies can engage in acts that may perpetuate the system of oppression that is harmful to oppressed group through not consulting with folks beyond their loved ones in oppressed groups, connecting individual acts of oppression to a system, or acknowledge their own internalized attitudes and behaviors (Edwards, 2006). Intervening in specific instances of overt discrimination for these individuals may be based on seeking to "do the right thing." However, the lack of understanding of overall systems of oppression may cause resistance. Aspiring Allies for Self-Interest are usually accepted due to their good intentions without consideration of how their actions may be contributing to the broader oppressive system (Edwards, 2006).

Aspiring Allies for Altruism are primarily motivated by the awareness of privilege and seeking to engage in advocacy as a means of dealing with guilt and shame (Edwards, 2006). Recognition of the systemic nature of privilege and oppression for members of dominant groups generate a range of emotional reactions from anger to guilt. While guilt can help individuals internalize experiences of oppression rather than intellectualize, it does not assist in changing systems that grant privilege to some and not others (Edwards, 2006). These aspiring allies often become defensive and have difficulties admitting to mistakes when confronted with their own

oppressive behaviors as they wish to maintain their status as an exceptional member of their dominant group (Edwards, 2006). In order to lessen their feelings of guilt, Aspiring Allies for Altruism may take seek the role of "hero" for oppressed groups as they see members of oppressed groups as victims of systems of oppression that need saving (Edwards, 2006). This type of allyship can be beneficial in the short term but eventually perpetuates the system by implying that oppressed groups need exceptional helpers to accomplish goals. Aspiring Allies for Altruism seek to empower members of oppressed groups while also maintaining credit for this empowerment rather than encouraging those members to empower themselves (Edwards, 2006). These allies additionally find it difficult to understand how dominant group members are also hurt by oppressive systems and seek acceptance and affirmation for the work that they are doing which can detract from the needs and voices of oppressed groups.

Allies for Social Justice work with those from oppressed groups to end systems of oppression. Allies for Social Justice recognize that members of the dominant group are also harmed by systems of oppression (Edwards, 2006). Allies have the goal of ending systemic oppression to benefit subordinate groups as well as liberate themselves. These allies have accepted the reality of privilege and recognize where it has influenced their own life. Allies for Social Justice are cognizant of multiple forms of oppression and its interconnectedness, and they seek to limit each of their impacts (Edwards, 2006). These individuals are open to being held accountable and seek to continue to develop as they take responsibility for the work that they are doing and how those impacts others.

Another framework utilized within previous literature to understand the role of allies includes the Ally, Advocate, Activist system, a framework used to assist individuals in connecting with others (Styer et al., 2018). Individuals learn how to translate materials they learn

and discussion topics over to interactions outside of formal learning environments like a classroom. Through the framework "ally" is meant to assist individuals in shaping informative discussions, "advocate" is meant to assist with creating discussions, and "activist" is meant to assist with creating persuasive speeches (Styer et al., 2018).

The authors suggest that "ally" be presented as a concept that helps individuals learn to provide information that will help others learn more about a misunderstood group of people (Styer et al., 2018). Concepts of allyship should be based on understanding of allyship from anti-oppression perspectives such that allyship is "not an identity – it is a lifelong process of building relationships based on trust, consistency, and accountability" along with "allyship is not self-defined" (Styer et al., 2018). Ally is defined a "someone who comes alongside another person to build interpersonal connections, receive constructive feedback, and offer support, but does not seek to speak for or in place of another person" (Styer et al., 2018).

Styer et al. (2018) recommend that the "advocate" concept should be introduced as a way to help individuals learn skills with which they can advocate for themselves for their needs or to communicate more clearly when speaking in their communities about themselves or others. Advocacy functions to help students learn the importance of interpersonal and professional communication as this will allow them to be better advocates. Lastly, the "activist" concept provides students with the understanding that language is a valuable tool for creating equity in change within communities (Styer et al., 2018).

Ally Models and Frameworks for Specific Identity Groups. With consideration of general social justice allyship models and frameworks that have been theorized, more specific models and frameworks on allyship development and understanding for specific identity groups

have been created such as the development of allyship for sexual minorities as well as for racial minorities. Poynter's (1997) Model of Heterosexual Ally Development and Pinto's (2014) Asexual Ally Development model address that stage of development for allies of sexual minorities including common attitudes and behaviors involved at each developmental stage. Reason, Millar, and Scales (2005) researched and reported the development of racial justice allies within college students including ally perspectives and behaviors.

Within Poynter's Model of Heterosexual Ally Development, ally stages are defined as the following developmental stages called "statuses": Status 1 Precontact, Status 2 Contact and Retreat, Status 3 Internal Identification, and Status 4 External Identification. Individuals within Status 1, or Precontact, view heterosexual relationships as superior, view LGBTQ people negatively, and do not identify as allies (Poynter 1997). Status 2, also known as Contact and Retreat, is defined by personal contact by an individual with a person who identifies as LGBTQ leading to increased awareness and conceptualization of LGBTQ people as human (Poynter 1997). There is the possibility for those who enter Status 2 to return to Status 1 after contact as they maintain some rigid views concerning LGBTQ issues. Status 3, or Internal Identification, includes a knowledge and awareness increase that informs an individual of the need to be more supportive and engage in advocacy (Poynter 1997). Status 4, External Identification, includes those individuals who take pride in being an ally who includes LGBTQ people in their social circles and relationships (Poynter 1997).

Pinto (2014) describes a model of ally development for asexual populations. Asexual individuals make up a small percentage of sexual minorities and is a relatively small and invisible community. Allies, as a result, are important in order to empower and support asexual people. Pinto modified that Model of Heterosexual Ally Development created by Poynter (1997).

The status categories of the model are consistent however the descriptions are more applicable to the experiences of the asexual community. Status 1 is the Precontact stage in which an individual begins to become more aware of asexuality through the media as they question familiar "isms" and phobias regarding sexuality (Pinot, 2014). Individuals within this stage may continue to consider conventional sexual orientations and expressions as superior to others, have negative perceptions of asexuality, and not self-identify as asexual allies. Status 2, the Contact and Retreat stage, is when an individual experiences personal contact with an asexual individual which helps individuals recognize that asexuality exists (Pinot, 2014). This contact could create anxiety due to incongruence of personal beliefs and experiences related to asexuality. This contact could also initiate retreating to Status 1 as a person may become closed off to asexual concerns. Status 3 is Internal Identification stage and Status 4 is External Identification. Status 3 includes the initial stages of asexual ally development although allyship identification is not openly identified to others (Pinot, 2014). Individuals gain awareness of the asexual community leading to increased advocacy and support that is seen in Status 4. Individuals within Status 4 have explored their personal anxieties and became knowledgeable about asexual oppression. Status 4 individuals have appreciation and support for asexual communities and engage in action to assist them (Pinot, 2014).

Prior research on White racial justice allies (Stokes Brown, 2002) found common characteristics including higher degrees of moral courage, higher levels of energy, good health, and increased optimism for change. Racial justice allies have also been found to reject colorblind worldviews to instead recognize the role of race in society (O'Brien 2001). In order to recognize the role of race in society, White allies must also understand their "Whiteness" (or the social construction of what it means for an individual to be White in the United States) and how that

relates to concepts of power and privilege. Bishop (2002) illustrated a six-step framework to understand the development of racial justice allies which progresses from cognitive understandings of oppression and recognizing how different forms of oppression can connect to an ally involving themselves in acting and raising their consciousness and the consciousness of others.

Reason, Millar, and Scales (2005) conducted a study to understand the development of racial justice allies through interviewing collegiate students. Students expressed a variety of attitudes about race and racial justice from no personal exploration to personal exploration and commitment. For those students who had not engaged in personal or academic exploration, they perceived White as only a skin color and were unable to articulate the effects of race in society (Reason, Millar, and Scales, 2005). Students who had exposure to courses or experiences that discussed race relations appeared to engage in some exploration of Whiteness though did not commit to an understanding about race's impact on societal concerns. Students who had identified themselves as allies conceptualized Whiteness by their relationships with other individuals. These students were able to discuss the role of power and privilege within broader societal history and within their personal history while also committing themselves to racial justice (Reason, Millar, and Scales, 2005).

Reason, Millar, and Scales (2005) reported that students who identified themselves as racial justice allies had taken a race relations course at some point during their college experience. Additionally, the application of information learned in race relations courses in everyday life experiences lead to significant racial attitude changes. Students who had taken more time to reflect on their privilege and experiences related to their Whiteness and the impact of racial injustice reported more engagement in racial justice actions (Reason, Millar, and Scales,

2005). The degree to which individuals participated in racial justice actions correlated with their own personal development. Those students who had just begun their exploration of issues of Whiteness took actions at individual levels such as researching information on their own or discussing social justice issues with their parents or friends in contexts that were safe (Reason, Millar, and Scales, 2005). Students at beginning levels of development additionally cited not being involved in more public ally action due to not receiving expressed invitation from targeted populations.

Most literature points to the importance of allies finding a group of like-minded individuals to which they could receive support for their development and social action. Support is especially important for those students at the start of their racial justice ally development. Reason, Millar, and Scales (2005) described a proposed model of racial justice ally development that examines the influence of pre-college experiences, curricular and co-curricular experiences, and cognitive complexity in the reconstruction of Whiteness. The model illustrates the role of Whiteness in decisions to take racial justice ally actions and how decision-making manifests. The model describes the following process: students enter college with existing understanding of Whiteness and racial justice attitudes that are often unexamined; parental influence on pre-college racial justice attitudes is particularly strong; coursework that explores and challenges racial justice attitudes are the most impactful for students in their development towards racial justice allyship; cognitive ability to make meaning from experiences in courses discussing race relations is required in order to engage in meaningful reflection; more reflection on Whiteness lead to more participation in racial justice actions and reconstructed their sense of Whiteness (Reason, Millar, and Scales, 2005).

Counseling Psychology, Social Justice, and Allyship

As described in psychology, oppression is the production of domination and subordination through power hierarchies that impact the processes of psychological and political victimization, agency, and resistance (Palmer et al., 2019; Prilleltensky, 2003). Oppression disrupts daily living for targeted groups through exclusion, exploitation, control, and violence (Palmer et al., 2019). Literature on the psychological impact of oppression indicates that acts such as the erasure and removal of social and cultural identities supported by oppressive structures can lead to negative outcome such as decreased self-esteem and internalizing negative group identities (Sonn & Fisher, 2003). The prevalence and harmful impacts of systemic oppression are important to consider within helping professions such as counseling psychology. Counseling psychologists engage in not only providing vital mental health services, but the profession as a whole has had a history of inclusion of social justice action, allyship, and advocacy (DeBlaere et al., 2019).

Counseling psychology values social justice and considers it to be an important and defining feature of the profession as it is included in clinical practice, training, research, and pedagogy (DeBlaere et al., 2019; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001; Toporek et al., 2006). Counseling psychologists have been involved in the inception and leadership of ethnic minority as well as gender and sexual minority psychological associations and divisions which provide opportunities to address issues relevant to marginalized populations (DeBlaere et al., 2019). In addition, counseling psychologists have been paramount in assisting with the development of social justice-orientated guidelines for psychological practice for a variety of populations (DeBlaere et al., 2019) including lesbian, gay and bisexual clients (APA, 2012), transgender and gender

nonconforming clients (APA, 2015) and people with low-income and economic marginalization (APA, 2019).

Counseling psychologists were also among the scholars who contributed to the importance of including multicultural competency within clinical practice which grew in popularity during the 1990s and 2000s (DeBlaere et al., 2019). There are a variety of multicultural competency models including the most well-known, Sue and Sue's (2008) model of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. Sue and Sue (2008) defined multicultural competence as consisting of the following three areas: awareness of self and others, knowledge of various cultural groups and systemic barriers they may encounter, and ability to provide a variety of skills to respond to and advocate for individuals.

Multicultural competence and social justice advocacy have frequently been used interchangeably when referring to counseling psychologist training and clinical practice (Pieterse et al., 2009). However, while multicultural competence and social justice advocacy have each contributed to the growth and inclusion of counseling psychology, they are two separate concepts. Multicultural competence is considered to be the fourth force in the development of counseling and psychology (Pedersen, 1991). Multiculturalism as it relates to counseling includes counseling relationships that cross social identities. Multicultural competency relies on the knowledge, awareness, and skills as they relate to the ability of a psychologist to work within a diverse society (Abreu et al., 2000; Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue & Sue, 2008). Scholars have suggested that social justice advocacy has just as vital a contribution and argue that social justice represents a fifth force in counseling and psychology (Ratts et al., 2004). The main focus of social justice is responding to systemic inequalities that marginalize different social groups. As it relates to counseling psychology, social justice has been defined as the professional action and research

aimed at changing societal values, structures, policies, and practices to assist historically marginalized groups with attaining access to resources for self-determination (Goodman et al., 2004) While multicultural competence focuses on inclusion and acceptance as important to diversity, social justice advocacy emphasizes knowing of and taking action against oppression and marginalization as necessary in promoting diversity (Pieterse et al., 2009).

Psychologists and counselors are well suited to be allies for social justice. Social justice is a vital part of the history and growth of psychology as a profession (DeBlaere et al., 2019). Furthermore, psychologists and counselors have access to resources to increase knowledge regarding social justice issues and the individuals impacted by them as well as having an opportunity to engage in direct allyship when working with clients or interacting within their training program. However, without meaningful commitment and action that intends to dismantle the oppressive structures that can impact individuals in- and outside of psychological practice, counseling and psychology training programs may perpetuate oppressive and colonizing practices (Goodman et al., 2011).

Scholars within counseling and psychology have addressed the importance of implementing social justice education in training programs (Goodman et al., 2004; Goodman et al., 2011; Toporek and McNally, 2006). Nevertheless, concern has arisen that within training programs, multicultural competence and social justice advocacy are embraced at a surface-level (Bemak et al., 2011). While many programs advertise diversity mission statements and develop courses intended to address multiculturalism and social justice, the degree to which said programs are committed to these principles in a meaningful way is less clear. Counseling psychology and counselor education training programs have additionally been criticized for lack

of diversity among students and faculty and lack of inclusion of training and materials from cultural practices outside of the Western ideology (Goodman et al., 2011).

Additionally, often the lack the knowledge and training on engaging in socially just action prevents individuals from participating in allyship for social justice (Motulsky et al., 2014). This lack of experience with action-based allyship may be due in part to the unlikeness of trainees to be involved in courses that fully integrate issues of oppression, power, and privilege or a course focused solely on social justice (Goodman et al., 2011; Motulsky et al., 2014; Talleyrand et al., 2006). For example, in a study of doctoral trainees, while all had taken a multicultural counseling course, 85% reported having not had a social justice-oriented course (Singh et al., 2010). Trainees additionally reported that while interested in involvement with social justice, they faced barriers such as lack of faculty time to dedicate to training, lack of economic resources, and restrictions due to coursework (Singh et al., 2010). Beer et al. (2012) underlines the importance of the training environment on student involvement and development of social justice activism and commitment. Findings indicated that if students perceived their training environment to be supportive of social justice, their commitment to social justice would increase (Beer et al., 2012). The training environment of individuals therefore has a key role in the development of social justice allyship.

The importance of training environment in the development of social justice allyship was further supported via a study on heterosexual ally development in counseling psychologists (Asta & Vacha-Haase, 2013). Pre-doctoral psychology interns and psychologists who self-identified as heterosexual were interviewed regarding their experiences with and development of allyship with the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community. Participants discussed whether being a counseling psychologist automatically qualifies an individual to be considered

an ally, to which there was disagreement (Asta & Vacha-Haase, 2013). While there is an intersection of social justice with the participants' roles as counseling psychologists, it was determined that incorporating social justice principles within professional and subjective experiences was most beneficial for development as allies (Asta & Vacha-Haase, 2013).

Need to Assess Allyship Identity Development

Evaluation of Current Instrumentation. Many studies have examined tendencies towards activism or social justice that generalize across a variety of topics related to justice and equity such as the Activism Orientation Scale (AOS; Corning & Myers, 2002) and the Social Justice Scale (SJS; Torres-Harding et al., 2012). The AOS measures the degree to which an individual engages in activist behaviors, which is one component of social justice work. The SJS was developed to measure attitudes towards social justice and values related to social justice. Furthermore, the SJS examines perceived self-efficacy around efforts for social justice as well as intentions to engage in activities and behaviors related to social justice (Torres-Harding et al., 2012).

Researchers have constructed a variety of scales on awareness of and engagement in advocacy work related to social issues. The Social Justice Advocacy Readiness Questionnaire (SJARQ; Chen-Hayes, 2001) is a self-assessment questionnaire for individuals to evaluate their social justice advocacy awareness, comfort, values, and knowledge, as well as their institutional social justice advocacy skills. The Social Issues Advocacy Scale (SIAS; Nilsson et a., 2011) measures aspects of advocacy related to social issues such as political and social advocacy, confronting discrimination, political awareness, and social issue awareness.

A scale has been developed to measure political engagement and the degree to which individuals believe they have the ability to impact the process of politics (Caprara et al., 2009). In addition, a measure of political solidarity, a construct consisting of allyship for minority identities, connecting to the causes related to minority groups, and a commitment to working with minority groups to achieve social change, has also been constructed (Neufeld, Starzyk, Gaucher, 2019).

Other studies have examined activism within specific social issues, such as feminist activism (Downing and Rough, 1985) and environmental activism (Seguin et al., 1998; Dono et al., 2010). Researchers have also developed scales to measures how specific groups of individuals value social justice or engage in activism or allyship such as within the Psychologists' Beliefs in Social Justice Scale (Ritchhart, 2002) and Engagement in LGBTQ Ally Actions in Sports Scale (Toomey et al., 2016). The Psychologists' Beliefs in Social Justice Scale measures the attitudes psychologists have towards social justice and social activism within their roles as mental health professionals. The Engagement in LGBTQ Ally Actions in Sports Scale assesses the level of engagement in LGBTQ ally behaviors among college student-athletes (Toomey et al., 2016).

Miller et al.'s (2009) Social Issues Questionnaire examines how individuals might develop interests in and commit to social justice through the use of the social cognitive career theory as an underlying framework. Concepts found within social cognitive career theory, such as self-efficacy and outcome expectations, were included in the scale. Scholars have additionally developed scales to measure how people apply principles of distributive and procedural justice to judge the fairness of society. Rasinski (1987) measures the use of equality of opportunity (proportionality) and equality of outcome (egalitarianism) to make judgments regarding fairness.

The Basic Social Justice Orientation (BSJO; Hulle et al., 2017) examines attitudes towards distributive justice principles equality, need, equity, and entitlement. Furthermore, researchers have also developed measures that inspect the degree to which an individual believes that the world is a just place and that people get what it is they deserve such as in the General Belief in a Just World Scaled (BJWS; Dalbert et al., 1987), the Global Belief in a Just World (GBJWS; Lipkus, 1991), and the Belief in a Just World (BJWS; Rubin & Peplau, 1975).

Existing measures that examine concepts related to understanding allyship includes measures that assess positive emotions towards outgroups (Dragojevic & Giles; 2014), identification with outgroups (Doosj et al., 1995; Leach et al., 2008; Wiley et al., 2013), as well as beliefs that outgroups and ingroups should work together (Glasford & Calcagno, 2012). A limited number of measures exist that assess ally identification development. Jones, Brewster, and Jones (2014) constructed a measure that examines LGBT ally identity. Other scholars such as Worthington, Dillon, and Becker-Schutte (2005) and Ji and Fujimoto (2013) also focused their measures on assessing allyship as it relates to gender and sexual minorities.

Measure of Allyship Identity. This study is interested in expanding the understanding of the process of individuals' development of social justice allyship. In regard to the contribution of this proposed measure of allyship identity development to counseling psychology, the belief is that this measure will provide a quantitative tool to assist psychology trainees and academics in understanding the degree to which trainees' experiences and training throughout the program (e.g. multicultural courses, social justice workshops, didactics, clinical practicum) benefit in developing a social justice ally identity. Additionally, this proposed measure may provide a method to address accountability for developing in the realm of social justice allyship for both the psychologists-in-training but also the program in providing resources for developmental

growth. Lastly, the proposed measure could be beneficial in understanding where students are developmentally in terms of social justice allyship to assist in adapting courses, didactics, and trainings to better fit the needs of trainees.

Extending beyond psychology training programs, a measure to assess social justice allyship identity development could also be utilized to evaluate the effectiveness of undergraduate courses on diversity, privilege, race, or gender studies. Prior research regarding the relationship between ally identity and college courses has indicated that those students who self-identified as social justice allies had also taken courses during their college experience that addressed social justice issues such as racism (Reason, Millar, Scales, 2005). An ally identity development measure can assist in understanding what ways students are impacted by social justice courses in the development of their ally identity. Lastly, during the process of interviewing for diversity and equity administrative positions, it would be beneficial to have a tool to evaluate candidate's allyship development with the expectation that candidates further along in their development would be ideal in leading efforts to increase social justice education.

There have been some studies on the development of assessments targeting social justice orientation, social justice advocacy, and engagement in allyship for specific marginalized communities such as the LGBTQ+ community. To date, few scales have been developed to specifically measure allyship identity development. Current instrumentation focuses on the concepts that do or do not contribute to allyship attitudes or behaviors however fail to provide understanding regarding one's development of allyship identity. Additionally, the intention of the proposed Measure of Allyship Identity is to quantify allyship on a continuum in order to understand how behaviors, impacts, and outcomes vary at differing stages of ally development.

Given the current interest in engaging in advocacy to support marginalized populations and the importance of the role of allies in the movement to increase and maintain equity across multiple identities, several questions need to be addressed: What does social justice allyship look like across a developmental continuum? How do knowledge, skills, and behaviors of social justice allies change as they develop? What impact might allies at distinct stages of development have on the movement for social justice? In order to address these inquiries, there is a need for a research instrument to assess individuals' allyship identity development.

Chapter 3. Methods

The purpose of this research was to create a valid and reliable scale that accurately assesses the knowledge, skills, and behavior of social justice allies across an allyship developmental continuum. The study utilized a mixed methodology including focus groups with self-identified social justice allies as well as individuals who do not self-identify as social justice allies in order to understand the dimensions of the development of allyship identity (Study 1a) and the construction and validation of a pilot measure, the Measure of Allyship Identity (MAI), of allyship identity development to measure the development and commitment of allies to social justice and equity (Study 1b).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study will examine the following question and hypotheses:

Study 1a

1. What are the components of allyship identity development?
2. What is the process of allyship identity development?

No specific hypotheses were developed for Study 1a as this was a qualitative study from a critical ideological paradigm.

Study 1b

3. How well does the Measure of Allyship Identity statistically differentiate between participants in different meaningful allyship identity categories?
    a. The Measure of Allyship Identity will statistically differentiate participants at distinct levels of identity development.
4. To what extent is the Measure of Allyship Identity measuring the constructs of allyship identity development identified in Study 1a?

a. Using exploratory factor analysis (EFA), a model capturing the constructs of allyship identity development identified in Study 1a will emerge.

5. Does the Measure of Allyship Identity appropriately assess allyship identity development as demonstrated by convergence with validated social justice measures?
    a. The Measure of Allyship Identity will appropriately assess allyship identity development and demonstrate convergent validity with validated social justice measures and discriminant validity with an impression management subscale.
6. Does allyship identity development predict beliefs related to fairness, justice, and social dominance?
    a. Greater development of one's allyship identity may be negatively associated with the belief that the world is a just or fair place and belief in social dominance.
    b. Greater development of one's allyship identity may be positively associated with favorable attitudes towards social justice activities, likelihood of engaging in social activism in the future, and greater political solidarity.
    c. Greater development of one's allyship identity may be positively associated with greater compassion for others.

Participants

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria. In that this study consists of both the development and validation of a measure of allyship identity development, the inclusion and exclusion criteria were varied.

Study 1a. A total of thirty-four students from a large Southeastern university participated across fourteen focus groups conducted for Study 1a. Inclusion criteria for seven groups

consisted of individuals 18 and older who self-identified as social justice allies and scored higher than 53 on the Activism Orientation Scale, which measured an individual's propensity to engage in a range of social action behaviors (Corning & Myers, 2002; AOS). Inclusion criteria for the additional seven groups consisted of individuals eighteen and older who a) scored below 53 on the Activism Orientation Scale and b) were randomly selected from the group of poor scorers. Exclusion criteria for all groups in Study 1a consisted of individual under the age of 18 and/or individuals who were not current students in attendance at the Southeastern university.

Study 1b. Inclusion criteria for the pilot measure and validation consisted of individuals 18 and older who lived in the United States of America. Prior research on scale development has indicated that a sample size of 150 to 300 participants is appropriate in obtaining an accurate solution in factor analysis should item intercorrelations be strong (Hinkin, 1995; Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988). A total of 218 participants completed the survey. A summary of demographic data can be viewed in Table 5.

Sampling Method

Study 1a. This qualitative study assessed differing levels of allyship identity development from a critical ideological lens. For the first sampling method, study participants were solicited from a large Southeastern university via a web-based system that manages, recruits, schedules, and assigns extra credit for courses for participation in research opportunities. The justification for using university students is based on research that indicates that those individuals who attend college have more exposure to opportunities and resources that develop one's critical thinking about social justice, activism, and allyship (Worthen, 2011; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). It is reasonable to suggest that the use of this population provided

a sample of individuals who were at differing degrees of development regarding social justice allyship. However, as this university was located in the rural southern United States of America, it is also reasonable that students with limited access, exposure, or interest in a social justice framework were represented in the sample.

A second sampling method included soliciting members of social justice-oriented organizations (e.g., Gay-Straight Alliance organizations) at a large Southeastern university to recruit members to engage in the focus groups. These organizations bring together large numbers of individuals engaged in social justice activity and may have had the potential to possess individuals at different developmental stages of allyship identity development. Participants were solicited via contacting the president of the organization with information regarding informed consent and instructions on how to schedule for the focus groups being sent electronically. Lastly, a third sampling method included advertisement via social media platforms (e.g., Instagram) to recruit members to engage in the focus group. Potential participants were provided a flyer (Appendix A) describing information about the study.

Study 1b. For the sampling method, study participants were solicited via web-based, such as Prolific, recruitment systems as well as snowball sampling on social networking sites in order to diversify the participant pool.

Measures

Study 1a

Demographic Measures. Focus group participants were asked to complete a brief demographic questionnaire prior to their scheduled focus group. Age, race, gender, sexual orientation, religious orientation, and political orientation were assessed as part of the

questionnaire. Participants were additionally asked if they considered themselves to be an "ally" after reading the following definition by Washington and Evans (1991) "a person who is a member of a dominant or majority group who works to end oppression in their personal and professional life through support of, and as an advocate for, an oppressed population." Table 1 highlights the demographic information from focus group participants.

Focus Group Protocol. Individuals participated in one 90-minute semi-structured focus group. The primary investigator created protocols to guide exploration of social justice allyship identity for participants in the general focus group for individuals with lower scores on the AOS (Appendix B) and participants in the self-identified allyship focus group with higher scores on the AOS (Appendix C). These protocols consisted of components of allyship identity that have been discussed in literature related to social justice allyship including the definition of an ally, characteristics attributed to allies, motivations for engaging in allyship, behaviors that an ally may or may not engage in, as well as when individuals may not be considered social justice allies (e.g. "What do you think motivates someone to describe themselves as an "ally"?). The protocol for the general focus group intended to ask participants to explore their perception of allyship and concepts related to allyship while the protocol specific to the focus group of those individuals who self-identify as allies intended to ask participants to explore and share their own experiences with allyship development. The intention of this protocol was to understand the components and process of allyship identity development.

Study 1b

Measure of Allyship Identity. The Measure of Allyship Identity (MAI) was constructed based on themes and subthemes identified from the focus groups conducted in Study 1a in order to evaluate social justice allies across an allyship developmental continuum.

Social Justice Scale. The Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding et al., ,2012; SJS) was developed in order to describe the definition and application of social justice. The SJS is comprised of twenty-four items which are answered on a 1 – 7 Likert-type scale, with 1 corresponding with "disagree strongly" and 7 corresponding with "strongly agree. The SJS is made up of four subscales including Attitudes Towards Social Justice, Perceived Behavioral Control, Subjective Norms, and Behavior Intentions. There are eleven items within the Attitudes Towards Social Justice subscale, which evaluates social justice attitudes (e.g., "I believe it is important to allow others to have meaningful input into decisions affecting their lives"). Social justice related goals are assessed using fourteen items in the Perceived Behavioral Control subscale (e.g., "I am certain that I possess an ability to work with individuals and groups in ways that are empowering"). Six items were developed in order to examine whether people within a respondents' social circle supports or discourages involvement in social justice activities within the Subjective Norms subscale (e.g., "Other people around me are engaged in activities that address social justice issues." Lastly, the four items representing Behavior Intentions evaluates a respondent's intention to engage in social justice behavior in the future (e.g. "In the future, I intend to talk with others about social power inequalities, social injustices, and the impact of social forces on health and well-being")..." Higher scores on the SJS indicate higher levels of social justice values and are scored via summative scoring. Cronbach's alphas were reported for each subscale indicating strong internal consistency across the four factors: Attitudes Towards Social Justice .95; Subjective Norms .82, Perceived Behavioral Control .84, and Behavior Intentions .88 (Torres-Harding et al., 2012). The SJS was utilized in this study to assess how attitudes in social justice led to social action, in addition to assessing the convergent validity of

the created Measure of Allyship Identity for appropriately assessing allyship identity development (Appendix D).

Activism Orientation Scale. The Activism Orientation Scale (Corning & Myers, 2002; AOS) assesses individuals' tendencies to engage in social action. The AOS measures activism engagement across a continuum of social action behaviors, positions of ideology, and issues related to social movements (Corning & Myers, 2002). Items correspond to behaviors that range from low-risk within the 28-item Convention Activism subscale (e.g., "Display a poster or bumper sticker with a political message") to unconventional in the seven-item High-Risk Activism subscale (e.g., "Engage in a physical confrontation at a political rally"). Preceding the 35-item measure is the question "How likely is it that you will engage in this activity in the future?" with individuals selecting from a 0 – 3 range with 0 indicating "extremely unlikely" and 3 indicating "extremely likely." Total scores for the measure are summed across items and can range from 0 to 105. Higher scores on the AOS indicate a greater willingness to engage in activist behaviors. Reliability in terms of internal consistency is robust with Cronbach's alpha reported as ranging from .87 to .97 (Ponterotto & Ruckdeschel, 2007). The AOS was utilized in this study to assess whether those individuals with more advanced allyship identity development have a greater likelihood of engaging in social action or behaviors (Appendix E).

Political Solidarity Measure. The Political Solidarity Measure (Neufeld et al., 2019; PSM) measures how much individuals feel they are an ally of, connected to, and committed to working for social change for individuals within a minority outgroup. The PSM includes factors such as allyship with the minority outgroup, a connection to their cause, and a commitment to work with them for social change. The PSM is comprised of nine items to which individuals indicate how much they agree or disagree with the statements tailored to a specific group or

cause (e.g., “I stand in solidarity with ___”). Higher scores on the PSM predict greater solidarity in attitudes and behavior towards minority outgroup members. Each factor reported good internal consistency with Allyship at .84, Cause Connection at .87, Social Change Commitment at .88, and the full scale at .92 (Neufeld et al., 2019). The PSM (Appendix F) was utilized in this study to evaluate the relationship between allyship identity development and political solidarity, with the intention of testing whether greater allyship identity development was associated with greater political solidarity.

Compassionate Love Scale. The Compassionate Love Scale (Sprecher & Fehr, 2005; CLS) assesses compassionate love, an attitude towards others that include feelings, thoughts, and actions focused on supporting, helping, and understanding others. The CLS has two versions with one assessing compassion towards others such as family and close friends and the other assessing compassion towards all humans. The CLS intended for measuring compassion towards all of humanity (e.g., “I spend a lot of time concerned about the well-being of humankind”), composed of twenty-one items, will be used in this study. Respondents answer items on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not at all true of me) to 7 (very true of me). Higher scores on the CLS indicate greater compassion for others. Each version of the CLS report high internal consistencies of a Cronbach’s alpha of.95. The CLS (Appendix G) was included in this study in order to evaluate the association between development of allyship identity and compassion for others.

Social Dominance Orientation. Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto et al., 1994) measures the extent to which an individual desires that one’s ingroup dominates and be superior to outgroups (Pratto et al., 1994). Individuals who score highly on this measure believe that group hierarchies are natural and desirable. The scale is comprised of fourteen items and is an

attitudinal orientation. Respondents are asked "Which of the following objects or statements do you have a positive or negative feeling towards?" prior to reading the items (e.g., "Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others"). Answers are provided on a 1 – 7 scale with 1 indicating "very negative" and 7 indicating "very positive." Across thirteen samples, internal consistencies, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, averaged .83, ranging from .80 to .89 (Pratto et al., 1994). The Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Appendix H) was utilized in this study to assess negative associations between greater allyship identity development and belief in the dominance and superiority of ingroups.

Global Belief in a Just World. The Global Belief in a Just World Scale (Lipkus, 1991; GBJWS) measures the belief one has in a just world, the process by which an individual perceives that what others receive in their life is what they deserve, and people are responsible for the own fortune (Lipkus, 1991). The GBJWS is comprised of seven items (e.g., "I feel that most people get what they are entitled to have") which are answered on a 1 – 7 Likert-type scale, with 1 indicating "strongly disagree" and 7 indicating "strongly agree." The possible range of scores occurs between 7 and 42 for the seven items with lower scores indicating less belief that the world is just and fair. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .83, indicating internal consistency among the scale items. The Global Belief in a Just World Scale (Appendix I) was utilized in this study to assess negative associations between greater allyship identity development and belief that individuals receive in life what they deserve.

Impression Management Subscale. The Balanced Inventory Desirable Responding (Paulhus, 1991,1998; BIDR) measures social desirability incorporating two different subscales: Self-Deceptive Enhancement (being overly positive when responding with honesty) and Impression Management (bias toward pleasing others). The Impression Management (IM)

subscale will be utilized for this study and is comprised of twenty items (e.g., "I sometimes tell lies if I have to") which are answered on a 1 – 7 Likert-type scale, with 1 indicating "not true" and 7 indicating "very true." Paulhus (1998) instructs that any participant responses that range from 1 to 5 be coded as 0 and any responses of 6 or 7 coded as 1. The responses are to be totaled to form an impression management score that could potentially range from 0 to 20. Higher scores on the IM indicate higher tendencies to provide socially desirable answers. Internal consistencies, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, averaged .78, ranging from .77 to .85 for the IM subscale (Paulhus, 1998). The IM (Appendix J) was utilized to assesses whether respondents are responding truthfully or are misrepresenting themselves in order to manage their self-presentation as it relates to social justice allyship identity.

Demographic Questions. Demographic information such as age, race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, and political orientation were assessed as part of the questionnaire to understand to makeup of the sample population.

Procedures

Study 1a. Institutional Review Board approvals were sought for Study 1a. Focus group participants were recruited via a university web-based recruitment system. Participants were asked to sign up via the web-based recruitment system for a day and time that aligns with their schedule. Online focus groups were conducted via Zoom due to health considerations taken for the COVID-19 pandemic to maintain the safety of researchers and participants. The Primary Investigator and an additional moderator ran the sessions. All focus group participants read and signed informed consent forms that outline the purpose, benefits, costs, and privacy of the study (Appendix K) prior to participating in the focus groups. Upon signing up, participants were asked to select a pseudonym in place of their legal name to deidentify the future transcriptions.

Participants were assigned to a focus group based on their scores on the ASO (Appendix E) which they completed along with providing demographic information. Those individuals with scores higher than 53 were randomly assigned together in focus groups with a protocol that asked more questions regarding allyship identity and development while those individuals with scores lower than 53 were randomly assigned together with a protocol that asked more general reflection questions regarding allyship. Participants were not disclosed the details of which focus group or protocol they were assigned.

The Primary Investigator lead eight focus groups while the research assistant led six. Prior to facilitation of the groups, the Primary Investigator and research assistant reviewed the protocols and questioning routes. The focus group discussions were a semi-structured method (e.g., encouraging the participants to discuss topics, providing new questions, and keeping the discussions on topic). All discussions began with the moderator describing the purpose and aim of the study. This was followed by an introduction question in which participants were asked to provide their pseudonym and were encouraged to change their display name on Zoom to align with their pseudonym of choice. An explanation of the ground rules, like respecting differing perspectives, providing space for everyone to engage in conversation, and maintaining privacy of personal information shared during discussions, was provided (Appendix B and C). After the introduction, the key content section began, including questions regarding participants' definition and description of allies, what they believe is involved in allyship (e.g., behaviors, attitudes, knowledge), when they believe someone is or is not engaging in allyship, as well as their individual experiences as an ally including influences and relationship with others. At the end of the focus group session, participants were provided debriefing documentation outlining the purpose of the study and resources for mental health services should they be interested in

pursuing resources for support (Appendix L). Focus group ranged in time from 45 to 90 minutes depending on the amount of information shared amongst participants. Research grant funding permitted that participants received compensation of a $10 Visa e-gift card for participation in the focus groups which was sent to each of the participants via email upon conclusion of the focus groups.

Study 1b. Construction of scale items was based on the information gathered in the focus groups. Instrument creation occurred after the completion of focus groups, transcription, and analysis (see Analytic Plan). The Measure of Allyship Identity was then distributed broadly for pilot testing after the Primary Investigator receives approval from the Institutional Review Board. Participants were recruited via two sampling methods (i.e., alternative web-based recruitment systems and snowball sampling from social networking websites) for pilot testing. A flyer was advertised for via social media with a link to more information (Appendix M). Participants gained access to pilot testing via web-based survey platform Qualtrics. Participants were provided an information letter upon opening the survey link (Appendix N) that outlined risks and benefits. Prior to completing the full survey, participants were asked to verify whether they accessed the survey via Prolific or social media to ensure they were provided the correct debriefing information. Research grant funding permitted that those participants who accessed the survey via social media were eligible to enter a drawing for one of three $20 Visa e-gift cards whereas those participants who accessed the survey via Prolific were compensated $7.50 through Prolific's system. The average completion time for the survey was between 30 to 45 minutes.

Ethical Considerations

Study 1a. There was potential risk of breach of confidentiality due to the nature of focus groups. Participants were informed that they were only asked to share to the extent to which they

felt comfortable. Participants were allowed to end their participation at any time without penalty. Precautions were also taken regarding content and structure of the focus groups. Participants were informed that they could have signed up for an alternative focus group (if available) should they have determined that they knew someone in the group who they were uncomfortable participating in front of their presence. Researchers also emphasized the importance of maintaining one another's privacy by agreeing not to share information from other participants outside of the focus group. Participants were asked to share their pseudonym only during the focus group sessions.

Video and audio recordings, needed for transcription, were stored, and transferred to a secure research drive immediately following the focus group sessions. Only researchers associated with this study had access to recordings or transcriptions. The recordings were then deleted from recording devices. Video recording allow for better tracking of who is speaking at a given time. All transcriptions included pseudonyms rather than legal names to maintain privacy. No key has been maintained that connects any identification codes back to participants.

Study 1b. To assist with the increase in confidentiality and decrease of risk to participants, research data as it pertains to the pilot measure completion and the validation of the measure was collected anonymously. The survey link directed participants to an anonymous web browser that does not record information regarding personal details, location, etc. Additionally, all survey data collected was reported in the aggregate. The only identifying information collected was a Prolific code to verify that participants completed the survey to be compensated. This code was not associated with any information such as emails or legal names. Additionally, those participants who accessed the survey via social media, if interested, could have entered a

drawing, and were directed to an alternative survey that was not connected to the initial survey in which they were asked to submit their email for notification if they had won the drawing.

Analyses

Study 1a. All the focus group sessions were video, and audio taped as well as transcribed verbatim by the principal investigator and research assistant. Transcripts were analyzed using the Grounded Theory technique (Corbin & Strauss, 1990) requiring two rounds of data analysis. The first round of data analysis, referred to as open coding, began with the principal investigator and research assistant reviewing the first of the focus group transcripts in order to identify and define emerging keywords, or codes, which intended to capture exclusive dominant themes (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). The coders generated initial codes and definitions of themes that were documented in order to assist in guiding the analysis of the subsequent focus group transcripts. Any discrepancies between coders were resolved by consensus of the research dyad. When new themes emerged, new code words and definitions were added to the initial list of codes allowing for the list to be refined and reviewed after review of each transcript. After all transcripts were coded and validated via the open coding process, the coded transcripts were prepared to enter the second round of analysis, referred to as axial coding. Nvivo, a qualitative data analysis software program, assisted in storing coded data and tagging relevant segments of the transcripts. Within axial coding, the broad themes established in the open coding phase were explored in order to identify subthemes. Text within the transcript coded within a specific theme were grouped together. In order to assist with item generation, researchers made note of the recurring topics and themes within the transcripts. Themes were categorized into potential subthemes with corresponding text examples from the transcript. Items were generated from translating text examples into general statements that encompass the subtheme.

After the creation of the initial items for the proposed measure, content validity was determined. Seven subject matter experts familiar with or having done research related to social justice allyship or identity development evaluated the proposed statements and determine if the items were valid. Lawshe's (Lawshe, 1975) method is the most widely used to establish and quantify content validity in education and psychology (Wilson et al., 2012) and therefore was utilized to calculate the content validity ratio (CVR) of the allyship identity development instrument items. Lawshe's method involves a panel of subject matter experts rating items into one of three categories: "essential," "useful, but not essential," or "not necessary." Those items that are deemed "essential" by a critical number of panel members were then included within the final instrument used for the pilot study, with those items failing to achieve this critical level were eliminated. Critical level was determined by the use of Lawshe's CVR formula which includes the number of experts who agreed on the relevance of the item, behavior, or question and total members of the panel of expert judges. The critical level, according to Lawshe's CVR formula, for seven panelists is 1.

Study 1b

General Descriptive Analyses. Descriptive data, including standard deviation, correlation, reliability, and mean were calculated and reported.

Hypothesis 3 and 4. In order to evaluate the Measure of Allyship Identity, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted with the use of SPSS with the 218 participants. Exploratory factor analyses (maximum likelihood w/ oblique rotation) are used to explore the dimensionality of a measurement instrument via finding the smallest number of interpretable factors needed to explain correlations among a set of variables. Prior to extracting factors, tests such as Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity were run

to assess how suitable the respondent data was for factor analysis. For this study, items that were poor factor indicators (correlation below .30) of the Measure of Allyship Identity were removed.

Hypothesis 5. In order to assess convergent and discriminant validity, the measure was correlated with the external measures administered in the study. Bivariate Pearson correlations coefficients were conducted to examine whether there were positive associations between the Measure of Allyship Identity and the Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding et al., 2012), Political Solidarity Measure (Neufeld et al., 2019), Activism Orientation Scale (Corning & Myers, 2002), and Compassionate Love Scale (Sprecher & Fehr, 2005) to assist in determining convergent validity. Additionally, correlations coefficients were conducted to examine the degree of negative associations between the proposed allyship development scale and the Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto et al., 1994) scale, Global Belief in a Just World (Lipkus, 1991) scale, and Impression Management subscale (Paulhus, 1998) to assist in determining discriminant validity.

Hypothesis 6. A final set of analyses were conducted in order to evaluate the link between the Measure of Allyship Identity and additional variables included in the pilot testing believed to be related to allyship identity development: belief that the world is a just or fair place, belief in social dominance, attitudes toward social justice activities, likelihood of engaging in social activism in the future, political solidarity, and compassion for others. In order to assess whether allyship identity development predicts beliefs related to fairness, social justice attitudes and behaviors, social dominance, and compassion for others, a multivariate regression was conducted.

Chapter 4. Results

Study 1a

Thirty-four students at a large public Southeastern university, participated in one of fourteen focus group interviews. Participants' age ranged from 18 to 33 years old. Twenty-eight participants were cisgender women while six were cisgender men. Twenty-four participants were white, four were Black, two were Asian, one was Latinx, one was multiracial, one was Arab American, and one was Persian. Thirty-one participants were straight, two were queer, and one did not disclose their sexual orientation. Seventeen participants were Christian, five were atheist, four were agnostic, four did not disclose their religious identity, three were Catholic, and one was Muslim. When describing political affiliation, ten did not align with a political affiliation or stated non-political, seven participants described themselves as Democrat, seven described themselves as Republican, four as Leftist, three as Liberal, two as Conservative, and one as undecided. Participants were asked if they considered themselves to be an "ally" after reading the following definition by Washington and Evans (1991) "a person who is a member of a dominant or majority group who works to end oppression in their personal and professional life through support of, and as an advocate for, an oppressed population." Twenty-six participants answer "yes" while eight answered "unsure." Demographic information and pseudonyms of participants can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Focus Group Demographics

Participant	Age	Gender	Race/Ethnicity	Sexual Orientation	Religion	Political Affiliation	Ally?
Tahani	24	Cis woman	Arab American	Straight	Muslim	Leftist	Yes
Gemma	31	Cis woman	White	Queer	N/A	Leftist	Yes
Ryan	22	Cis woman	White	Straight	Agnostic	Democrat	Yes
Catherine	30	Cis woman	White	Straight	Agnostic	Democrat	Yes
Charlotte Belle	19	Cis woman	White	Straight	Atheist	Liberal	Yes
Scorpio	25	Cis woman	White	Straight	Catholic	Democrat	Yes
AJ	33	Cis man	Black	Queer	Agnostic	Democrat	Yes
Golfgame12	21	Cis woman	White	Straight	Christian	Conservative	Yes
Aubie	29	Cis woman	Black	Straight	Christian	Democrat	Yes
Graycie	19	Cis woman	White	Straight	Atheist	Leftist	Yes
Athena	19	Cis woman	White	Straight	Christian	Republican	Yes
Agnus	20	Cis woman	White	Straight	Christian	Republican	Yes
Gaines	19	Cis woman	White	Straight	Christian	Republican	Yes

Walton	20	Cis woman	White	Straight	Christian	N/A	Yes
Ellis	20	Cis woman	Persian	Straight	N/A	N/A	Unsure
Michelle	29	Cis woman	Black	Straight	Christian	Democrat	Yes
M.K. Smith	20	Cis woman	White	Straight	Christian	Democrat	Yes
Flower	22	Cis woman	White	Straight	Atheist	N/A	Yes
Malcolm	19	Cis man	White	Straight	Agnostic	Leftist	Yes
JP	20	Cis man	White	Straight	Christian	N/A	Unsure
Lila	20	Cis woman	White	Straight	Christian	N/A	Yes
Mary	19	Cis woman	White	Straight	Catholic	Republican	Yes
Alex J	20	Cis man	Asian	Straight	Atheist	N/A	Unsure
Alex B	20	Cis woman	White	Straight	Christian	Republican	Unsure
Anthony	18	Cis man	Asian	Straight	Atheist	N/A	Unsure
KKTY	24	Cis woman	Multiracial	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
Liz Reeves	22	Cis woman	White	Straight	Christian	Republican	Unsure
Vector	19	Cis woman	White	Straight	Christian	N/A	Yes

Sansa	21	Cis woman	White	Straight	Catholic	Liberal	Yes
Haley Fern	20	Cis woman	White	Straight	Christian	Conservative	Yes
Rip Dutton	20	Cis man	White	Straight	Christian	Republican	Unsure
Monday Taylor	20	Cis woman	Black	Straight	N/A	Liberal	Yes
C. Star	22	Cis woman	White	Straight	Christian	Undecided	Unsure
Ella	21	Cis woman	Latinx	Straight	Christian	N/A	Yes

Note. All participant names are pseudonyms.

Participants described an array of perspectives regarding relationships with others, reflection on themselves and their values, allyship, and advocacy. The first step in analysis of the focus group transcriptions, open coding, involved breaking down data into distinct parts and creating codes to label them and later compare and contrast to find commonality. Open coding revealed 109 initial codes, refer to Table 2, such as “ally as a trend,” “empathy,” “information gathering,” and “reflections on privilege.” The second step in analysis of the focus group transcriptions, axial coding, drew connections between the 109 initial codes in order to group the codes into categories. Axial coding revealed 15 overarching themes: ally for whom or what; view of fairness and justice; perspectives of problems; values and morals; engagement as an ally; responding when one causes harm; what is privilege; relationship with privilege; action; perspectives on protesting; self-awareness and reflection; perspectives on history; motivation for being an ally; ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors; and ally as an identity. Detailed findings are summarized in the following sections.

Table 2

Initial Open Codes

Open Codes	Number of References Coded
2020 Presidential Election	1
Accountability	12
Acknowledge Unique Challenges	3
Activism Separate from Allyship	1
Ally is a Friend	7
Allyship and Competition	5
Allyship and Risk	5
Allyship as a Trend or Performative	19
Allyship as Supporting Others	27
Allyship Development Ongoing	2
Allyship Distanced from Collective Action	1
Allyship Effectiveness	2
Allyship is Collective Action	9
Allyship is Providing Help	3
Allyship Means Action	30
Ambivalence to Protests	1
Amplifying the Voices of Others	8
Apologizing	15
Barriers Exist as to Why World is Unfair	3
Black Lives Matter	15
Choosing Silence	1
Communication	7
Comparing Self to Others	12
Context	5
Cost Benefit Analysis	6
Critical Thinking	1
Cultural Immersion Experiences	7
Defensiveness	5
Definition Evolves	3
Denial	4
Denial of White Privilege	5
Difference Between Ally, Accomplice, Advocate	8
Distant from Emotions but Compassion for Affected	3
Don’t See Color and Kind to All	6
Emotions Related to US History	24
Empathy	11
Engaging in Action	22
Equal Opportunities	5
External Motivations for Allyship or Advocacy	7
Fairness about Perspective	14
Fairness Depends on Hard Work	6
Gender	3
Good and Bad Parts of History	4
Importance of Education	19
Increased Social Awareness	2
Information Gathering	25

Intent vs Impact	9
Internal Motivations for Allyship or Advocacy	27
Intrinsic vs Extrinsic Benefits	2
Know History but It's of the Past	2
Know History So It Doesn't Repeat	1
Knowledge from Others	6
Knowledge from Research	13
Label of Ally Not Important	1
Lack of Accountability	2
Lack of Care and Empathy	3
Lack of Involvement Due to Early Development	1
Lack of Knowledge	6
Learn Something New Everyday	4
Levels to Allyship	3
Listen More Speak Less	5
No Emotions Related to US History	6
No Protest Knowledge	5
Normalizing Mistakes	5
Open to Being Challenged	5
Passive vs Active Support	8
Patterns of Behavior	6
Peaceful Protest	7
Personality	12
Positionality	11
Privilege and Financial Stability	2
Privilege and Spirituality	1
Privilege as an Advantage	10
Privilege as Negative	9
Privilege as Positive	4
Privilege is Natural Gifts and Abilities	4
Privilege Means Not Working Hard	1
Protest as Valid Action	20
Protests Ineffective	2
Race or Ethnicity	28
Reflection on Oppression or Marginalization	24
Reflection on Privilege	38
Reject Ultimatums	2
Relationships	30
Self at the Center	5
Self-Exploratory	7
Self-Identified Ally	7
Self-Reflection	54
Sensitivity to the Self	7
Severity of Transgression	9
Sexual Orientation or Identity	13
Sharing Experiences and Emotions	10
Skeptical of Self-Identified Allies	6
Slavery	3
Social Media	24
Solution Oriented	4
Speaking Up	26

Systems	17
The South	10
Thinking About Others More Than Self	2
Tokenizing	4
Tolerant of Protests Under Certain Conditions	4
Transition Leads to Thinking About Positionality	5
Understanding Others	17
Unfairness a Part of Life	7
USA Lacks Accountability	1
Validate Feelings	2
Where I'm From	10
World Not Fair or Just	12

Focus Group Themes

Ally for whom or what. Participants varied in how they described for who or for what allyship would occur. It was indicated that allyship could occur for an individual, a group of people, or a specific topic or cause of importance. When considering an individual, participants most often named a "loved one," such as friends or family members, as someone for whom they would advocate. Personal love and investment as well as knowledge of loved one's experiences helped contribute to participants' willingness to be allies on behalf of loved ones. Groups of people most frequently included allyship for groups with shared identities to loved ones and allyship for groups who held historically marginalized identities, with frequent overlap. Participants clarified that difficult experiences of their loved ones assisted in building a desire to support other folks with similar identities. For some participants, identities of loved ones did include those that are a part of historically marginalized groups. Ryan shared the beginning of her engagement with allyship for LGBTQ+ people as a result of a connection to her best friend:

> So, my best friend of 10 years, she is a part of the LGBTQ+ community, but just being around her and seeing her experiences…it was very hard for her, and something that people really like did not see coming. So just her experiences, made me really aware of

> the needs of this group…just my relationship with her like that was really eye-opening to what's going on and she is the person who really has taught me a lot of information and how to research for myself…

Allyship for a specific topic or cause was also discussed such that participants shared passion around learning and spreading information on a cause such as climate change. Individuals or groups of people were not specifically named as part of this allyship. Some participants combined many of these ideas when considering who or for what they engage in allyship. According to participants within the study, if loved ones had a particular passion for a cause or topic, it would be of interest to help support that cause too due to the desire to support their loved one in their passions. Vector outlined this engagement:

> I feel like I'm an advocate, like an ally for like all my friends and anything that they need help with…like then seeing them very passionate kind of makes me very passionate about it [a cause]. And so, I'm like willing to help them in anything that they need or like anything that they need assistance and stuff.

View of fairness and justice. Participants had mixed responses when discussing views on fairness and presence of justice within the world. The four most common responses included describing the world as fair and just and that all people have the same opportunities; focusing on perspectives such that if one is positive, they can overcome unfairness, while those who are negative struggle; that the fluctuation between fairness and unfairness was a natural part of life and to be experienced by every person; and the world is not fair or just and due to systemic barriers, everyone does not have the same opportunities. Those individuals that focused on perception highlighted the need for a “good” attitude as well as “hard work” in order to

overcome struggles. Golfgame12 highlighted “work ethic” as a contributor to changing outlook on fairness of the world as well as changing one’s circumstances:

> …I would say that, like based on your work ethic, and everything you, you might create situations that help you out, but overall just in terms of everything, we know that life isn't fair in the world isn't fair but hopefully you put yourself in situations that allow you to get fair things by your hard work and everything…

In contrast, participants who agreed that the world was not fair or just frequently mentioned social identities and systemic barriers that impacted access to justice such as racism, sexism, cissexism, and heterosexism. The more individuals held social identities that have been historically marginalized, the less opportunities for fair treatment due to the presence of oppression in one’s life. Alex B discussed her personal identities and acknowledged how unequal opportunities occurred based on social identities:

> I am a straight white female…I have a lot of privilege, and I do not think the world is fair and just. I feel like there is unequal opportunities for a lot of people that things such as race, gender, sexual identity can cause a lot of unfairness to others.

Perspectives of problems. Participants outlined diverse ways of approaching why individuals experience hardship and where problems come from that cause this struggle. For some participants, they highlighted how problems occur based on everyone’s life circumstances and that it would be an individual’s duty to shift their cognitive outlook and solve their own problems. An example of this is the belief that if an individual does not have a positive outlook on their life, problems will arise and maintain. Other participants shared that there was recognition of systemic issues that impact how individuals function in their daily life, however, it

is up to that particular individual to try to find ways to solve the problems created by system issues using work ethic. An example of this is the belief that those who are experiencing houselessness should work harder in order to no longer be houseless and be successful. Lastly, participations shared recognition of systemic issues and how they impact individuals with the belief that in order to reduce struggle and problems, the system itself needed shifting. Walton highlights how social identities and the systemic oppression or privilege that can result from a particular identity makes it harder, or easier, for some to solve concerns and work towards life goals:

> I think there is a lot of factors that like play in that like I'm your social economic status, race, religion, like so many things planned to that that would make it harder for some people to work towards success.

Values and morals. Most participants agreed that if allyship included treating others equally, it was the morally correct behavior to engage in and was an important value. Some participants indicated a need for allyship to embrace "liberation" as a core value such that the freedom of all from systemic oppression and expectation would lead to justice, and thus was the morally correct thing to do. A smaller collective of participants shared how their spiritual or faith practice dictated supporting others such that being a "good" and "moral" follower of a faith included allyship on behalf of others. Ella shared her perspective of helping others based on her faith:

> I'm a Christian, and so, like, I believe that, like the Lord or like God has like given us things and like our purpose and like being blessed in ways that other people…like to pour out those blessings on to others. But if you're not looking at it from that standpoint, which, like not everyone is Christian so not everyone should then like…that's the only

> reason why I believe that so like I don't know it just depends on your stances on other things.

Engagement as an ally. There was much discussion regarding what prompts engagement as an ally for individuals. Participants shared that supporting an individual through allyship happened most frequently when the "target" of their allyship, such as a sibling, was physically present in their space. Others discussed being prompted to engage in allyship when something happens that could negatively affect the "target" of their allyship, whether that be an individual or a group. An example of this could be increased support of trans people after the suggestion or the passage of anti-trans legislation. Participants additionally shared the about the impact of social media and that that may have prompted engagement such that individuals post information, donation links, etc. to receive praise, avoid judgment, or some combination of both. However, participants critiqued this perspective and experience as more so "performative" than altruistic. The most positively reviewed form of engagement as an ally was those who are constantly involved in helping people, groups, or causes without expectation or desire for praise as the intention is to help contribute to overall change, not gain personal accolades. Aubie provided a definition of ally as an example of this degree of engagement:

> …I would describe the word ally as someone who is in solidarity with someone's beliefs or someone that is willing to help or help contribute to change in the community or in society as a whole…

Responding when one causes harm. Participants shared one of the most important components of engaging with others as an ally being the ability to acknowledge and respond when learning that harm was caused to another individual. There was a spectrum of responses

shared by participants regarding the aftermath of learning one was harmful or hurtful: lack of acknowledgement or ignoring the problem; engaging in information gathering in order to further understand what caused harm (e.g. words, actions, etc.); apologizing; experiencing defensiveness; and accepting when others provide critiques or feedback about how to change moving forward. Apologies were spoken of in more depth such that there were two forms of apologies noted which included apologizing that a reaction was caused within an individual without personal accountability or acknowledging how behavior would shift in the future (e.g. I am sorry you felt that way) and apologizing with intention to shift behavior due to taking personal accountability for harm caused (e.g. I am sorry and will try to do better by…).

Most participants described many of these reactions as realistically being combined. The most frequent combinations of responses included apologizing and information gathering which is shown as example by Haley Fern:

> Usually, my first reaction is to apologize cause even though what I said might not have been seen as offensive to me, it could have been seen as offensive to someone else. So, my first thing is to apologize and then I like ask why it was offensive, so I don't like make the same mistake again with somebody else like just try to like learn from your mistake.

What is privilege. Privilege was a frequent term brought up in the focus groups as participants discussed their understanding of interacting with others and engaging in allyship. Although the frequency of the term was high, the definition varied among participants. Some participants, particularly those that indicated having strong faith backgrounds, referred to

privilege as being associated with blessings. Additionally, privilege was also associated with extraordinary gifts or abilities which was KKTY's perspective:

> I was gonna say something like that…like [privilege is] when people like have like special gifts or abilities to do things

Privilege was also associated with financial benefits or advantages such that participants described those with privilege as those who have the means to purchase whatever they want without working extra hard for it. Vector stated this in her understanding:

> I feel like when I think of the word privilege, I think about someone that like gets something that they didn't have to work hard for. Whereas like you know someone else might work really hard to get that, you know, designer bag they might save up from working. And then I feel like privilege would be someone else you know, just getting the bag without having to put any hard work in. And you know that example can be, you know applied to many different ways.

Components of Vector's definition make-up what many participants shared as their definition of privilege such that unearned advantages connected to systems of oppression positions some individuals to access greater benefits compared to others. Reflecting on privilege and one's positionality were frequently brought up as important indicators of engaging in allyship.

Relationship with privilege. While defining privilege is important in growing and engaging as an ally, recognizing one's relationship to privilege is another vital activity as posed by the participants. Those individuals with less alignment with allyship indicated that they rarely reflect on privilege or distance themselves from conversations including privilege. However, those

participants with stronger alignment shared personal reflections on how privilege is considered in their personal life as well as how to address disparities when they are positioned as more privileged compared to peers or other individuals. Malcolm shared some of his reflections, namely reflecting on how police interactions don't trigger the same reactions within him as those of his friends of color:

> When I hear privilege I really just think of being treated differently in some way or like having an avenue where you don't have to experience some things that aren't good and some of the experience I've had I've talked to a lot of my friends who are people of color and they've told me about some of the things that they're scared of like being pulled over by the cops and what might happen because of that, or some of the other things that happen in their lives and I realized that I have a lot of privilege because I don't have to experience a lot of those things that they are scared of or they have to think about on a daily basis, whatever it may be.

Action. Participants indicated that one of the most fundamental components of allyship was engagement in action to address injustice and inequality. A number of different expectations related to action were discussed such as speaking up and out against injustice or harm; educating oneself on different cultures and experiences; sharing resources and amplifying the experiences of those that are the "targets" of allyship; donating to people or organizations to benefit programming or overall life expenses; and changing one's behavior to include a greater culture of equity. AJ provides a comprehensive understanding of what many participants shared as the foundation of engaging in active allyship:

> So, I think I would define it as um…I don't think it's passive. Okay it's active right? So, you're not sitting on the sidelines, I think, active participation, I think that an ally is not only active but it's someone who's centering their efforts on the target group. I'm not coming here with my own initiatives of what I think would be best for you right but I'm sitting down and I'm listening to what you think. I'm listening to you and what's best for you and really thinking about the ways in which I can assist and use my position. To assist you in furthering your efforts, like I'm on the sidelines with you, I'm not doing the work if I don't include the people that's being targeted, so I think a lot of times, even in academia, we have folks engaged in in this critical research and things like that, but have you talked to these folks you know that you're completing research with you know? Like are you like in your community? Like are you donating to the organizations? Have you consulted with them? I think that your actions are geared towards producing an outcome that creates equity.

Perspectives on protesting. Engagement in protesting or demonstrating was viewed as one of the most common forms of advocacy and allyship by participants, however, there were varied perspectives on the effectiveness and usefulness of protesting. Focus group occurred within a year of increased Black Lives Matter demonstrations domestically and internationally, with most participants having some familiarity with a protest that occurred during the summer of 2020. Participants varied in their perspectives on protesting as a valid and useful form of allyship and action. Some individuals denied any involvement in demonstrating as well as a lack of knowledge of any recent protests in their physical location. Others stated their support for protesting such that it is an act protected by citizen's rights in the United States of America. These individuals did not name particular protests they were aware of or interested in but

reiterated that the rights of all Americans, including those who engage in protesting, should be supported.

Those participants who shared knowledge of and actively engaged in protesting or demonstrating, indicated three different perspectives: protesting is acceptable as long as it is non-violent and peaceful; protesting, regardless of whether it is non-violent or not is ineffective therefore unnecessary; and protesting is effective, and it is important to be involved in demonstrating and supporting causes. Alex B's comment is an example of those participants who value "non-violent" protesting describing this action as something to "respect":

> …within our community, it was more on that peaceful respectful side of the town. There was, to my knowledge, no damaging of buildings or, you know, violence, and so I think I personally just had a respect for that protest…

Ellis shared perspectives regarding lack of necessity for demonstrations when no measurable action or change can be determined by the demonstration.

> I don't know if the Stop Racism people count as a protest…and personally, I really do not understand their motive or agenda. When they hold up signs…I'm a person of color. And I feel like I've obviously experienced racism. I can't speak for all people of color, but in my head I see like some white people holding some "Stop Racism" signs and I'm like, I don't feel more safer like there's less racism around here I'm like, I feel like you could do more for like our planet by like cleaning up or doing like some community service I don't know. But that's, I'm just not rolling my eyes but, like, what, what is really what is being done here and maybe I don't just like understand their goals. But I don't know what the signs specifically are supposed to…supposed to do.

Self-awareness and reflection. Self-awareness and reflection were highlighted as helpful individual behaviors for those who are wanting to develop as allies to engage in, especially considering it garners the least risk as it predominately relies on an individual reflecting on their life and experiences. A few participants indicated rarely reflecting on their experiences or the experiences of others while others shared that they would reflect on their life based on the present roles that inhabited. An example of this is college students reflecting on ways to be a better student and how to be successful in achieving professional goals once graduating, all reflections based on individuals' role as a college student. Participants shared that an important facet of building understanding for others as an ally was reflecting on the self, others, and the systems that impact all of us as we navigate through life. This can include recognizing one's social positionality which is reflective of the areas that individuals have influence or power. Graycie shared reflection she engages in regarding how her life would be different if one aspect of her identity were different along with reflecting on the power of words:

> …the two examples I can think of are like looking at myself and thinking if I were different, like if I were male, would people perceive like my ideas and the things I say like my achievements differently? And then the other example is, I'm white, so I think about how as a white person how can I like spread and share ideas of injustice to help minorities, if that makes sense. Like I think about like the impact my words may have…

Perspectives on history. Participants were divided regarding the importance of recognizing and reflecting on historical events and the impact of the past on the present. Most individuals indicated that it is important to know and understand history, however, how, or why was debated. Some participants stated that it was important to know history so that it does not repeat itself in the present or future. Others shared that while knowing history is important, it is best not

to dwell on the past as things have improved in the present and those of us living now were not responsible for whatever occurred in the past. JP outlined this particular perspective:

> I don't feel any like embarrassment or anything for what happened in United States history just because I think it's kind of like, you shouldn't be like proud of something that you had no hand in achieving, just like you shouldn't be embarrassed of something that you had no hand in achieving, it goes both ways. So, if you didn't have any part of it, you shouldn't feel either way about something.

An alternative perspective, which frequently came up for those participants who shared a close alignment with identifying as allies, indicated that they felt a variety of emotions when reflecting on history, such as sadness and embarrassment, as the events that did occur, such as the genocide of Native Americans or enslavement of Black Americans, still impact folks in the present. Individuals shared that although they recognize they were not physically present during historical events, it is still a part of their overall history when considering societal systems and how they may be benefitting. Ryan shared her thoughts related to this perspective including her growth:

> …I would definitely say in the last five to six years as I've gotten older, that I have been like, "Oh my gosh, like this is my history" and this is…this is embarrassing, like this is why people are mad. And it was definitely something that I had to go through as an older person because growing up, never, never once had I felt guilty because it wasn't me, per se, you know? Like that thought process.

Motivation for being an "ally." Participants reflected on two dual considerations of motivating factors for engaging in allyship: internal versus external motivation and positive

versus negative motivation. Internal versus external motivation included discussion about those individuals who were motivated by personal belief that all people deserve equal opportunity and treatment (internal) contrasted to those individual motivated by how others may perceive them based on engagement or lack of engagement (external). Internal motivation was highlighted as including empathy and understanding others such as Taylor Monday's description of how folks get involved in allyship to begin with:

> I think the reason behind wanting to even be one [an ally] in the first place is that maybe you see a part of yourself in whoever you're supporting and also that you feel strongly enough to be that support system.

In reflecting on positive versus negative motivations, participants shared positive motivations for being an ally includes a desire to facilitate change as well as support others in achieving justice. However, many participants discussed an increase in negative motivations, focusing on performativity, trendiness, and monetary gain. Social media was included in discussions regarding the performative and perceived trendiness such that individuals would post information regarding causes or awareness that on the surface alludes to allyship but is primarily motivated by boosting one's status or avoiding the perception that if they are not posting, they are bad people. Participants additionally spoke of allyship being included within trends on social media more often such that posting about social justice and equity may result in increased likes for some individuals, however, they do not engage in any other active work to assist communities outside of the posts. Ryan shared some of her thoughts in regard to social media and allyship:

> I think that there are a few things that can motivate, I mean one being just social media hype, it's very "fun" right now to be an ally. It's very…I mean you get more likes if you're an ally.

Ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors. Participants reflected on their overall general beliefs about who allies are, what they know, their attitudes and belief, as well as what types of behaviors are expected. There was also reflection regarding what beliefs, knowledge, and behaviors are not associated with allies. Predominantly, allies were perceived to be open, empathetic, and willing to hold themselves accountable. Participants shared that allies would be knowledgeable regarding how subjective experiences are impacted by privilege and oppression. Additionally, allies were anticipated to seek out continued learning, have a willingness to develop and change over time, and to challenge themselves. The most common points discussed in regard to what is not expected or perceived of an ally was defensiveness, denial, and minimization such that individuals would be unwilling to engage with innovative ideas or understandings to assist with personal growth. Scorpio described these concepts:

> …individuals might not believe in things existing or believe things being as big of an issue as they are. So, there's that denial, there's that minimization piece. There's that sort of separation from responsibility. You know, "I'm not…it's not my problem." The whole Robin DiAngelo's Good/Bad Binary sort of idea of "I'm not one of those bad people therefore I'm not part of the problem or the solution. A bad person looks like this and I'm one of the good ones." Meaning that if you don't think sometimes exists, you're not gonna have motives or motivations to contribute with your help to a solution if you don't think there's problem.

Ally as an identity. There were a number of individuals who felt alignment with "ally" as a label, indicating their self-identification as such. Those individuals stated the importance of others knowing where they stand on social issues based on who they engaged in allyship for. Participants also grappled with the idea that only those individuals who receive support from "allies" could assign folks with the label of "ally." Based on this perspective, an example would be that only persons within the LGBTQ+ community could indicate which straight, or cisgender people were "allies," and which were not. These participants maintained that self-identification as an ally was discrediting the voices and experiences of historically marginalized populations. Additionally, there was expressed distaste for the term "ally," such that it did not feel like and accurate or appropriate term. Participants indicated a desire not to be perceived as "performative" as it relates to engaging in advocacy or support of others and believed that focusing on the label or term of "ally" took away from what should be a focus on the action that would assist folks. Gemma discussed her dislike of "ally" as a term and overall, the concept of having to label folks:

> But like it's not like I walk around and say oh "Hi I'm Gemma I'm an ally." I think there's something about me as a person, using a term like that that feels performative. That doesn't sit well with me, but I think I'm trying to separate myself from that…I guess, I have some distaste for the terms.

Disagreement with the term "ally" was also present such that participants desired a different term in replacement. Some folks shared the belief that "ally" was outdated or did not fully capture how others engage in supporting and advocating for others in an authentic way. Terms such as "partner," "activist," and "accomplice" were suggested as alternatives. AJ shared his preference regarding terminology along with his perception of what describes an accomplice:

> I prefer accomplice, instead of an ally and advocate because I think accomplice really highlights how there's another person there that I'm assisting, that's with me, that I'm here on this journey with you. Like we're here and we're together…if you go down, I'm going down too. Fuck with you, you know? Or whatever thing that we're working towards right that, for me, like accomplice feels like the term.

Initial Item Pool Generation. Practical measurement considerations were discussed such as utilizing a five or seven Likert-type scale. It was additionally agreed that terms such as "ally" or "allyship" would not be used within measurement items to refrain from priming individuals when completing the measure. After reflecting on the meaning of each of the15 aforementioned themes, as well as reviewing text segments from focus group transcripts, seventy total items were generated. All themes contributed to the pool of items. Table 3 illustrates themes, number of items generated per theme, and an item example. All seventy items can be reviewed in Appendix O.

Table 3

Measure of Allyship Identity Item Generation

Theme	Number of Items Generated	Item Example
Ally for whom or what	6	It is important to me to support and advocate on behalf of historically overlooked or marginalized people.
View of fairness and justice	5	I believe that all people experience fairness and unfairness equally, as it is a natural part of life.
Perspectives of problems	3	There are structural social, economic, and political barriers that contribute to problems in life and in order to solve those problems, the structures need to change.
Values and morals	3	All people should be treated equally because it is the right thing to do.
Engagement as an ally	6	I support and advocate on behalf of others regardless of whether they provide me with support in return.
Responding when one causes harm	4	I try to gather information to understand what caused the harm when I learn that I have hurt someone.
What is privilege	4	I believe that privilege means that someone has access to financial resources.
Relationship with privilege	5	I often think of privilege, oppression, and power when making decisions in my life.
Action	11	I support and advocate for others by donating directly to them or to organizations that support their causes
Perspectives on protesting	4	I believe that protesting or demonstrations are effective and necessary for change.
Self-awareness and reflection	4	I often engage in self-reflection and think about my place in the world.
Perspectives on history	4	I think it is important to learn about history and how events that occurred in the past impact people in the present.
Motivation for being an ally	3	I am motivated to help others by my personal beliefs that all people deserve equal opportunity and treatment.
Ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors	5	I believe it is important to respect the diverse experiences and identities of others.
Ally as an identity	3	I believe it is important that others identify me as an advocate, helpful and supportive.

Content Validity and Item Selection. All seventy items generated for the initial pool where randomized and placed within one document for review by subject matter experts for content validation and to assist in the process of reducing the number of items for the proposed measure. Lawshe's (1975) content validity ratio (CVR) was used to establish content validity of initial items. The CVR focused on the consideration of the level of agreement that an item is essential from experts within a panel and is calculated utilizing the following formula:

$$CVR = \frac{n_e - (N/2)}{N/2}$$

Within the formula, n_e is the number of panel members indicating that an item is essential while N is the number of total panel members. In addition to the CVR formula, a table of critical CVR values is utilized to assist in determining how many panel members need to agree an item is essential and thus which items should be included or excluded from a final proposed measure. Due to the panel being composed of seven subject matter experts, based on the critical CVR values table, a minimum of seven experts were required to agree that an item was essential as well as critical CVR exact value of 1, in order to retain the item on the final proposed measure. Of the seventy proposed items, thirteen items were agreed upon as essential by all seven panelists thus achieving a critical CVR exact value of 1. The proposed Measure of Allyship Identity, which includes the thirteen items that achieved content validity, can be found in Table 3. The items span five of the fifteen initial themes that resulted from the focus groups which is additionally outlined in Table 4. Thus, based on focus group data and subject matter area expert review and input, the following components contribute to allyship identity development: ally for whom or what; view of fairness and justice; relationship with privilege; ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors; and action.

Table 4

Measure of Allyship Identity

Item	Theme
I think it is important for people to collectively work together to support and advocate for others or causes.	Action
It is important to me to support and advocate for causes that I value.	Ally for whom or what?
Privilege, oppression, and power are not things I think about or apply to my life.	Relationship with privilege
I support and advocate for others by speaking up when they are being harassed or hurt.	Action
I often engage in activities that promote social justice and equality for all.	Ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors
I do not have discussions about privilege, oppression, and power because I believe it causes conflict and division between people.	Relationship with privilege
I believe it is important to educate myself about societal structures of privilege, oppression, and power.	Ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors
I believe it is important to think about the ways privilege, oppression, and power impact my life.	Relationship with privilege
I often think of privilege, oppression, and power when making decisions in my life.	Relationship with privilege
I believe that there are structural social, economic, and political barriers that prevent everyone from having the same opportunities.	View of fairness and justice
It is important to me to support and advocate on behalf of historically overlooked or marginalized people.	Ally for whom or what?
I believe it is important to think about the ways privilege, oppression, and power impact the lives of others.	Relationship with privilege
I believe it is important to discuss societal structures of privilege, oppression, and power with others.	Ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors

Note. 1 (Strongly Disagree) – 7 (Strongly Agree) Likert-type scale utilized in response to items.

Study 1b

Two hundred and eighteen individuals (see Table 5) completed an online survey. Participants were recruited from Prolific (155), social media (52), and email or listservs (11). A majority of participants (78.9%) were between the ages of 18 to 34 years old. Participants selected all the racial and/or ethnic identities that applied to their self-identity to which one hundred and fifty (68.8%) participants indicated white, thirty-five (16.1%) Black, twenty-nine (13.3%) Latinx, twenty-three (10.6%) Asian, seven (3.2%) Native American, four (1.8%) were Pacific Islander, and four (1.8%) Middle Eastern. Upon selecting all applicable gender identities, one hundred and

fifty-seven (72%) indicated woman, forty-nine (22.5%) man, thirteen (6%) non-binary, seven (3.2%) gender non-conforming, five (2.3%) trans man, three agender (1.4%), and 2 (.9%) as unlisted which included genderqueer and genderfluid.

Participants selected all sexual orientations that applied to their self-identity to which one hundred thirty-two (60.6%) indicated straight, forty-six (21.1%) bisexual, nineteen (8.7%) pansexual, sixteen (7.3%) queer, nine (4.1%) asexual, nine (4.1%) lesbian, seven (3.2%) gay, four (1.8%) as unlisted which included bicurious, demisexual, fluid, and omnisexual. In regard to religious identity, a majority of participants reported identifying as Christian (73; 33.5%), fifty-two (23.9%) as agnostic, thirty-two (14.7%) as atheist, twenty-four (11%) as not list which included spiritual, pagan, and eclectic, eighteen (8.3%) as Catholic, nine (4.1%) as Muslim, five (2.3%) as Buddhist, three (1.4%) as Jewish, one (.5%) as Jehovah's Witness, and one (.5%) as Hindu.

Regarding highest level of educational experience, eighty-one (37.2%) indicated a high school diploma, fifty-seven (26.1%) participants indicated receiving a bachelor's degree, thirty-one (14.2%) a master's degree, twenty-seven (12.4%) an associate degree, eight (3.7%) a doctorate, eight (3.7%) completed trade school, four (3.7%) a professional degree, and 2 (.9%) less than high school. When describing political affiliation or orientation, one hundred and fourteen (52.3%) reported identifying as liberal, thirty (13.8%) as moderate, twenty-two (10.1%) as leaning liberal, seventeen (7.8%) as unsure, thirteen (6%) as leaning conservative, thirteen (6%) as not listed which include progressive, non-political, or leftist, and nine (4.1%) as conservative.

Table 5

Survey Demographics

Variable	N = 218	%
Age		
18 to 24	80	36.7%
25 to 24	92	42.2%
35 to 44	24	11%
45 to 54	13	6%
55 to 64	7	3.2%
65 to 74	2	.9%
Race and/or Ethnicity		
White	150	68.8%
Black	35	16.1%
Latinx	29	13.3%
Asian	23	10.6%
Native American/Indigenous	7	3.2%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	4	1.8%
Middle Eastern/Arab	4	1.8%
Gender		
Woman	157	72%
Man	49	22.5%
Non-Binary	13	6%
Gender Non-Conforming	7	3.2%
Trans Man	5	2.3%
Agender	3	1.4%
Unlisted	2	.9%
Sexual Orientation		
Straight	132	60.6%
Bisexual	46	46%
Pansexual	19	19%
Queer	16	7.3%
Asexual	9	4.1%
Lesbian	9	4.1%
Gay	7	3.2%
Unlisted	4	1.8%
Religion		
Christian	73	33.5%
Agnostic	52	23.9%
Atheist	32	14.7%
Unlisted	24	11%
Catholic	18	8.3%
Muslim	9	4.1%
Buddhist	5	2.3%
Jewish	3	1.4%
Jehovah's Witness	1	.5%
Hindu	1	.5%
Education		
High School Diploma	81	37.2%
Bachelor's	57	26.1%

Master's	31	14.2%
Associate	27	12.4%
Doctorate	8	3.7%
Trade School	8	3.7%
Professional Degree	4	3.7%
Less than high school	2	.9%
Political Orientation		
Liberal	114	52.3%
Moderate	30	13.8%
Leaning Liberal	22	10.1%
Unsure	17	7.8%
Leaning Conservative	13	6%
Unlisted	13	6%
Conservative	9	4.1%

Note. Participants could select multiple categories for Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Sexual Orientation to best align with identities.

Exploratory Factor Analysis. All analyses were performed using SPSS statistical software packages. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity were used to assess the suitability of the data for factor analysis (Dziuban & Shirkey, 1974). Principal axis factor extraction was completed on the thirteen items of the MAI. The Kaiser-Myer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was .920 and the Barlett's test of sphericity was significant (X^2 = 1834.326, *df* = 78, p < .001), demonstrating adequate factorability to proceed with further analyses. Three factors were detected with eigenvalues factor loadings greater than or equal to 1 (eigenvalues = 6.92, 1.32, 1.05). Further examination of the scree plot in conjunction with a parallel analysis comparison eliminated factors 2 and 3, demonstrating a one-factor extraction was acceptable (Hayton et al., 2004). Analysis was re-specified to extract one factor.

Both the KMO and Bartlett's test demonstrated acceptability for factor extraction (KMO = .920; Bartlett's test of sphericity, X^2 = 1834.326, *df* = 78, p < .001). A one-factor model was appropriate (eigenvalue = 6.49), accounting for 49.93% of the variance in this measure. Table 6 depicts descriptive statistics and the factor loadings of all 13 MAI items. As the table shows,

factor loadings ranged from low to high, ranging from .47 to .88. The MAI additionally demonstrated acceptable internal consistency (Chronbach's alpha = .92)

Table 6

Measure of Allyship Identity Factor Loadings

MAI Item	Factor Loading
I think it is important for people to collectively work together to support and advocate for others or causes.	.620
It is important to me to support and advocate for causes that I value.	.474
Privilege, oppression, and power are not things I think about or apply to my life.	.601
I support and advocate for others by speaking up when they are being harassed or hurt.	.526
I often engage in activities that promote social justice and equality for all.	.497
I do not have discussions about privilege, oppression, and power because I believe it causes conflict and division between people.	.708
I believe it is important to educate myself about societal structures of privilege, oppression, and power.	.853
I believe it is important to think about the ways privilege, oppression, and power impact my life.	.842
I often think of privilege, oppression, and power when making decisions in my life.	.651
I believe that there are structural social, economic, and political barriers that prevent everyone from having the same opportunities.	.658
It is important to me to support and advocate on behalf of historically overlooked or marginalized people.	.844
I believe it is important to think about the ways privilege, oppression, and power impact the lives of others.	.846
I believe it is important to discuss societal structures of privilege, oppression, and power with others.	.880

Note. KMO = .920; Bartlett's test of sphericity, $X^2 = 1834.326$, $df = 78$, $p < .001$

Correlations. To assess the degree of convergent and discriminant validity of the MAI with various related validated measures, bivariate correlations were conducted with the use of total scores of each of the measures. Effect sizes were evaluated in accordance with Cohen's (1988) benchmarks. Correlations can be viewed in Table 7. The MAI was compared to the Social Justice Scale (SJS), the Activism Orientation Scale (AOS), the Political Solidarity Measure (PSM), the Compassionate Love Scale (CLS), the Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDO), the Global Belief in a Just World Scale (GBJW), and the Impression Management Subscale

(IMS). The MAI was positively correlated with Social Justice Scale, the Activism Orientation Scale, the Political Solidarity Measure, the Compassionate Love Scale and negatively correlated with the Social Dominance Orientation Scale and the Global Belief in a Just World Scale, supporting convergent validity. The MAI and Impression Management Subscale were not statistically significantly associated. Partial correlations were run to determine the relationship between each of MAI, SJS, AOS, PSM, CLS, and SDO GBJW whilst controlling for social desirability via the Impression Management subscale. As indicated by Table 8, social desirability had very little influence in controlling for the relationship between the variables.

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistency, and Correlations

Variable	*M (SD)*	*α*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
[1]SJS	5.83 (.787)	.94	—							
[2]AOS	2.26 (.661)	.97	.53**	—						
[3]PSM	5.61 (1.16)	.93	.73**	.58**	—					
[4]CLS	5.26 (.903)	.94	.53**	.29**	.45**	—				
[5]GBJW	2.85 (1.15)	.91	-.40**	-.42**	-.45**	-.15*	—			
[6]SDO	1.85 (.891)	.92	-.62**	-.37**	-.62**	-.37**	.53**	—		
[7]IMS	3.72 (.779)	.78	-.01	.00	.01	.17*	.05	.02	—	
[8]MAI	5.57 (.991)	.92	.82**	.60**	.80**	.48**	-.53**	-.63**	.03	—

Note: ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Table 8

Partial Correlations

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[1]SJS	—						
[2]AOS	.53**	—					
[3]PSM	.73**	.58**	—				
[4]CLS	.54**	.29**	.45**	—			
[5]GBJW	-.40**	-.42**	-.45**	-.16*	—		
[6]SDO	-.62**	-.37**	-.62**	-.38**	.53**	—	
[7]MAI	.82**	.60**	.80**	.48**	-.53**	-.63**	—

Note: ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Regressions. Using a multivariate regression to assess associations of allyship identity development with other related or unrelated constructs, we specified favorable attitudes towards social justice activities, likelihood of engaging in social activism in the future, political solidarity, and compassion for others as the independent variables and allyship identity development as the dependent variable. Additionally, the belief that the world is a just or fair place and belief in social dominance were specified as independent variables and allyship identity development as the dependent variable. It was hypothesized that allyship identity development would be negatively associated with the belief that the world is a just or fair place and belief in social dominance while positively associated with favorable attitudes towards social justice activities, likelihood of engaging in social activism in the future, political solidarity, and compassion for others.

The results of the regression, as depicted in Table 9 indicated that the model explained 78% of the variance and that the model was a significant predictor of allyship identity development, $F(6,211) = 128.72$, $p < .001$. While favorable attitudes towards social justice activities ($B = .519$, $p<.001$), likelihood of engaging in social activism in the future ($B = .148$, $p<.05$), political solidarity ($B = .283$, $p<.001$), and belief that the world is a just or fair place ($B = -.123$, $p<.001$), contributed significantly, compassion for others ($B = .047$, $p = .263$) and belief in social dominance ($B = -.048$, $p = .351$) did not. Tests to see if the data met the assumption of collinearity indicated that multicollinearity was not a concern (Favorable attitudes towards social justice activities, Tolerance = .36, VIF = 2.76; Likelihood of engaging in social activism in the future, Tolerance = .60, VIF = 1.66; Political solidarity, Tolerance = .37, VIF = 2.71; Compassion for others, Tolerance = .70, VIF = 1.43; Belief that the world is a just or fair place, Tolerance = .66, VIF = 1.54; Belief in social dominance, Tolerance = .48, VIF = 2.07).

Table 9

Multivariate Multiple Regression Exploring Factors that Relate to Allyship Identity

Variable	B	SE	t	p	%CI
Attitudes Towards Social Justice	.52	.07	7.79	<.001	[.39, .65]
Likelihood of Engaging in Social Activism	.15	.06	2.40	.02	[.03, .27]
Political Solidarity	.28	.04	6.33	<.001	[.20, .37]
Compassion for Others	.05	.04	1.12	.26	[-.04, .13]
Belief in a Just World	-.12	.03	-3.62	<.001	[-.19, -.06]
Belief in Social Dominance	-.05	.05	-.94	.35	[-.15, .05]

ANOVAs. Three one-way between subjects ANOVAs were conducted to compare the effect of political affiliation, race and ethnicity, and gender on scores on the MAI. For political affiliation, there was a significant effect [F (6, 211) = 14.10, p < .01]. Post hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for conservative-affiliated participants (M = 4.50, SD = 1.15) on the MAI was lower than the mean scores for liberal-affiliated (M = 5.94, SD = .70) and leaning liberal-affiliated participants (M = 5.53, SD = .90). Additionally, the mean score for leaning conservative-affiliated participants (M = 4.36, SD = 1.01) on the MAI was lower than the mean scores for leaning liberal-affiliated (M = 5.53, SD = .90) and liberal-affiliated participants (M = 5.94, SD = .70). Lastly, the mean score for moderate-affiliation participants (M = 5.02, SD = .96) on the MAI was lower than the mean score for liberal-affiliated participants (M = 5.94, SD = .70). For race and ethnicity, there was not a significant effect [F (6, 211) = .235, p = .97]. For gender, there was a significant effect [F (2, 215) = 8.84, p < .01]. Post hoc comparisons using Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for cisgender men (M =

5.09, *SD* = 1.00) on the MAI was lower than the means scores for cisgender women (*M* = 5.66, *SD* = .97) and for gender diverse people (*M* = 6.10, *SD* = .65).

Chapter 5. Discussion

The previous chapter reported the results of the research questions that guided this study in exploring the purpose of this research, which was to create a tool, the Measure of Allyship Identity, for individuals to gain a better understanding of their allyship identity development. An interpretation of the findings, limitations and future directions associated with the study, as well as implications for education and training within counseling psychology are discussed in this chapter.

Summary of Findings

Study 1a. The purpose of Study 1a was to understand the dimensions and constructs that related to the development of allyship identity to contribute to the construction of the Measure of Allyship Identity (MAI). Of the fifteen initial themes that emerged from the focus groups conducted to evaluate experiences and perceptions of allyship, five remained following a review by subject matter area experts: ally for whom or what; view of fairness and justice; relationship with privilege; ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors; and action.

These proposed components of allyship identity development are similar to prior established models of allyship development. The concept of ally for whom or what focuses on the motivation an individual has for engaging in allyship for an individual or cause. Edwards (2006) describes a similar idea related to motivation and allyship towards causes based on one's level of development. Motivation was explained as fluctuating from interest in being an ally for one's loved ones, an ally only for targeted groups, or an ally for all individuals such that social justice (Edwards, 2006) would positively impact everyone. Additionally, individuals were described as possibly being an ally to one individual, an entire targeted group, or a specific issue.

Evaluating one's view of fairness and justice as well as relationship with privilege is a key cognitive and affective expectation of engaging in ally development. Suyemoto and Hochman (2021) evaluated the processing of being and becoming an ally and found that cycles of understanding privilege, oppression, and positionality were vital to the process of ally development. What this leads to, and similar to participants within the current research, is reflecting on what has been learned and understood about privilege, oppression, and how systems function. Edwards (2006) also described the variety of views of justice, relationship to the system, and privilege at various levels of development such that those who were more self-interested were not interested in the system and does not acknowledge privilege while those with more development acknowledged the benefits of justice for all via destroying and redefining systems and attending to privilege.

Literature on ally identity and development has frequently listed common ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors (Broido, 2000). While some research can be specific in naming an attitude or behavior as it is associated with a particular group, those components more generally highlighted as important ally expectations include knowledge about experiences and history of a historically marginalized or targeted group, awareness of the experiences of a targeted or historically marginalized group, skills developed to assist individuals in times of need, and willingness to engage in social action to challenge and promote change (Jones, Brewster, Jones, 2014). The process of participating in social justice action, which can take many forms and is continuous and consistently developing, is a key behavioral expectation of engaging in ally development. Action involves changing what is typical of a system, such as disparities, and reconceptualizing and repurposing in order to distribute resources and opportunities in such a way that is transformative and equitable (Torres-Harding et al., 2012).

Model of Allyship Development. In order to better understand how social justice allies may develop across a continuum the following development of allyship identity is being proposed with consideration of the themes and experiences that emerged from the focus groups.

Stage 1: Nonidentification. An individual has no basis for and/or interest in identification with allyship. If there is involvement in support for others, it is focused on closer interpersonal ties such as with family members or friends. Regarding views of fairness and justice, individuals at this stage are likely to consider the world as fair and just with the belief that all people have similar opportunities or access to resources in life. Those individuals within this stage rarely reflect on privilege and/or distance themselves from conversations that may challenge their viewpoint regarding privilege and/or oppression. There is additionally the possibility that individuals within this stage are unaware of or do not believe that privilege exists or has an impact on daily life. In reflecting on ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors as well as action, individuals may be more cognitively inflexible with less openness to innovative ideas or behaviors, would not self-identify as an ally, and would be comfortable with this status.

Stage 2: Contact and Conflict. This stage usually occurs after an individual experiences person contact with a friend, family member, or coworker from a historically marginalized social identity who shares a different, oftentimes negative, or harmful, experience within the world. This contact allows for the individual to recognize that other people navigate the world differently and have experiences that do not align with their own. Individuals may be drawn to supporting whomever they made contact with; however, this supportive behavior would be in conflict with their rigid views of fairness and justice or relationship with privilege. Individuals may lean into that conflict and engage in exploration to broaden understanding of privilege, oppression, and justice or they may retreat and be closed off due to discomfort. Should

individuals retreat, they may maintain a relationship with the person to which they had initial contact with, however, any support would be at the individual level with no action or movement towards addressing institutional or systemic concerns. Contact is not a requirement for individuals to self-identify as allies or explore social justice concepts, however, it has been noted as a frequent precursor to allyship development.

Stage 3: Internalizing. Individuals within this stage are forming their understanding of what a social justice ally would be. Individuals are considering who and what they want to support as they begin to consider opportunities beyond interpersonal interactions with loved ones or familiar people. Regarding views of fairness and justice, individuals are considering how there is fluctuation between fairness and unfairness experienced by people. There is increased understanding of privilege and oppression as individuals start to understand more of how privilege relates to their experiences and the experiences of others. Regarding direct action, individuals within this stage may struggle with speaking out or challenging institutions due to worry or fear of making mistakes. Ally attitudes and behaviors begin to manifest as individuals develop openness and seek out opportunities to learn. Individuals may not openly identify themselves as allies at the start of this stage but with increased experience, gain comfort with that association.

Stage 4: Ally. As individuals explore personal worry and nervousness and engage in increased learning about historical marginalization and systemic oppression, they make more movement towards open identification as a social justice ally. Individuals will identify a cause or issues to advocate for that move beyond individual or interpersonal interactions. It is understood that the concepts of fairness and justice are impacted by privilege and oppression which leads to different experiences for all people. Individuals in this stage will have respect and appreciation

for continued growth in their knowledge and challenging of privilege. Ally actions and attitudes will increase as individuals increase in comfort as they participate in organizations that support historically marginalized groups or address social justice causes. It is to be noted that individuals may also face some feelings of estrangement from those peers who do not identify as allies as they immerse themselves in interactions with other allies more frequently.

Stage 5: Solidarity. Individuals within this stage are less focused on allyship as an identity and more on the ongoing growth that occurs at the individual level and action at the system level. Persons at this stage understand and reflect on justice, privilege, and oppression and are concerned about what needs to change broadly within society to support those being directly and indirectly harmed by oppressive systems. Although they do engage in supporting loved ones, groups, and social justice issues, there is less of a focus on what that means for them as individuals or on their personal identity. The intention for individuals at this stage is to stand in solidarity with social justice activists and contribute their resources and knowledge to liberation for all.

The intention of the Measure of Allyship Identity was to expand research and instrumentation to include a measure that can be used to quantitatively evaluate allyship identity development across a continuum similar to the one previously described.

Study 1b. The purpose of Study 1b was to psychometrically evaluate the Measure of Allyship Identity (MAI). We questioned the extent to which the MAI measured the constructs of allyship identity development as identified by Study 1a utilizing an exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Results from the EFA indicated that the MAI had a one factor structure and all thirteen items administered were retained. This finding suggests that the constructs of ally for whom or

what, view of fairness and justice, relationship with privilege, ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors, and action collaborate as one dominant underlying mechanism present in the sample contributing to understanding allyship identity. We originally predicted that a multi-factor structure would emerge reflecting a developmental continuum of allyship identity to differentiate individuals at various levels of allyship identity development. However, due to statistical analyses supporting each of the themes as only one dimension of allyship identity, this finding does not align with the initial intention of the MAI to quantitatively evaluate allyship identity development across a continuum or to differentiate between participants in different meaningful allyship identity categories. Rather, what is likely to be better supported by the findings is a static measure that evaluates one's self-reported allyship identity development in the moment. Thus, should individuals complete the MAI, it would be more of a reflection on their current perception of their self-identification as an ally.

Contrary to our hypotheses, each of the themes that emerged from the focus groups loaded onto one factor. Upon closer inspection of item content, it may have been that some items originally designed to assess one of the themes may also speak to a different theme. For example, the item "I think it is important for people to collectively work together to support and advocate for others or causes" is one associated with the theme of action, however, it may also be latently assessing the theme of ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors. Additionally, the item "I believe it is important to educate myself about societal structure of privilege, oppression, and power" while associated with the theme of ally attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors, may have evaluated the theme of relationship to privilege as well.

There is benefit in reflecting on how the nuanced layers of allyship indicated in the focus groups work simultaneously to contribute to allyship with the MAI. Prior research on ally

development highlights the need for not only understanding and undermining one's privilege but engaging in action against oppression of which is intended to be ongoing and relational (Suyemoto et al., 2021). Effective action in support of historically marginalized and targeted groups and against systemic oppression are connected to comprehensive understanding of one's social positionality and privilege (Ayvazian, 1995; Caldwell & Vera, 2010; Clark, 2010; Edwards, 2006; Washington & Evans, 1991). Thus, the strength of each of the themes working simultaneously as a mechanism of allyship identity within the MAI is supported by ally development research that posits that these constructs do not happen separate of one another for effective allyship but must happen concurrently and indefinitely.

Additionally, although the statistical analyses did not support the Measure of Allyship Identity as a quantitative tool for assessing allyship identity development across a continuum, the results did support sound initial reliability and validity. Internal consistency for the total MAI was excellent. Additionally, the MAI positively correlated as hypothesized with favorable attitudes towards social justice activities, likelihood of engaging in social activism in the future, political solidarity, and compassion for others. The MAI also negatively correlated, as hypothesized, with the belief that the world is a just or fair place and belief in social dominance. This indicates that respondents who scored more highly on the MAI were more likely to hold positive attitudes towards activities associated with social justice, more likely to indicate interest in engaging in social activism in the future, more likely to have increased political solidarity, and more likely to have higher compassionate love for others. Additionally, this indicates that respondents who scored more highly on the MAI were less likely to believe that the world is a fair or just place and less likely to believe in social dominance hierarchies. This is consistent with literature outlining critical consciousness which encompasses cognitive, emotional, and

behavior components that challenge individuals to develop better understanding of cultural differences and systemic inequity as well as engage in action to relinquish power to correct injustices (Pitner & Sakamoto, 2005).

Social justice allies must be aware of the existence of injustice and inequalities as well as acknowledge how systemic oppression within society contribute to those harmful and unjust circumstances. Multivariate regressions were also conducted to evaluate whether allyship identity could predict beliefs related to fairness, justice, and social dominance. It was hypothesized that greater development of one's allyship identity may be negatively associated with belief in a just or fair world and belief in social dominance. This hypothesis was partially supported as there was a significant negative association between allyship identity and belief in a fair or just world. This association suggests that individuals who answered positively on the MAI are more likely to have developed critical awareness of how systems impact individuals' experiences (Pitner & Sakamoto, 2005). The foundation of effective allyship and behavior is built on understanding the impact of oppression as well as how one's own life has been shaped based off their positionality and standpoint (Suyemoto et al., 2021).

Furthermore, it was hypothesized that greater development of one's allyship identity may be positively associated with favorable attitudes towards social justice activities, likelihood of engaging in social activism in the future, political solidarity, and compassion love for others. Overall, results indicated significant positive associations between increased allyship identity and each of those constructs with the exception of compassion love for others which was not significantly associated. This association suggests that individuals who answered positively on the MAI are more likely to respond positively to action oriented towards challenging systems, likelihood of engagement in future social justice action, and belief in political solidarity with

others. Ally development research has consistently highlighted the critical need for allies to be involved in action which can take the form of public activism, supporting those individuals' experiencing discrimination and marginalization, or assisting in the accountability for those individuals with privilege who are developing as allies (Suyemoto et al., 2021).

Limitations and Future Directions

While efforts were taken to ensure that sound methodology was employed, there are some limitations that should be considered regarding this study. First, regarding Study 1a and Study 1b, the sample was predominately white, cisgender women, despite utilizing different recruitment methods in order to create a more diverse sample. While Study 1a's sample is representative of the population at the rural Southeastern university that participants were recruited from, Study 1b's methods broadened recruitment strategies to include any individual over the age of eighteen with English-proficiency in the United States of America through an online recruitment website, however, demographics remained similarly to those of Study 1a. The homogeneity of the sample may create concern when attempting to apply findings to those communities with differing cultural identities. This lack of variety in race, ethnicity, and gender identity is consist within prior literature on allyship identity and measure creation such as in the creation and validation of the Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding et al., 2012) and the LGBT Ally Identity Measure (Jones et al., 2014), further highlighting the need for additional research that includes advocates of a variety of backgrounds. Similarly, the lived experiences of college-aged students, as recruited in Study 1a, vary across institutions as well as when compared to those individuals who self-identify as allies who are not current college students. While findings from the focus groups conducted in Study 1a mirrored prior research on allyship identity and

development, future research should consider a greater assortment of participants that represent engagement as social justice allies, such as middle-to-older aged adults.

Another limitation to consider is the completion of the entirety of the study online, which may have brought about potential interferences with the data. Study 1a focus groups were conducted via an online video platform, Zoom, which may have found students in a variety of locations and settings. It is reasonable to consider that some focus group participants may not have been in a setting where they could fully express thoughts such as in a shared space where others may overhear dialogue that was shared by the participant. Additionally, there is the possibility that focus group members may not have expressed their honest opinions about allyship for fear of evaluation from others or due to potential discomfort if they voiced opposing views compared to other participants. Study 1b was additionally conducted online and, similarly to Study 1a, participants could have been in a variety of settings and environments while completing the survey. Response time was recorded, and attention check items were included in order to monitor focus, however, there is not a possibility for the researcher to know the impact on survey responses that completing the survey in a variety of locations had on the overall data.

An additional limitation is the lack of participants who responded “No” to the inquiry about whether individuals self-identified as an ally for Study 1a. Of the thirty-four participants who were involved in the focus groups, there were none that stated that they were not an ally despite there being individuals who scored lower on the AOS regarding their interest and intention for future participation in activism or advocacy. Within this study, focus group participants shared about increased external pressure that they reported when engaging with social justice allyship and concern for how they would be perceived by others, which at times lead to engaging in behaviors that they felt would be approved by peers. It is possible that

participants thought it most socially acceptable to respond “yes” or “unsure” to a question regarding their identity as an ally. Future research should consider exploring how social desirability manifests within social justice allies and advocates.

Additionally, the impact of social media on allyship identity development and engagement as an ally would be an interesting direction for continued research. Participants within the focus groups shared the impact of social media on how they have learned and grown, as well as been hindered, in their journey with allyship. Individuals highlighted the ease of access to resources associated with social justice and advocacy, which was appreciated when trying to learn about how to support causes. However, social media was discussed as a double-edged sword such that learning could be accomplished along with performative engagement as an ally. Performative allyship via social media was viewed as actions done to increase one’s social media presence (e.g., number of likes on a post, number of followers) rather than because of devotion or genuine support for a group of people or a cause. One specific example provided was of the increased posting of black squares on Instagram as a show of solidarity in the summer of 2020 following the increase in Black Lives Matter protests. Participants shared hesitancy on the effectiveness of such a gesture as they understood that some social media users wanted to express support and felt this was a well-meaning way to do so versus those users interested in maintaining credibility by following what they viewed as a popular trend. Recent research supports this hesitancy as Wellman (2022) reflected on social media influencers and performative allyship. Wellman (2022) indicated that the posting of the black squares on Instagram was more tied to building or maintaining credibility as social media influencers rather than genuine support for Black Lives Matter as a cause. Additionally, performative allyship was described as being connected with a focus on one’s own self-focused emotional reactions to

inequality and injustice as motivated by guilt rather than the needs of historically marginalized communities (Wellman, 2022). Continued research looking into performative allyship and its prevalence on social media would be of interest, especially as social media continues to evolve, and social injustice persists.

Implications for Counseling Psychology, Education, and Training

Our study has several implications for attending to allyship within counseling psychology, education, and training. The social composition of the United States has grown such that increased diversity has illuminated multicultural issues, thus, the emphasis on diversity and multiculturalism grew within the field of psychology (Hope & Chappell, 2015). Preliminary work on cross-cultural competencies within mental health defined competence via three broad domains: awareness, knowledge, and skills (Sue et al., 1992). According to Sue et al., culturally competent therapists are aware of their own cultural background and the potential for biases to operate within the therapeutic process, value clients' beliefs, willingly bring a non-judgmental approach to work with culturally different clients and are comfortable with differences. In efforts to attend to cultural competence, prejudice reduction and implicit bias training are frequently employed, and prior literature has supported the effectiveness of such programming for short-term individual shifts (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2005; Stathi et al., 2014). However, in order to improve opportunities and experiences for students, clients, and individuals, long-term and continuous efforts that can be sustainable need to be incorporated. Therefore, it is our recommendation that counseling psychology and training programs not just focus on developing cultural competency but on developing scholar-allies, advocates, or activists. Training leaders invested in the process of assisting with the development of allies should adapt education materials and classrooms to reflect on motivations for engagement as an advocate as well as

views of fairness, privilege, positionality, and oppression and understanding of expectations and attitudes of allyship and advocacy, including potential behaviors and action that can be taken. It is our recommendation too that educators themselves be actively engaged in the process of ally development as a model for trainees but also in order to establish accountability.

Prior research discussing allyship within education and academia has highlighted the need for continued advancements in how educators attend to social justice and equity in and outside of the classroom. If the intention of counseling psychology is to continue to center social justice as the predominate value of the profession, changes certainly need to be made to attend to the needs and wellbeing of students, staff, and faculty. Boutte and Jackson (2014) and Fischer (2018) highlighted advice that educators should consider and incorporate in order to increase inclusivity and accessibility for students and faculty of color as well as queer and trans students and faculty. Boutte and Jackson (2014) focused on ways white allies could better support people of color within academia including but not limited to engaging in dialogue about issues of racism, becoming familiar with literature that addresses racism and anti-racism, understanding how racism is imbedded within the policies and overall structure of academia, and be willing to unlearn one's own racism. Fischer (2018) shared similar pieces of advice regarding cisgender faculty taking more decisive action to support trans faculty such as actively advocating for inclusive campus culture by being involved in university committees, incorporating intersectional voices and topics within syllabi and classrooms, and inviting as well as adequately compensating trans people for their time and expertise for guest lectures and keynote addresses. Overall, the highlight of each of these articles was the importance of individuals who claim allyship as part of their identity to engage in action rather than remain complacent.

Ally development may also be a critical component of addressing a key problem of counseling psychology: white supremacy and white nationalism. Grzanka, Gonzalez, and Spanierman (2019) described alarm regarding the widespread mainstream rise white supremacy globally and their belief that counseling psychologists have the tools necessary to combat this increase. The critical-conceptual framework described included explicit critiques of various multicultural approaches that have been embedded in psychology for decades. Allyship is particularly discussed as an area by which counseling psychologists can address systemic problems rooted in white supremacy. As a result, it is our recommendation that as individuals engage in developing or maintaining their role as an ally, they are also thoughtful about critical considerations. While the current research supports individuals reflecting and understanding privilege awareness, support and resource access, and power, additional literature encourages challenging oneself to continue evaluating contributions and growth (Grzanka et al., 2019). For example, while intergroup dialogue can be helpful and has been utilized previously as a multicultural approach, a tool for combatting white supremacy through allyship is hosting accountability groups for white people to engage in dismantling their own perspectives of whiteness (Grzanka et al., 2019). This approach could be helpful in attending to hierarchies of power that can be replicated within intergroup interactions by reducing the expectations frequently placed on historically marginalized individuals to educate or facilitate change within those with more access to privilege. Additionally, it encourages individuals to create a community for support and growth which challenges the individualistic nature of white supremacy.

While much of the present research focuses on individual development as social justice allies, there are other factors to consider, especially when reflecting on implications for

counseling psychology, such as how allyship might function beyond the individual level at the institutional or systemic level, what should a proposed outcome or impact of allyship be, or reflections on whether "development" is the most accurate language to associate with the process of engaging in social justice activism. The present research aimed to better understand personal development of allyship identity and while beneficial, a natural next step in future directions should consider how allyship is incorporated within institutions and systems. This reflection would be helpful in considering how allyship can contribute meaningfully to social change at distinct levels, not just individually. Based on prior research and taking into consideration the goals of counseling psychology to embody liberatory practice, what may be most beneficial in addressing these factors would be incorporating socially just mental health practice. Socially just mental health practice is born out of critical studies, social justice scholarship, and liberatory psychology (Smith et al., 2009). The traditional, medical model influenced approach to psychology and mental health practice largely ignores the consequences and impact of living in an unjust society (Albee, 1969). Clinical practice may focus more on what is "wrong" with a client and how to address that at an individual level, rather than exploring what systemic barriers are impacting well-being. The goal of socially just mental health practice is to collaborate to include reflection and exploration of social justice perspectives that validate distinct cultural practices and reject those practices that center oppression (Smith et al., 2009). Other related fields, such as social work, have begun this process utilizing anti-oppressive approaches to center social justice within clinical work by honoring cultural and lived experiences and engaging in community care (Johnstone, 2021). Allyship may have a role beyond the individual level should there be collective widespread support within psychology to apply socially just mental health practice in the discipline within training programs and clinical practice.

Conclusion

In studying the experiences of individuals at various levels of interest and development in their identity as social justice allies, an array of information was revealed. Through the grounded theory analysis process, the themes emerged provided the researcher with insight on individual's perception of allyship identity and development. The findings revealed that considerations regarding who or what motivates an individual to engage as an ally, evaluation of one's views of fairness and justice within society as well as relationship with and experiences of privilege, understanding of attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors commonly associated with social justice allies, and engagement in action to support justice and dismantling of systemic oppression are all constructs that assist in understanding the development of allyship identity. Furthermore, our results regarding allyship identity suggest significant positive associations with favorable attitudes towards social justice activities, likelihood of engaging in social activism, and political solidarity and negative associations with the belief that the world is a just or fair place.

The limitations of this research study, along with the literature review which highlights the importance of understanding advocacy and allyship, signals a need to continue this research. This study will help individuals within counseling psychology and mental health better understand how their personal development of cultural competency also incorporates important tenants of developing as allies and accomplices. Further, this research will help diversity, equity, and inclusion educators with nuanced development of practices to assist individuals in better engaging as advocates and allies. Providing structured understanding of allyship identity development parallel with one's lived experiences and cultural identities can facilitate rich dialogues and growth as more individuals aim for an equitable and liberated world. Most importantly, this research contributes to the understanding that ally development and behavior

requires continued and consistent action and personal change that ultimately decenters “ally” as an identity and focuses on challenging the existence, prevalence, and impact of oppression.

References

Abreu, J. M., Chung, R. H. G., & Atkinson, D. R. (2000). Multicultural Counseling Training: Past, Present, and Future Directions. *The Counseling Psychologist, 5*, 641-656.

Accomplice. (2020). *Accomplice*. In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Retrieved June 29, 2020, from https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/1152

Albee, G. W. (1969). Who shall be served? *Professional Psychology, 1*, 4 –7.

American Psychological Association. (2012). Guidelines for psychological practice with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *American Psychologist, 67*(1), 10–42. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024659

American Psychological Association (2015). Guidelines for psychological practice with transgender and gender nonconforming people. *American Psychologist, 70*(9), 832–864. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039906

American Psychological Association. (2019). *Guidelines for psychological practice with people with low-income and economic marginalization*. Retrieved from

https://www.apa.org/about/policy/guidelines-low-income.pdf

Anderson, S. K., & Middleton, V. A. (Eds.). (2011). *Explorations in diversity: Examining privilege and oppression in a multicultural society* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Arredondo, P., Toporek, R., Brown, S. P., Sanchez, J., Locke, D. C., Sanchez, J., & Stadler, H. (1996). Operationalization of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 24*(1), 42–78. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.1996.tb00288.x

Ashburn-Nardo, L., Morris, K., & Goodwin, S. (2008). The confronting prejudice responses (CPR) model: Applying CPR in organizations. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7,* 332-342.

Ayvazian, A. (1995). *Interrupting the Cycle of Oppression: The Role of Allies as Agents of Change*. P. Rothenberg & S. Munshi (Eds.), *Race, Class, and Gender in the United States: An Integrated Study* (pp. 629–635). New York, NY: Worth Publishers.

Beck, C.T., & Gable, R.K. (2001). Ensuring Content Validity: An Illustration of the Process. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, *2*, 201.

Beer, A. M., Spanierman, L. B., Greene, J. C., & Todd, N. R. (2012). Counseling psychology trainees' perceptions of training and commitments to social justice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *59*(1), 120–133. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026325

Bemak, F., Chi-Ying Chung, R., Talleyrand, R. M., Jones, H., & Daquin, J. (2011). Implementing Multicultural Social Justice Strategies in Counselor Education Training Programs. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling & Psychology*, *3*(1), 29–43. https://doi.org/10.33043/jsacp.3.1.29-43

BETNetworks. (2020, February 22). Rihanna Says Tell Your Friends Of Other Races To "Pull Up" For Black Issues [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fZiyZ2rDdv8

Bishop, A. (2002). *Becoming an ally: Breaking the cycle of oppression in people* (2nd ed.). Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada: Fernwood.

Blanchard, F. A., Crandall, C. S., Brigham, J. C., & Vaughn, L. A. (1994). Condemning and Condoning Racism: A Social Context Approach to Interracial Settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*(6), 993–997. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.6.993

Blodorn, A., O'Brien, L. T., & Kordys, J. (2012). Responding to sex-based discrimination: Gender differences in perceived discrimination and implications for legal decision making. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 15*(4), 409–424. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430211427172

Boutte, G.S., & Jackson, T.O. (2014). Advice to white allies: Insights from faculty of color. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 17*(5), 623-642.

Broido, E. M. (2000). The development of social justice allies during college: A phenomenological investigation. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*, 3-18.

Brooks, A. K., & Edwards, K. (2009). Allies in the Workplace: Including LGBT in HRD. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 11*(1), 136–149. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422308328500

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

Caldwell, J. C., & Vera, E. M. (2010). Critical incidents in counseling psychology professionals' and trainees' social justice orientation development. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4*(3), 163–176. https://doi.org/ 10.1037/a0019093

Caprara, G. V., Vecchione, M., Capanna, C., & Mebane, M. (2009). Perceived political self-efficacy: Theory, assessment, and applications. European. *Journal of Social Psychology, 39*(6), 1002–1020. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.604

Casey, E. A., & Ohler, K. (2012). Being a Positive Bystander: Male Antiviolence Allies' Experiences of "Stepping up." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *27*(1), 62–83.

Chen-Hayes, S. (2001) Social Justice Advocacy Readiness Questionnaire. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 13*(1-2), 191-203. https://doi.org/10.1300/J041v13n01_13

Clark, C. T. (2010). Preparing LGBTQ-allies and combating homophobia in a U.S. teacher education program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(3), 704–713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.006

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. London, England: Routledge.

Corning, A. F., & Myers, D. J. (2002). Individual orientation towards engagement in social action. *Political Psychology*, *23*(4),703–729.

Curtin, N., & McGarty, C. (2016). Expanding on psychological theories of engagement to understand activism in context(s). *Journal of Social Issues, 72*(2), 227-241. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12164

Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 532–544. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250923

Dalbert, C., Montada, L., & Schmitt, M. (1987). Glaube an eine gerechte Welt als Motiv: Validierungskorrelatezweier Skalen (Belief in a just world as motive: Validity correlates of two scales). *Psychologische Beiträge, 29*, 596–615.

DeBlaere, C., Singh, A. A., Wilcox, M. M., Cokley, K. O., Delgado-Romero, E. A., Scalise, D. A., & Shawahin, L. (2019). Social justice in counseling psychology: Then, now, and looking forward. *The Counseling Psychologist, 47*(6), 938–962. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000019893283

Dono, J., Webb, J., & Richardson, B. (2010). The relationship between environmental activism, pro-environmental behavior, and social identity. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 30*(2),176–186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2009.11.006

Doosje, B., Ellemers, N., & Spears, R. (1995). Perceived intragroup variability as a function of group status and identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31*, 410-436.

Downing, N. E., & Roush, K. (1985). From passive acceptance to active commitment: A model of feminist identity development for women. *The Counseling Psychologist, 13*, 695–709. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000085134013

Dragojevic, M., & Giles, H. (2014). The reference frame effect: An intergroup perspective on language attitudes. *Human Communication Research, 40*, 91-111. https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12017

Droogendyk, L., Wright, S.C., Lubensky, M., & Louis, W.R. (2016). Acting in Solidarity: Cross-Group Contact between Disadvantaged Group Members and Advantaged Group Allies. *Journal of Social Issues, 72*(2), 315-334. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12168

Drury, B. J., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Allies against Sexism: The Role of Men in Confronting Sexism. *Journal of Social Issues*, *70*(4), 637–652. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12083

Duncan, L. E., Mincer, E., & Dunn, S. R. (2017). Assessing Politicized Sexual Orientation Identity: Validating the Queer Consciousness Scale. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *64*(8), 1069–1091. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2016.1236599

Dziuban, C. D., & Shirkey, E. C. (1974). When is a correlation matrix appropriate for factor analysis? Some decision rules. *Psychology Bulletin, 81*, 358–361. doi: 10.1037/h0036316

Edwards, K. E. (2006). Aspiring social justice ally identity development: A conceptual model. *NASPA Journal*, *43*(4), 39-60.

Evans, N. J., & Wall, V. A. (Eds.). (1991). *Beyond tolerance: Gays, lesbians, and bisexuals on campus*. American College Personnel Association.

Finnerty, P., Goodrich, K. M., Brace, A., & Pope, A. (2014). Charting the course of ally development. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, *8*(4), 326–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/15538605.2014.974385

Fischer, M. (2018). The Cistakes of Allyship. *Women & Language*, *41*(1), 159–161.

Foster, S. M. (2011). Supposed to know better: On accepting privilege. In S. K. Anderson & V. A. Middleton (Eds.), *Explorations in diversity: Examining privilege and oppression in a multicultural society* (2nd ed., pp. 25–31). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2005). Understanding and addressing contemporary racism: From aversive racism to the common in group identity model. *Journal of Social Issues, 61*(3), 615–639. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560. 2005.00424.x

Giroux, H. (1997). Rewriting the Discourse of Racial Identity: Towards a Pedagogy and Politics of Whiteness. *Harvard Educational Review*, *67*(2), 285–321. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.67.2.r4523gh4176677u8

Glasford, D. E., & Calcagno, J. (2012). The conflict of harmony: Intergroup contact, commonality, and political solidarity between minority groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(1), 323–328. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.001

Goodman, L. A., Liang, B., Helms, J. E., Latta, R. E., Sparks, E., & Weintraub, S. R. (2004). Training Counseling Psychologists as Social Justice Agents: Feminist and Multicultural Principles in Action. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *32*(6), 793–837. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000004268802

Goodman, R. D., Williams, J. M., Chung, R. C.-Y., Talleyrand, R. M., Douglass, A. M., McMahon, H. G., & Bemak, F. (2015). Decolonizing traditional pedagogies and practices in counseling and psychology education: A move towards social justice and action. In R. D. Goodman & P. C. Gorski (Eds.), *Decolonizing "multicultural" counseling through social justice*. (2014-50149-011; pp. 147–164). Springer Science + Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1283-4_11

Griffin, P. (1997). Introductory module for the single-issue course. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Grzanka, P. R., Gonzalez, K. A., & Spanierman, L. B. (2019). White supremacy and counseling psychology: A critical–conceptual framework. *The Counseling Psychologist, 47*(4), 478–529. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000019880843

Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W. F. (1988). Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(2), 265–275. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.103.2.265

Hackman, R. (2015, June 26). *"We need co-conspirators, not allies": How white Americans can fight racism*. The Guardian. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jun/26/how-white-americans-can-fight-racism

Hardiman, R., Jackson, B.W., Griffin, P. (2013) Conceptual foundations. In M. Adams, M. J. Blumenfeld, C. R. Casteneda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, & X. Zuñiga (Eds.) *Readings for diversity and social justice, third edition*. (pp. 26-34) New York, NY: Routledge.

Hayton, J.C., Allen, D.G., & V. Scarpello. (2004). Factor Retention Decisions in Exploratory Factor Analysis: A Tutorial on Parallel Analysis. *Organizational Research Methods, 7*(2), 191-205.

Health Service Psychology Education Collaborative. (2013). Professional psychology in health care services: A blueprint for education and training. *American Psychologist, 68*(6), 411–426. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033265

Hernández, L. H. (2020). Silence, (In)Action, and the Downfalls of White Allyship. *Women & Language*, *43*(1), 147–152. https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.34036/WL.2020.015

Hesch, R. (2016). Becoming and Remaining an Ally of Aboriginal Peoples in Education. *Our Schools / Our Selves*, *25*(2), 61.

Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, *21*(5), 967–988. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639502100509

Hope, D. A., & Chappell, C. L. (2015). Extending training in multicultural competencies to include individuals identifying as lesbian, gay, and bisexual: Key choice points for clinical psychology training programs. *Clinical Psychology: Science & Practice, 22*(2), 105-118. https://doi.org/10.1111/cpsp.12099

Hülle, S., Liebig, S., & May, M. J. (2018). Measuring Attitudes Toward Distributive Justice: The Basic Social Justice Orientations Scale. *Social Indicators Research*, *136*(2), 663–692. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-017-1580-x

Indigenous Action Media. (2015). Accomplices not allies. In C. Milstein (Ed.) *Taking sides: Revolutionary solidarity and the poverty of liberalism*. (pp. 85-96). Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Jackson, R.G., Huskins, K, Skelton, S.M., & Thorius, K.A.K. (2020). Ally & Accomplice: Two Sides of the Same Coin. *Equity Dispatch, 4*(3), 8.

Ji, P., Du Bois, S. N., & Finnessy, P. (2009). An Academic Course That Teaches Heterosexual Students to be Allies to LGBT Communities: A Qualitative Analysis. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 21*(4), 402–429. https://doi.org/10.1080/10538720802690001

Ji, P., & Fujimoto, K. (2013). Measuring heterosexual LGBT ally development: A Rasch Analysis. *Journal of Homosexuality, 60*, 1695–1725. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.834211

Johnstone, M. (2021). Centering Social Justice in Mental Health Practice: Epistemic Justice and Social Work Practice. *Research on Social Work Practice, 31*(6), 634-643.

Jones, K. N., Brewster, M. E., & Jones, J. A. (2014). The creation and validation of the LGBT Ally Identity Measure. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1*(2), 181–195. https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000033

LaMantia, K., Wagner, H., & Bohecker, L. (2015). Ally development through feminist pedagogy: A systemic focus on intersectionality. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling, 9*(2), 136–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/15538605.2015.1029205

Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A Quantitative Approach to Content Validity. *Personnel Psychology, 28*(4), 563–575. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x

Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 144-165. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144

LeMaster, B. (2018). (Un)Becoming Ally: Trans at the Intersections of Difference. *Women & Language*, *41*(1), 155–158.

Lipkus, I. (1991). The construction and preliminary validation of a global belief in a just world scale and the exploratory analysis of the multidimensional belief in a just world scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *12*(11), 1171–1178. https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(91)90081-L

Lister, K. E., Chan, C. D., Marasco, V. M., & Astramovich, R. L. (2020). Counselors Making Sense of Their Experiences as Allies to LGBTQ + Communities. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, *14*(4), 321–340. https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.1080/15538605.2020.1827474

Lynn, M. R. (1986). Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nursing Research*, *35*(6), 382–385. https://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-198611000-00017

Mathers, L. A. B., Sumerau, J. E., & Ueno, K. (2018). "This Isn't Just Another Gay Group": Privileging Heterosexuality in a Mixed-Sexuality LGBTQ Advocacy Group. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *47*(6), 834–864. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241615578905

McEwen, M. (2003). New perspectives on identity development. In S. R. Komives & D. Woodard, Jr. (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 188–217). San Francisco: JosseyBass.

McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and Male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in Women's studies*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

Michael, A., Conger, M. C., Bickerstaff, S., Crawford-Garrett, K., & Fulmer, E. F. (2009). Becoming an Anti-Racist White Ally: How a White Affinity Group Can Help. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, *6*(1), 56–60.

Miller, M. J., Sendrowitz, K., Connacher, C., Blanco, S., Muniz de la Pena, C., Bernadi, S., & Morere, L. (2009). College students' social justice interest and commitment: A social-cognitive perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *56*(4), 495–507. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017220

Mizock, L., & Page, K. V. (2016). Evaluating the Ally Role: Contributions, Limitations, and the Activist Position in Counseling and Psychology. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling & Psychology*, *8*(1), 17–33. https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.33043/jsacp.8.1.17-33

Motulsky, S. L., Gere, S. H., Saleem, R., & Trantham, S. M. (2014). Teaching social justice in counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *42*(8), 1058–1083. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000014553855

Move to End Violence. (2016). *Ally or co-conspirator?: What it means to act #inSolidarity*. Retrieved from: http://www.movetoendviolence.org/blog/ally-co-conspirator-means-act-insolidarity/

Neufeld, K., Starzyk, K., Gaucher, D. (2019). Political Solidarity: A Theory and a Measure. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, *7*(2), 726-765. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v7i2.1058

Nilsson, J. E., Marszalek, J. M., Linnemeyer, R. M., Bahner, A. D., & Misialek, L. H. (2011). Development and assessment of the Social Issues Advocacy Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *71*(1), 258–275. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164410391581

Palmer, G. L., Ferńandez, J. S., Lee, G., Masud, H., Hilson, S., Tang, C., Thomas, D., Clark, L., Guzman, B., & Bernai, I. (2019). Oppression and Power. In *Introduction to Community Psychology.* https://press.rebus.community/introductiontocommunitypsychology/chapter/oppression-and-power/

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes.* (1991-97206-001; pp. 17–59). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-590241-0.50006-X

Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Interpersonal and Intrapsychic Adaptiveness of Trait Self-Enhancement: A Mixed Blessing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *5*, 1197.

Pedersen, P. B. (1991). Multiculturalism as a fourth force in counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *70*, 6-12.

Pieterse, A. L., Evans, S. A., Risner-Butner, A., Collins, N. M., & Mason, L. B. (2009). Multicultural Competence and Social Justice Training in Counseling Psychology and Counselor Education: A Review and Analysis of a Sample of Multicultural Course Syllabi. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *37*(1), 93–115. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000008319986

Pinto, S. A. (2014). ASEXUally: On being an ally to the asexual community. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, *8*(4), 331–343. https://doi.org/10.1080/15538605.2014.960130

Pitner, R. O., & Sakamoto, I. (2005). The role of critical consciousness in multicultural practice: Examining how its strength becomes its limitation. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 75*(4), 684–694.

Ponterotto, J., & Ruckdeschel, D. (2007). An Overview of Coefficient Alpha and a Reliability Matrix for Estimating Adequacy of Internal Consistency Coefficients with Psychological Research Measures. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 3*, 997. https://doi.org/10.2466/PMS.105.3.997-1014

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), 741–763. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741

Prilleltensky Isaac. (2003). Understanding, Resisting, and Overcoming Oppression: Toward Psychopolitical Validity. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 12*, 195.

Rasinski, K. A. (1987). What's fair is fair—or is it? value differences underlying public views about social justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*(1), 201–211.

Ratts, M., D'Andrea, M., & Arredondo, P. (2004). Social justice counseling: "Fifth force" in field. *Counseling Today, 47*, 28-30.

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

Reedus, L. B. (2020). When White Disengagement Masquerades as White Allyship, We All Lose. *Women & Language, 43*(1), 157–160. https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.34036/WL.2020.017

Ritchhart, M. K. (2002). *Development of the Social Activism Beliefs Rating Scale (SABR): An instrument to measure psychologists' attitudes toward social activism* (2002-95024-280; Issues 6-B). ProQuest Information & Learning.

Rodin, M. J., Price, J. M., Bryson, J. B., & Sanchez, F. J. (1990). Asymmetry in prejudice attribution. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *26*(6), 481–504. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(90)90052-N

Rostosky, S. S., & Riggle, E. D. B. (2011). Marriage Equality for Same-Sex Couples: Counseling Psychologists as Social Change Agents. *Counseling Psychologist*, *39*(7), 956–972.

Rubel, D. J., & Ratts, M. J. (2011). Diversity and social justice issues in counseling and psychotherapy. In D. Capuzzi & D. R. Gross (Eds.), *Counseling and psychotherapy., 5th ed.* (2010-18469-002; pp. 29–51). American Counseling Association.

Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L. (1975). Who believes in a just world? *Journal of Social Issues, 31*, 65-90. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1975.tb00997.x

Seguin, C., Pelletier, L. G., & Hunsley, J. (1998). Toward a model of environmental activism. *Environment and Behavior, 5*, 628. https://doi.org/10.1177/001391659803000503

Sensoy, O., & DiAngelo, R. (2017). *Is Everyone Really Equal?* Teacher's College Press.

Singh, A. A., Hofsess, C. D., Boyer, E. M., Kwong, A., Lau, A. S. M., McLain, M., & Haggins, K. L. (2010). Social Justice and Counseling Psychology: Listening to the Voices of Doctoral Trainees. *Counseling Psychologist*, *38*(6), 766–795.

Singh, A.A. (2019). *The Racial Healing Handbook*. New Harbinger Publications.

Smith, L., Chambers, D.-A., & Bratini, L. (2009). When Oppression Is the Pathogen: The Participatory Development of Socially Just Mental Health Practice. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 79*(2), 159–168. https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.1037/a0015353

Sonn Christopher C., & Fisher Adrian T. (2003). Identity and Oppression: Differential Responses to an In-Between Status. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *12*, 117.

Spanierman, L. B., & Smith, L. (2017). Confronting White Hegemony: A Moral Imperative for the Helping Professions. *Counseling Psychologist, 45*(5), 727–736. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000017719550

Sprecher, S., & Fehr, B. (2005). Compassionate love for close others and humanity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *22*(5), 629–651. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407505056439

Stathi, S., Cameron, L., Hartley, B., & Bradford, S. (2014). Imagined contact as a prejudice-reduction intervention in schools: The underlying role of similarity and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *44*(8), 536–546. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12245

Stangor, C., Swim, J. K., Sechrist, G. B., DeCoster, J., Allen, K. L. V., & Ottenbreit, A. (2003). Ask, Answer and Announce: Three stages in perceiving and responding to discrimination. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (pp. 277–311). Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis (UK).

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Styer, M. I., Anderson, L. B., & Nichols, A. L. (2018). Ally, Advocate, Activist: Semester-Long Civic Engagement in the Basic Communication Course. *Communication Teacher*, *32*(4), 231–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/17404622.2017.1372604

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2008). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Wiley

Sue, D. W. (2017). The Challenges of Becoming a White Ally. *Counseling Psychologist*, *45*(5), 706–716. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000017719323

Suyemoto, K. L., Hochman, A. L., Donovan, R. A., & Roemer, L. (2020). Becoming and Fostering Allies and Accomplices through Authentic Relationships: Choosing Justice over Comfort. *Research in Human Development*, *18*(1-2), 1-28. **Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**

Suyemoto, K. L., & Hochman, A. L. (2021). "Taking the Empathy to an Activist State": Ally Development as Continuous Cycles of Critical Understanding and Action. *Research in Human Development*, *18*(1-2), 105-148. https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.1080/15427609.2021.1928453

Suyemoto, K.L., & Tree, C.A.F. (2006). Building Bridges Across Differences to Meet Social Action Goals: Being and Creating Allies Among People of Color. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *34*, 237.

Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., & Ferguson, M. J. (2001). Everyday Sexism: Evidence for Its Incidence, Nature, and Psychological Impact From Three Daily Diary Studies. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(1), 31–53. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00200

Talleyrand, R. M., Chung, R. C.-Y., & Bemak, F. (2006). *Incorporating social justice in counselor training programs: A case study example*. In R. L. Toporek, L. H. Gerstein, N. A. Fouad, G. Roysircar, & T. Israel (Eds.), *Handbook for social justice in counseling psychology: Leadership, vision, and action*. (2010-23820-004; pp. 44–58). Sage Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412976220.n4

Toomey, R., McGeorge, C., & Carlson, T. (2016). A Mixed-Methods Pilot Study of Student Athlete Engagement in LGBTQ Ally Actions. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport, 9*, 247-267.

Toporek, R. L., & Chope, R. C. (2006). Individual, programmatic, and entrepreneurial approaches to social justice: Counseling psychologists in vocational and career counseling. In R. L. Toporek, L. H. Gerstein, N. A. Fouad, G. Roysircar, & T. Israel (Eds.), *Handbook for social justice in counseling psychology: Leadership, vision, and action.* (2010-23820-020; pp. 276–293). Sage Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412976220.n20

Torres-Harding, S. R., Siers, B., & Olson, B. D. (2012). Development and psychometric evaluation of the Social Justice Scale (SJS). *American Journal of Community Psychology, 50*, 77-88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-011-9478-2

Washington, J., & Evans, N. J. (1991). Becoming an ally. In N. J. Evans & V. A. Wall (Eds.) *Beyond tolerance: Gays, lesbians, and bisexuals on campus* (pp. 195-204). Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association.

Wellman, M. L. (2022). Black Squares for Black Lives? Performative Allyship as Credibility Maintenance for Social Media Influencers on Instagram. Social Media + Society, 8(1). https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.1177/20563051221080473

Wiley, S., & Dunne, C. (2019). Comrades in the Struggle? Feminist Women Prefer Male Allies Who Offer Autonomy- not Dependency-Oriented Help. *Sex Roles*, *80*(11–12), 656–666. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-018-0970-0

Wiley, S., Srinivasan, R., Finke, E., Firnhaber, J., & Shilinsky, A. (2013). Positive portrayals of feminist men increase men's solidarity with feminists and collective action intentions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37*, 61-71.

Williams, B., Onsman, A., & Brown, T. (2010). Exploratory factor analysis: A five-step guide for novices. *Journal of Emergency Primary Health Care*, *8*(3), 1.

Wilson, F. R., Pan, W., & Schumsky, D. A. (2012). Recalculation of the Critical Values for Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development*, *45*(3), 197–210. https://doi.org/10.1177/0748175612440286

Worthen, M. G. F. (2011). College Student Experiences with an LGBTQ Ally Training Program: A Mixed Methods Study at a University in the Southern United States. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *8*(4), 332–377. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2011.608024

Worthington, R. L., Dillon, F. R., & Becker-Schutte, A. M. (2005). Development, reliability, and validity of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale for heterosexuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 104–118.

Yee, J. (2009). Allyship and Youth. *Our Schools / Our Selves*, *18*(2), 101–106.

Appendix A

Focus Group Advertisement

Appendix B

Focus Group Protocol – General Groups

Zoom Meeting ID #:

Access Code #:

Date and Time of Appointment:

Introduction: Thank you for your willingness to participate in this focus group today. My name is Erika Hanley (Alexis Jones), and I am a doctoral candidate (student) in the College of Education and the Primary Investigator (Research Personnel) for this study.

Consent to Record: I would like to remind you that this focus group will be recorded. However, before we begin, I would like for you all to ensure that your display name on Zoom is the pseudonym that you provided during the screening and demographics survey.

If you don't have any additional questions, do I have your permission to begin recording this interview?

Project Aim: Before we get started, I thought it would make sense to tell you a little about why we're engaging in this research.

We are interested in the experiences and development of social justice allyship identity. The goal of this project is to learn about and understand your perceptions and experiences of allyship. We intend to use the information gathered in this discussion to understand and quantify the development of allyship identity.

Ground Rules: There are several questions I will be asking today. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. We expect that many of you will have differing points of view. Please feel free to share your point of view even when it differs from what others have said. I do ask, however, that you respect the perspectives of others while explaining how your perspective differs. I am here to ask questions, to listen, and to make sure everyone has a chance to share. You do not necessarily need to answer every question, but I do want to hear from everyone at some point today. So, if you are talking a lot, I may ask that you allow others the chance to respond. If you are not saying very much, I may ask for your thoughts. Please know that you are only asked to share to the extent that you feel comfortable doing so for any given question. In addition, we ask that you all keep the information shared by others private. That is, please do not talk to others outside of this group about what any other participant shares today. You are certainly able, however, to talk others about your own reflections as a result of this focus group session.

Questioning Route

Let us begin.

General Questions of Perception

1. How would you react if someone told you that something you did hurt them or made them uncomfortable?
    a. How would you react if something someone did hurt you or made you uncomfortable?
2. Is the world fair or just to you? Why or why not?
    a. Is the world fair or just to others? Why or why not?
3. How often do you think about your experiences and your place in the world?
    a. How often do you think about other people's experiences and their place in the world?
4. Have you ever felt guilt, shame, embarrassment, or any other emotions/reactions when learning about United States history?
    a. If not, what keeps you from feeling guilt, shame, or embarrassment? What reactions do you have?
    b. If so, what might cause you to feel guilt, shame, or embarrassment?
5. What do you think of when you hear the word "privilege?"
    a. What types of experiences have you had that impact whether you perceive the word "privilege" as positive, negative, or neutral?
6. Recently, within the last 10 months, there was a protest on Auburn's campus. Can you tell me how you reacted to said protest? Why?

Questions Specific to Allyship

7. Have you heard the term ally, accomplice, or advocate?
    a. How would you define it?
    b. What perceptions do you have when you think about those terms?
    c. Do you perceive someone who describes themselves as an ally or accomplice as helpful to others? How so?
    d. How useful or effective do you believe ally or advocate behavior to be? Why?
8. What do you think motivates someone to describe themselves as an "ally"?
9. Overall, how much do you perceive yourself as an ally or advocate? Why?
10. What else do you think is important for us to know about your perception of allyship that we have not already discussed?

Debriefing: Some of the conversations we had today might have brought up some difficult emotions or memories. If you are experiencing such concerns, I encourage you to seek counseling or mental health services. Our debriefing sheet has more information on the counseling services and other resources local to the area.

Please be sure to remember that you should not talk to other people outside of this group about what your fellow participants disclosed today. But again, you are welcome to share with others your own reflections as a result of participating in this focus group.

Departure/Closing Remarks: I want to again thank you for your time in participating in our study. I will be available after this session to answer any remaining questions you might have.

Appendix C

Focus Group Protocol –Ally Groups

Zoom Meeting ID #:

Access Code #:

Date and Time of Appointment:

Introduction: Thank you for your willingness to participate in this focus group today. My name is Erika Hanley (Alexis Jones), and I am a doctoral candidate (student) in the College of Education and the Primary Investigator (Research Personnel) for this study.

Consent to Record: I would like to remind you that this focus group will be recorded. However, before we begin, I would like for you all to ensure that your display name on Zoom is the pseudonym that you provided during the screening and demographics survey.

If you don't have any additional questions, do I have your permission to begin recording this interview?

Project Aim: Before we get started, I thought it would make sense to tell you a little about why we're engaging in this research.

We are interested in the experiences and development of social justice allyship identity. The goal of this project is to learn about and understand your perceptions and experiences of allyship. We intend to use the information gathered in this discussion to understand and quantify the development of allyship identity.

Ground Rules: There are several questions I will be asking today. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. We expect that many of you will have differing points of view. Please feel free to share your point of view even when it differs from what others have said. I do ask, however, that you respect the perspectives of others while explaining how your perspective differs. I am here to ask questions, to listen, and to make sure everyone has a chance to share. You do not necessarily need to answer every question, but I do want to hear from everyone at some point today. So, if you are talking a lot, I may ask that you allow others the chance to respond. If you are not saying very much, I may ask for your thoughts. Please know that you are only asked to share to the extent that you feel comfortable doing so for any given question. In addition, we ask that you all keep the information shared by others private. That is, please do not talk to others outside of this group about what any other participant shares today. You are certainly able, however, to talk others about your own reflections as a result of this focus group session.

Questioning Route

Let us begin.

General Questions of Perception

1. How would you react if someone told you that something you did hurt them or made them uncomfortable?
    a. How would you react if something someone did hurt you or made you uncomfortable?
2. How often do you think about your experiences and your place in the world?
    a. How often do you think about other people's experiences and their place in the world?
3. Have you ever felt guilt, shame, or embarrassment or any other emotions/reactions when learning about United States history?
    a. If not, what keeps you from feeling guilt, shame, or embarrassment? What reactions do you have?
    b. If so, what might cause you to feel guilt, shame, or embarrassment?
4. Recently, within the last 10 months, there was a protest on Auburn's campus. Can you tell me how you reacted to said protest? Why?

Questions Specific to Allyship

5. How would you define a social justice ally, accomplice, or advocate?
6. What do you think motivates someone to describe themselves as an "ally"?
7. Overall, how much do you perceive yourself as an ally or advocate?
8. Tell me about your experiences as an ally.
    a. What things influenced these experiences?
    b. How would you describe your development as an ally?
    c. Tell me about your relationship with those you engage as an ally for.
    d. Tell me about your relationship with other allies.
9. What are some attitudes, beliefs, motivations, or actions that a person may or may not engage in when they are NOT a social justice ally?
10. What else do you think is important for us to know about your perception of allyship that we have not already discussed?

Debriefing: Some of the conversations we had today might have brought up some difficult emotions or memories. If you are experiencing such concerns, I encourage you to seek counseling or mental health services. Our debriefing sheet has more information on the counseling services and other resources local to the area.

Please be sure to remember that you should not talk to other people outside of this group about what your fellow participants disclosed today. But again, you are welcome to share with others your own reflections as a result of participating in this focus group.

Departure/Closing Remarks: I want to again thank you for your time in participating in our study. I will be available after this session to answer any remaining questions you might have.

Appendix D

Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012; SJS)

Using the scale below, indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statements.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Disagree Strongly Neutral Agree Strongly

1. I believe that it is important to make sure that all individuals and groups have a chance to speak and be heard, especially those from traditionally ignored or marginalized groups.
2. I believe that it is important to allow individuals and groups to define and describe their problems, experiences, and goals in their own terms.
3. I believe that it is important to talk to others about societal systems of power, privilege, and oppression.
4. I believe that it is important to try to change larger social conditions that cause individual suffering and impede well-being.
5. I believe that it is important to help individuals and groups to pursue their chosen goals in life.
6. I believe that it is important to promote the physical and emotional well-being of individuals and groups.
7. I believe that it is important to respect and appreciate people's diverse social identities.
8. I believe that it is important to allow others to have meaningful input into decisions affecting their lives.
9. I believe that it is important support community organizations and institutions that help individuals and group achieve their aims.
10. I believe that it is important to promote fair and equitable allocation of bargaining powers, obligations, and resources in our society.
11. I believe that it is important to act for social justice.
12. I am confident that I can have a positive impact on others' lives.
13. I am certain that I possess an ability to work with individuals and groups in ways that are empowering.
14. If I choose to do so, I am capable of influencing others promote fairness and equality.
15. I feel confident in my ability to talk to others about social injustices and the impact of social conditions on health and well-being.
16. I am certain that if I try, I can have a positive impact on my community.
17. Other people around me are engaged in activities that address social injustices.
18. Other people around me feel that it is important to engage in dialogue around social injustices.
19. Other people around me are supportive of efforts that promote social justice.

20. Other people around me are aware of issues of social injustices and power inequalities in our society.
21. In the future, I will do my best to ensure that all individuals and groups have a chance to speak and be heard.
22. In the future, I intend to talk with others about social power inequalities, social injustices, and the impact of social forces on health and well-being.
23. In the future, I intend to engage in activities that will promote social justice.
24. In the future, I intend to work collaboratively with others so that they can define their own problems and build their own capacity to solve problems.

Appendix E

Activism Orientation Scale (Corning & Myers, 2002; AOS)

How likely is it that you will engage in this activity in the future?

0	1	2	3
Extremely Unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Extremely Likely

1. Display a poster or bumper sticker with a political message?
2. Invite a friend to attend a meeting of a political organization or event?
3. Purchase a poster, t-shirt, etc. that endorses a political point of view?
4. Serve as an officer in a political organization?
5. Engage in a political activity in which you knew you would be arrested?
6. Attend an informational meeting of a political group?
7. Organize a political event (e.g., talk, support group, march)?
8. Give a lecture or talk about a social or political issue?
9. Go out of your way to collect information on a social or political issue?
10. Campaign door-to-door for a political candidate?
11. Present facts to contest another person's social or political statement?
12. Donate money to a political candidate?
13. Vote in a non-presidential federal, state, or local election?
14. Engage in a physical confrontation at a political rally?
15. Send a letter or e-mail expressing a political opinion to the editor of a periodical or television show?
16. Engage in a political activity in which you feared that some of your possessions would be damaged?
17. Engage in an illegal act as part of a political protest?
18. Confront jokes, statements, or innuendos that opposed a particular group's cause?
19. Boycott a product for political reasons?
20. Distribute information representing a particular social or political group's cause?
21. Engage in a political activity in which you suspect there would be a confrontation with the police or possible arrest?
22. Send a letter or e-mail about a political issue to a public official?
23. Attend a talk on a particular group's social or political concerns?
24. Attend a political organization's regular planning meeting?
25. Sign a petition for a political cause?
26. Encourage a friend to join a political organization?
27. Try to change a friend's or acquaintance's mind about a social or political issue?
28. Block access to a building or public area with your body?

29. Donate money to a political organization?
30. Try to change a relative's mind about a social or political issue?
31. Wear a t-shirt or button with a political message?
32. Keep track of the views of members of Congress regarding an issue important to you?
33. Participate in discussion groups designed to discuss issues or solutions of a particular social or political group?
34. Campaign by phone for a political candidate?
35. Engage in a political activity in which you feared for your personal safety?

Appendix F

Political Solidarity Measure (Neufeld, Starzyk, & Gaucher 2019; PSM)

You will answer a series of questions about your feelings toward another group and a current issue related to the group, that is, their "cause." It is ok if you do not agree with the group or the cause.

The group you will reflect on is X.

The cause you will reflect on is Y.

Using the scale below, please answer the following questions. Remember to answer the questions while thinking about X and their cause, Y.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree

1. I feel a sense of "brotherhood" or "sisterhood" with X.
2. I feel a sense of solidarity with X.
3. I stand united with X.
4. In some ways, I view the issue of Y for X as my cause, too.
5. I have a role to play in the issue of Y for X.
6. I feel connected to the issue of Y for X.
7. Policies negatively affecting X should be changed.
8. More people should know about how X are negatively affected by this issue.
9. It's important to challenge the power structures that disadvantage X.

Appendix G

The Compassionate Love Scale (Sprecher & Fehr, 2005; CLS)

Compassionate love toward humanity is defined as an attitude toward humanity that involves behavior, feeling, and thinking that focuses on concern, caring, and support for humanity, as well as a motivation to understand and help humanity (strangers) when they are most in need.

Thinking of all of humanity or humankind, indicate the degree to which the following statements are true or untrue for you.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not At All True of Me Neither True or Untrue of Me Very True of Me

1. When I see people, I do not know feeling sad, I feel a need to reach out to them.
2. I spend a lot of time concerned about the well-being of humankind.
3. When I hear about someone (a stranger) going through a difficult time, I feel a great deal of compassion for them.
4. It is easy for me to feel the pain (and joy) experienced by others, even though I do not know them.
5. If I encounter a stranger who needs help, I would do almost anything I could to help them.
6. I feel considerable compassionate love for people from everywhere.
7. I would rather suffer myself than see someone else (a stranger) suffer.
8. If given the opportunity, I am willing to sacrifice in order to let people from other places who are less fortunate achieve their goals.
9. I tend to feel compassion for people, even though I do not know them.
10. One of the activities that provides me with the most meaning in my life is helping others in the world when they need help.
11. I would rather engage in actions that help others, even though they are strangers, than engage in actions that would help me.
12. I often have tender feelings toward people (strangers) when they seem to be in need.
13. I feel a selfless caring for most of humankind.
14. I accept others whom I do not know even when they do things, I think are wrong.
15. If a person (a stranger) is troubled, I usually feel extreme tenderness and caring.
16. I try to understand rather than judge people who are strangers to me.
17. I try to put myself in a stranger’s shoes when they are in trouble.
18. I feel happy when I see that others (strangers) are happy.
19. Those whom I encounter through my work and public life can assume that I will be there if they need me.

20. I want to spend time with people I don’t know well so that I can find ways to help enrich their lives.
21. I very much wish to be kind and good to fellow human beings.

Appendix H

Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto et al., 1994)

Which of the following objects or statements do you have a positive or negative feeling towards? Beside each object or statement, place a number from' 1' to '7' which represents the degree of your positive or negative feeling.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Very Negative Neither Positive nor Negative Very Positive

1. Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others.
2. Some people are just more worthy than others.
3. This country would be better off if we cared less about how equal all people were.
4. Some people are just more deserving than others.
5. It is not a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others.
6. Some people are just inferior to others.
7. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on others.
8. Increased economic equality.
9. Increased social equality.
10. Equality.
11. If people were treated more equally, we would have fewer problems in this country.
12. In an ideal world, all nations would be equal.
13. We should try to treat one another as equals as much as possible.
14. It is important that we treat other countries as equals.

Appendix I

Global Belief in a Just World (Lipkus, 1991; GBJWS)

Using the scale below, indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statements.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree Neither Disagree nor Agree Strongly Agree

1. I feel that most people get what they are entitled to have.
2. I feel that a person's efforts are noticed and rewarded.
3. I feel that people earn the rewards and punishments they get.
4. I feel that people who meet with misfortune have brought it on themselves.
5. I feel that people get what they deserve.
6. I feel that rewards and punishments are fairly given.
7. I basically feel that the world is fair place.

Appendix J

Impression Management Subscale (Paulhus, 1991; IM)

Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how true it is.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not True			Somewhat True			Very True

1. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.
2. I never cover up my mistakes.
3. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
4. I never swear.
5. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
6. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
7. I have said something bad about a friend behind his/her back.
8. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
9. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
10. I always declare everything at customs.
11. When I was young, I sometimes stole things.
12. I have never dropped litter on the street.
13. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
14. I never read sexy books or magazines.
15. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
16. I never take things that don't belong to me.
17. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
18. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
19. I have some pretty awful habits.
20. I don't gossip about other people's business.

Appendix K

Information Letter for Study 1a

INFORMATION LETTER

for a Research Study entitled "Perceptions and Experiences of Allyship"

You are invited to participate in a research study to explore the understanding and development of allyship identity. This study is being conducted by Erika Hanley under the direction of Dr. Evelyn Hunter in the Auburn University Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling. You were selected as a possible participant because you are over the age of 18 and are a current undergraduate, graduate, or professional student who is attending Auburn University.

What will be involved if you participate? If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete a 10–15-minute screening and demographic survey, which includes an informed consent document. Once completed, you will participate in one research focus group via Zoom as provided by Auburn University. At the appointment, you will participate in a discussion aimed at exploring allyship identity and development. You will only be asked to discuss your experiences to the extent that you feel comfortable. You can talk about either personal experience related to allyship or perceptions and experiences of allyship in general. The discussion groups will be videotaped so that the researchers can later identify the themes discussed and code responses. Your participation is completely voluntary, and participation is expected to take 1 hour and 30 minutes.

Are there any risks or discomforts? It is possible for the focus group to cause uncomfortable emotions or reactions because of the potential sensitive nature of the issues being discussed. To minimize these risks, you are not required to answer any question that you do not wish to answer or that makes you feel too uncomfortable. You are also free to choose to end your participation at any time. There will be no penalty to you if you choose not to answer a question or discontinue your participation in the study. In addition, if needed or requested, we can provide referrals to mental health professionals in your local area.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? If you decide to participate in this study, there will be no guaranteed direct benefit to you. However, some participants may find it interesting or helpful to reflect on the concept of or their experiences with allyship. Your participation in this project may help the researchers develop a better understanding of factors that contribute to the development of allyship identity.

Will you receive compensation for participating? You will receive compensation of extra credit and/or $10 for participating in a focus group appointment.

Are there any costs? There are no direct costs associated with your participation. However, if you choose to seek counseling for any concerns raised during your participation, the counseling would be at your own expense.

If you change your mind about participating, you can withdraw at any time during the study. Your participation is completely voluntary. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. If you know a person who is also at your focus group appointment and you feel uncomfortable participating in the focus group with that person, please inform the researchers. We will work with you to get you scheduled for an alternate focus group session, if any remain and they work with your schedule. If you decide to not participate in the study or if you end your participation early, it will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University; the Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling; the College of Education; Erika Hanley, or Evelyn Hunter, Ph.D.

Your privacy will be protected. Any information obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential. Pseudonyms will be used in place of participant identifying information. We suggest modifying your display name in Zoom prior to joining the session with your pseudonym to assist in protecting your identity. The focus groups will be recorded using the video recorder function on Zoom. Immediately following the interview, the digital files will be uploaded to a secure password protected and encrypted drive and then the files on the recording devices will be erased. The focus group sessions will be transcribed with only the use of the pseudonyms. Thus, no identifying information will be included in the transcripts of the focus group sessions. The digital recordings will be erased following verification of the transcription.

The researchers are trained to keep confidential any information revealed by participants in this study, but there are limits to this confidentiality. If during the interview a participant discloses to the researcher about either abuse/neglect of a minor or dependent adult or the imminent harm to self or others, the researcher may be mandated or permitted to break confidentiality and inform the appropriate authorities (e.g., Department of Human Services, local police). In addition, the researchers cannot guarantee that other participants will keep information you share in the focus group private. However, all participants, including yourself, will be asked to keep information disclosed by other participants in the focus group private by not sharing that information with anyone outside the focus group. Additionally, due to the focus group occurring on Zoom, we ask that participants protect their privacy and the privacy of others by completing the session in a private space, to ensure conversations are not overheard; disable “cookies” and close the device browser; and use Zoom provided by Auburn University due to the safety features built within, as other platforms may have limitations.

Information obtained through your participation may be used a part of a dissertation study, presented in a professional meeting and/or used in an academic publication. In general, responses from your participation will be combined with those from all other participants in this study. Because of the qualitative nature of this study, however, representative quotes from the focus group may be included in a paper or presentation. The researchers will take care to omit any information from quotes that could be personally identifying.

If you have questions about this study, please contact the Primary Investigator, Erika Hanley, at ezh0029@auburn.edu or the faculty research advisor, Evelyn Hunter, at eac0006@auburn.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334)-844-5966 or e-mail at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from February 25, 2021, to ----------, Protocol #20-489 EP 2011, Hanley.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES YOUR WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE.

DO YOU CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE?

YES. Please type your name in the textbox to verify your consent.

_____

NO

Appendix L

Focus Group Debriefing Form

Thank you for participating in our research study. We are interested in exploring and understanding the development of allyship identity. We hope the data you provided will assist in the creation of a measure that will assess the development of allyship identity across a continuum. The intention of the measure is to create a comprehensive tool to understand the development of allyship identity to assist in evaluating the effectiveness of social justice-associated courses and programming.

If discussing these experiences have brought up difficult emotions or memories, I encourage you to seek out support services. Below we have compiled a few referrals that you can utilize.

Office/Organization	**Services**	**Phone Number**	**Alternate Contact**
Student Counseling and Psychological Services	Individual and group therapy (free for students)	(334) 844-5123	http://wp.auburn.edu/scs/
Auburn Psychology Group	Individual, couples, and family therapy	(334) 887-4343	http://www.auburnpsychology.com/
Clinical Psychologists, P.C.	Individual and family therapy	(334) 821-3350	http://www.clinicalpsychauburn.com/
Cross-Cultural Center for Excellence	Cultural programming, advocacy, and support for diverse students	(334)844-2946	diversity@auburn.edu

Appendix M

Advertisement for Survey

Appendix N

Information Letters for Study 1b

INFORMATION LETTER

PROLIFIC

for a Research Study entitled "Understanding Self and Others"

You are invited to participate in a research study about your beliefs about the world, understanding of yourself, and perceptions of others. This study is being conducted by Erika Hanley under the direction of Dr. Evelyn Hunter in the Auburn University Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling. You were selected as a possible participant because you are over the age of 18.

What will be involved if you participate? If you chose to participate in this study, you will be asked to respond to questions about your personal demographics, beliefs about the world, and perspectives about your life and society. The questionnaire will take approximately 30 to 40 minutes to complete. Your survey responses will be confidential and information from this research will be reported only in the total.

Are there any risks or discomforts? Upon completion of the survey, you should close your web browser. You may decide to discontinue participation at any point by simply closing your web browser. There is no risk to participating in this study. If you do feel discomfort, please remember that you can stop at any time.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? If you decide to participate in this study, there will be no guaranteed direct benefit to you. Information gathered during the study may benefit individuals interested in learning more about how people understand themselves and others.

Will you receive compensation for participating? To thank you for your time, you will receive compensation through the Prolific system at an hourly rate of $7.50. As a reminder, upon completion of the survey, you are required to submit your completion code via Prolific in order to be eligible for compensation. This study will contain a number of attention checks. If you fail more than one attention check, your survey data may be rejected which may result in asking you to repeat your submission, partial payment, or no payment as dictated by Prolific's participant guidelines.

Are there any costs? There are no costs to you for participating in this study.

If you change your mind about participating, you can withdraw at any time during the study. Your participation is completely voluntary. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University; the Department of Special

Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling; the College of Education; Erika Hanley, or Evelyn Hunter, Ph.D.

Your privacy will be protected. Any information obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous and private. We suggest that you take precautions to protect your privacy by completing the survey in a private space, disabling "cookies," and closing your device's browser upon completion of the survey.

Information obtained through your participation may be used a part of a dissertation study, presented in a professional meeting and/or used in an academic publication. In general, responses from your participation will be combined with those from all other participants in this study.

If you have questions about this study, please contact the Primary Investigator, Erika Hanley, at ezh0029@auburn.edu or the faculty research advisor, Evelyn Hunter, at eac0006@auburn.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334)-844-5966 or e-mail at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from XXX to XXX.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, THE DATA YOU PROVIDE WILL SERVE AS YOUR AGREEMENT TO DO SO.

ARE YOU OLDER THAN 18 YEARS OF AGE?

YES

NO

DO YOU CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE?

YES

NO

INFORMATION LETTER

SOCIAL MEDIA

You are invited to participate in a research study about your beliefs about the world, understanding of yourself, and perceptions of others. This study is being conducted by Erika Hanley under the direction of Dr. Evelyn Hunter in the Auburn University Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling. You were selected as a possible participant because you are over the age of 18.

What will be involved if you participate? If you chose to participate in this study, you will be asked to respond to questions about your personal demographics, beliefs about the world, and perspectives about your life and society. The questionnaire will take approximately 30 to 40 minutes to complete. Your survey responses will be confidential and information from this research will be reported only in the total.

Are there any risks or discomforts? Upon completion of the survey, you should close your web browser. You may decide to discontinue participation at any point by simply closing your web browser. There is no risk to participating in this study. If you do feel discomfort, please remember that you can stop at any time.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? If you decide to participate in this study, there will be no guaranteed direct benefit to you. Information gathered during the study may benefit individuals interested in learning more about how people understand themselves and others.

Will you receive compensation for participating? To thank you for your time, you can choose to be in a drawing for one of 3 $20 Visa gift card by opening the link provided at the end of the study to a separate survey and entering your email address.

Are there any costs? There are no costs to you for participating in this study.

If you change your mind about participating, you can withdraw at any time during the study. Your participation is completely voluntary. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University; the Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling; the College of Education; Erika Hanley, or Evelyn Hunter, Ph.D.

Your privacy will be protected. Any information obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous and private. We suggest that you take precautions to protect your privacy by completing the survey in a private space, disabling “cookies,” and closing your device’s browser upon completion of the survey.

Information obtained through your participation may be used a part of a dissertation study, presented in a professional meeting and/or used in an academic publication. In general, responses from your participation will be combined with those from all other participants in this study.

If you have questions about this study, please contact the Primary Investigator, Erika Hanley, at ezh0029@auburn.edu or the faculty research advisor, Evelyn Hunter, at eac0006@auburn.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334)-844-5966 or e-mail at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from XXX to XXX.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, THE DATA YOU PROVIDE WILL SERVE AS YOUR AGREEMENT TO DO SO.

ARE YOU OLDER THAN 18 YEARS OF AGE?

YES

NO

DO YOU CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE?

YES

NO

Appendix O

Measure of Allyship Identity Item Pool

1. I think it is important to reflect on the areas of my life that I have influence and determine what kind of impact I can have on others.
2. I am motivated to help others by my personal beliefs that all people deserve equal opportunity and treatment.
3. I believe that the world is fair, just, and everyone has the same opportunities in life.
4. All people should be treated equally because it is the right thing to do.
5. I support and advocate on behalf of others when they also provide me with support and advocate on my behalf.
6. I think it is important for people to collectively work together to support and advocate for others or causes.
7. It is difficult for me to acknowledge the times when I have hurt others.
8. I believe that privilege is synonymous with "blessings" such that those who "have privilege" have been blessed or supported by a higher power.
9. Everyone has problems that occur in their life, but they can overcome those problems if they have a positive outlook.
10. It is important to me to support and advocate on behalf of my loved ones.
11. I think it is important to learn about history so that it does not repeat itself in the present or future.
12. I believe it is important to respect the diverse experiences and identities of others.
13. It is important to me to support and advocate for causes that I value.
14. I believe that all people have a right to protest or demonstrate for what they believe in.
15. I believe it is important to identify myself as someone who is an advocate, helpful and supportive.
16. Privilege, oppression, and power are not things I think about or apply to my life.
17. It is important to me to support and advocate on behalf of people who share similarities with me.
18. I believe that all people experience fairness and unfairness equally, as it is a natural part of life.
19. I advocate for others by changing my behavior to better support them.
20. I like to be recognized for the support and advocacy I do on behalf of others.
21. I support and advocate for others by speaking up when they are being harassed or hurt.
22. While some actions that occurred in history may have been sad or embarrassing, it is important not to dwell on them because things have improved and are better now.
23. I often engage in activities that promote social justice and equality for all.
24. I believe that if people are positive and work hard, they can overcome obstacles and barriers.

25. I try to gather information to understand what caused the harm when I learn that I have hurt someone.
26. I do not have discussions about privilege, oppression, and power because I believe it causes conflict and division between people.
27. I often compare myself to others.
28. I support and advocate on behalf of others when they are physically present with me.
29. In order to be a good person, one must help and support others.
30. It is important for me to share my perspectives and engage in discussion on topics like race, religion, and politics.
31. It is important to me to support and advocate on behalf of all people.
32. I believe that privilege means that someone has overall advantages that others do not have because of historical, political, and/or social factors.
33. I support and advocate for others by physically intervening when they are being harassed or hurt.
34. I believe that the world is not fair or just and everyone does not have the same opportunities in life.
35. When I learn that I have hurt someone, I work on ways to change my behavior to avoid causing harm in the future.
36. I often share resources on social media about topics like race, religion, and politics.
37. I believe it is important that others identify me as an advocate, helpful and supportive.
38. There are structural social, economic, and political barriers that contribute to problems in life but if an individual works hard they can overcome those barriers.
39. Supporting and advocating for others is an important value in my personal spiritual and/or religious practice.
40. I support and advocate on behalf of others when I learn that something has happened that could negatively impact them.
41. I believe that protesting or demonstrations are most effective when they are non-violent and peaceful.
42. I believe it is important to educate myself about societal structures of privilege, oppression, and power.
43. It is important to me to support and advocate on behalf of people who share similarities with my loved ones.
44. I believe it is important to think about the ways privilege, oppression, and power impact my life.
45. I believe that protesting or demonstrations are ineffective and unnecessary for change.
46. I am motivated to help others by the desire to facilitate change.
47. I think it is important to learn about history, but we are not responsible for any events that occurred in the past because those of us in the present were not there.
48. I believe that privilege means that someone has access to financial resources.

49. There are structural social, economic, and political barriers that contribute to problems in life and in order to solve those problems, the structures need to change.
50. I often think of privilege, oppression, and power when making decisions in my life.
51. I often try to learn and educate myself more about topics like race, religion, and politics.
52. I often engage in self-reflection and think about my place in the world.
53. I believe that the work done to help others is more important than being identified as an advocate or not.
54. I often do not discuss topics like race, religion, or politics because it is uncomfortable.
55. Liberation for all people is necessary for justice and equality.
56. I support and advocate on behalf of others when they are not physically present with me.
57. I believe that there are structural social, economic, and political barriers that prevent everyone from having the same opportunities.
58. I think it is important to learn about history and how events that occurred in the past impact people in the present.
59. I apologize for whatever caused the harm when I learn that I have hurt someone.
60. I believe it is important that those around me discuss societal structure of privilege, oppression, and power and engage in activities that promote social justice and equality for all.
61. I believe that protesting or demonstrations are effective and necessary for change.
62. It is important to me to support and advocate on behalf of historically overlooked or marginalized people.
63. I do not believe that privilege, oppression, and power are relevant when trying to understand life experiences.
64. I am willing to risk myself financially (e.g., suggesting another individual for a paid position or opportunity who is more qualified than myself) to support or advocate for others.
65. I often reflect on the experiences of others and their place in the world.
66. I believe it is important to think about the ways privilege, oppression, and power impact the lives of others.
67. I support and advocate on behalf of others regardless of whether they provide me with support in return.
68. I am willing to risk myself socially (e.g., losing friends or becoming estranged with family members) to support or advocate for others.
69. I believe it is important to discuss societal structures of privilege, oppression, and power with others.
70. I support and advocate for others by donating directly to them or to organizations that support their causes.