INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

**MOTIVATIONS FOR CROSSING INTERGROUP BOUNDARIES
IN SOCIAL ACTIVIST ALLIANCES**

by

CATHERINE BORSHUK

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Psychology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
July 2000
copyright
Catherine Borshuk

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-57603-5

Canada

The undersigned recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis

**MOTIVATIONS FOR CROSSING INTERGROUP BOUNDARIES
IN SOCIAL ACTIVIST ALLIANCES**

Submitted by Catherine Borshuk, M. A.

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Chair, Department of Psychology

Thesis Supervisor

External Examiner

CARLETON UNIVERSITY
July 2000

ABSTRACT

Two studies investigated “outgroup activism,” which is collective action intended solely to benefit a social outgroup. The first study empirically evaluated the role of prosocial, personal history, and attitudinal variables in outgroup activism, and was tested with 103 undergraduate students. It was expected that prior social activists with higher measured amounts of altruism and empathy, social marginality, and education about issues, who were politically aware, and endorsed a transcendent ingroup orientation would be more likely to form outgroup alliances and exhibit outgroup solidarity than others. Findings indicated that the best predictors of a willingness to form outgroup alliances were higher measured levels of political awareness and universalist values, as well as a history of past activist behaviours. Also, women participants enrolled in social critique-type university courses were found to be more willing than other women, and more willing than men enrolled in all types of university courses, to engage in outgroup activism.

A second study was conducted to explore the motivations for political intervention with outgroups using interview methodology with eight community members who are outgroup activists in diverse organizations. Research questions were related to activists’ histories with social movements, self-ascribed motivations for social activism, the social context (e.g., personal relationships) in which activism was practiced, intergroup consciousness regarding the outgroup, and the costs and benefits of outgroup activism.

Key findings relate to the self-construal of activists, political ideology and moral responsibility as important motivations, a downplaying of intergroup boundaries between the activists and outgroup ‘others,’ and an awareness of the costs and benefits of social movement participation.

The findings from both studies suggest that while a number of factors, including personal experiences and political attitudes, are important to outgroup activism, a sense of universalism, or the development of an intergroup consciousness may be implicated in decisions to intervene politically in the lives of others. It is suggested that future research takes seriously the concept of intergroup consciousness in order to overcome the limitations associated with identity politics movements.

Acknowledgements

This thesis is the product of the labour and inspiration of a number of people who deserve to share in the accomplishment. First, the social activists whose voices are represented here have my gratitude as well as my admiration. Their willingness to share the meanings that imbue their activism has afforded me a keener understanding of the nature of political commitment. I wish them well, and affirm that they are, to the benefit of us all, indeed changing the world.

My deepest debt of gratitude is owed to Dr. Fran Cherry, my academic advisor and friend for many years. Through Fran, I have learned about the responsibilities, opportunities and challenges in the life of an activist-scholar, of which she is a shining and certain example. Many times Fran has saved me from being “hoisted by my own petard,” and for that and many other things I thank her.

Other members of my thesis committee have contributed not only to this project, but to my academic development. Dr. Connie Kristiansen had the foresight many years ago to encourage me to “make the process fun,” and I vow to carry these words through all the processes yet to come. Dr. Kim Matheson displayed a tolerance for my vision of a slightly non-linear world, and an understanding of the place where I believe the person meets the social group. Dr. Fran Klodawsky sent across the disciplinary divide books and a deeper insight of real-world politics than I would ever have gained from a psychology course. And Dr. Rhoda Unger, my external examiner, has set me a course with further readings that will no doubt enrich my knowledge of social psychology for many years.

To paraphrase Lewin, a person can only go so far without an enriching environment, and I count myself extremely fortunate to have been in an environment of exceptional graduate student colleagues. Many of these are women who offered both practical and philosophical support to this project. To name but a few: Lisa Verdon, for once again saving me from techno-demons; Kathleen Felton, who knew (and still knows!) all the details that I didn't; Wendy Hovdestadt for some wonderful arguments; Judith Kalin, for sharing with me her passion for life history research; Michelle Melia-Gordon, for contributing generously to my collection of qualitative research sources; Cheryl Terrance, for listening to "practice talks" over and over again; and Gordana Eljdupovic-Guzina, who reminded me that there is a time to work, and a time to drink beer.

And also, a few good men! I must thank Dino Zuccarini for his singular and immediate understanding of what I have attempted to communicate. I offer love and gratitude to my family, especially to my father, Bill Borshuk, and to my son, Richard McLean, neither of whom thought it at all unusual for me to be doing such a thing for such a long time. And finally, for years of support of every kind, for constant nurturing and life-long love, I thank Stephen Gill.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	
Overview.....	1
The ‘Problem’ of Helping Others.....	3
Activism and Social Identity.....	6
Studying Outgroup Activism: Multiple Motivations	7
 STUDY A: PREDICTING ACTIVISM FOR OUTGROUPS	
Introduction	
Overview.....	10
Altruism and Empathy	10
Personal Factors and Personal Histories of Social Activists.....	13
Political Attitudes, Values, and ‘Intergroup Consciousness’	16
Method	
Participants	25
Procedure	26
Predictor Measures.....	26
Altruism	27
Empathy.....	27
Value Types.....	28
Political Awareness.....	29
Intergroup Orientation.....	30
Social Desirability	30
Criterion Measures.....	31
Outgroup Activism.....	31
Resource Allocation to Outgroups	33
Prior Social Activism	34
Results	
Preliminary Analyses	36
Participant Characteristics	36
Descriptive Statistics for Predictor Variables	39
Descriptive Statistics for Criterion Variables	48
Main Analyses.....	53
Correlations	53
Multiple Regression Analyses.....	56
Discussion	
Altruism and Empathy	60
Personal Factors and Personal History	61
Political Awareness and Universality.....	67

STUDY B: INTERVIEWING OUTGROUP ACTIVISTS	
Introduction	
Overview.....	73
Social Movement Organizations: From Emotions, to Interests, to Identity	74
Politics, Morality, and Identity Construction.....	80
Relational Self-Construals and Confronting the ‘Other’	83
Method	
Participants	88
Materials	90
Procedures	93
Results	
Working with the Data.....	95
Levels of Qualitative Analysis.....	96
Participant Characteristics.....	100
Themes.....	102
Self as Social Activist	102
Individual Self.....	103
Self-in-Context.....	108
Main Motivations for Activism.....	112
Triggers.....	112
Causal Motivations	114
Us and Them: View of Outgroups	117
Universalism.....	118
Acknowledging Differences	120
Giving and Taking: Cost/Benefit Analyses	124
Benefits to Self.....	125
Costs to Self.....	127
Discussion	
Overview	132
Self-Construals	132
Motivations.....	135
Altruism and the ‘Selfish Maximizer’	136
Marginality and Outsider Status.....	139
Intergroup Boundaries and Universalism	140
GENERAL DISCUSSION	
Overview	142
Combining Methodologies	143
Limitations of the Present Research.....	145
Conclusions	147
References.....	149

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Informed Consent Form, Study A.....	166
Appendix B – Written Debriefing, Study A.....	167
Appendix C – Predictor Measures, Study A.....	168
Appendix D – Criterion Measures, Study A.....	178
Appendix E – Factor Loadings for Intergroup Orientation Scales.....	182
Appendix F – Research Questions and Sample Interview Questions, Study B.....	185
Appendix G – Demographic Questionnaire, Study B.....	187
Appendix H – Informed Consent Form, Study B.....	188
Appendix I – Written Debriefing, Study B	189

List of Tables

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants in Study A	38
Table 2: Internal Consistency and Descriptive Statistics For Predictor Variables.....	41
Table 3: Intercorrelations Among Predictor Variables.....	46
Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Criterion Variables.....	48
Table 5: Ranking of Allocations for Campus Organizations by Outgroup Solidarity Measure.....	50
Table 6: Correlations Between Predictor and Criterion Variables.....	55
Table 7: Multiple Regression of Personality, Personal History, and Attitude Variables on Outgroup Activism.....	58
Table 8: Demographic Characteristics of Interviewees.....	101

Overview

The current fiscal and social climate under which social movement organizations are operating has prompted such groups to begin promoting alliances amongst different social justice interests. Recently, throughout much of Canada, fiscally conservative governments have drastically reduced the funding of activist organizations devoted to social justice and social change. In many cases, these cutbacks have affected organizations to a point where the only resource left to them is their members (Cameron, 1997). Many social activist organizations are, therefore, seeking to expand their constituencies through grassroots organizing and recruitment efforts (Pilisuk, McAllister, & Rothman, 1996).

Furthermore, activist groups organized around particular social identities such as gender, race, and sexual orientation – which were for some time at the centre of political and social change – have had to withstand charges of being ‘special interest groups,’ catering to exclusive and narrowly-defined interests. In light of these concerns and challenges, social movements are relying more often on allies and sympathizers to their causes, as well as opening up space for participants with multiple identities (Burman, 1994) and concerned ‘others.’¹ In essence, social movements are beginning to question the practice of endorsing single-identity perspectives (Bishop, 1994). This changing context provides the opportunity to develop a new framework for viewing social activism as an intergroup phenomenon.

¹ One example of the changing nature of activist organizations is the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgendered (GLBT) Centre on the campus of Carleton University, which works to promote its

Allies in social movements have not, as yet, been the subject of much scholarly attention. When the motivations of allies or sympathizers have been examined, their behaviours have been explained mostly through reference to interpersonal variables. For example, in a study of Black and White women active in the Mississippi civil rights movement in the 1960s, Jenny Irons (1998) drew race-based conclusions about the factors that led to their involvement. She attributed Black women's activism to societal forces, such as the oppression of Black Americans, and concluded that the Black women were drawn to the movement directly due to their experiences of discrimination. White women, on the other hand, she found to be only "indirectly" linked to the movement, despite the extent of their actions on behalf of civil rights. Further, the motivations of White women were presented in psychological, rather than in societal or intergroup terms. Irons wrote, "While white women were not directly tied to the movement through personal experiences of oppression, they sometimes became involved *for the sake of helping others*" (1998, p. 703, italics added).

This practice of "helping others" across a primary social identity boundary, in the context of social activist alliances, is the subject of the present research. I argue that the traditional theoretical construction of helping as a prosocial behaviour in psychology has been limited to interpersonal and apolitical contexts. In the case of social activism, and especially in cases where individuals cross intergroup boundaries for the sake of

"Ally Group" of Carleton community members who sympathize with the primary interests of the collective.

marginalized groups, an examination of multiple motivations including both prosocial and intergroup variables is required.

The ‘Problem’ of Helping Others

The reasons why some people intervene in the lives of others has been constructed as a “problem” for social scientific understanding. For example, a sub-specialization of Holocaust studies, devoted to the examination of rescuers, ‘Righteous Gentiles’ who sheltered and saved Jews and others from the Nazis, has traditionally treated the actions of these Christians as a puzzle to be worked out (e.g., Gross, 1994; Monroe, 1994, 1996; Oliner & Oliner, 1988, Tec, 1986).

There are many reasons such behaviour has been constructed as a problem: scholarship in social psychology and political science teaches that we quickly entrench into identity groups (Tajfel, 1981); that we favour our own groups, and hold biases against other groups (Brewer, 1979); that we help those who are like ourselves (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986); and that we engage in social action to benefit ourselves or members of our group (Taylor & Mogghadam, 1987).

Social psychologists, in fact, have devoted far more research to the question of why people do *not* intervene in the lives of others than to the question of why they *do*. The experimental study of prosocial behaviour in social psychology began in earnest during the 1970s with experiments into the bystander effect (see Latané & Darley, 1970; also see Cherry, 1995). A key theoretical debate emerging from the research into helping concerned the nature of altruism versus pseudoaltruism, that is, whether helping arose from pure selflessness or from the hope of some personal gain (Batson, 1991). In essence,

this motivational question was given shape by preceding decades of psychology that had resulted in a normalized picture of people as rational agents operating mainly to maximize their own interests. However, this discourse of 'selfish maximizer' is simply one of many possible discourses on helping, and one based on an ideology of a particular North American consumer culture that emphasizes costs and rewards (du Preez, 1996).

The prevailing view in social science of the altruist as 'selfish maximizer' can be traced to Thibaut and Kelly's (1959) social exchange theory, which suggested behaviour is guided by the principle of maximizing rewards and minimizing costs to obtain the most profitable outcome. People thus perceive the costs of their present behaviour in terms of future rewards, which, while not limited to material payoffs, may be expectations of social rewards or even the reinforcement of personally-held values (Bar-Tal, 1976). This view of pseudoaltruism was also reflected in the resource mobilization theory of social movement participation, which promotes a rational actor engaged in cognitive cost-benefit analyses in deciding whether to join a social movement (Hercus, 1999).

It is in this discursive context of the helper as selfish maximizer that prosocial behaviour has, in effect, presented a problem for psychologists. Further, the emphasis on the helper as an isolated individual, or what Burman (1994) calls the "rational unitary subject" (p. 171), precludes an examination of both relational and political motivations in prosocial decision-making. Feminists have critiqued the research paradigm of bystander intervention, upon which many theories of altruism rest, because it privileges the male gender role, reflected through heroism and chivalry, over the female gender role, which is focussed on nurture and care (Eagly & Crowley, 1986; Gilligan, 1993).

Other theorists (e.g., Borshuk, 1999; Vela-McConnell, 1999) have critiqued the mainstream approach to the study of prosocial behaviour, and have rejected the foundational assumptions that (a) prosocial behaviour is contingent on a rational cost-benefit analysis, (b) that all helping stems from self-interest, and (c) that altruism is necessarily located in the individual rather than in collectivities. For example, Lerner and Meindl (1981) called attention to a serious flaw in the assumptions governing altruism research: phenomenological data suggest people follow rules of justice because it feels naturally right, not because they are motivated by perceived reinforcements. They concluded that the personal-motive derivative of self-interest is trivial and culturally-bound. Similarly, Batson and Coke (1981) wrote that “current theories tend to be egoistic; they are built on the assumption that everything we do is ultimately directed toward the end-stated goal of benefiting ourselves” (p. 168). Campbell (1975) had earlier noted the normative quality of this view when he wrote “psychology and psychiatry ... not only describe man as selfishly motivated, but implicitly or explicitly teach that he ought to be so” (p. 1104).

These criticisms of traditional models of altruism have opened new possibilities in the study of helping behaviour which acknowledge the socially-imbedded nature of helping, the potential for collective formulations of motivation, and alternative narratives to rational-choice models. The conceptions of motivations for helping in a social change context have been expanded from simple cost-benefit analyses to include variables such as self-esteem (Morgan, 1998), feelings of interconnectedness (Monroe, 1996), ethics or morality (Gross, 1994), community involvement (Davidson & Cotter, 1989), and

personal identity (Teske, 1997). Once it is recognized that altruism need not be reduced to a calculation of cognitive equity by individuals in a context devoid of social particulars, once emotions and values are treated as inseparable from mental calculations, and once the recognition of power inequities is entailed by the definition of altruism, it may be more likely that social and political activism will be recognized within its domain. These possibilities guided the present research.

Activism and Social Identity

The area of social psychology that has, perhaps, been most willing to confront and analyse power inequities and social change is the study of intergroup relations (Burman, 1994). However, the application of social identity to motivational studies of social activism has been limited to descriptions of the conditions under which a consciousness of oppression will spur a social identity group to take action in attempts to level inequalitarian societal structures (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1987). In other words, social identity theory has demonstrated itself to be supportive of the view of identity politics, but not of alliances between members of different social groups.

Recent feminist and postmodern discussions of the interplay between the multiple oppressions of gender, race and class (e.g., Flax, 1992) have raised the possibility of alliance-building between various identity-politics collectivities (Johnson Reagon, 1983). For example, Bishop (1994) wrote that “as long as we who are fighting oppression continue to play the game of competition with one another, all forms of oppression will continue to exist” (p. 10). This very recent movement toward alliances has led social movements located in particularized identity positions to realize the benefits of joining

together with those who do not share similar primary identities in order to advance wider notions of social justice. In part, it has been the backlash against minority and marginalized interests (Rowland, 1986) which has made it necessary to combine the energies and resources of smaller social justice interests, and to engage in grassroots rather than statist struggles to achieve social change (Ralph, Regimbald, & St-Amand, 1997).

As social movement discourse begins to broach the possibilities of organizational alliances, individuals themselves are questioning their entrenchment within particularized identity communities (Bishop, 1994). In this context, the question of who is most likely to form alliances with outgroup members becomes most salient. This thesis marks an attempt to identify those who do choose to participate in political and social struggles on behalf of a social outgroup, and the beginning of an attempt to answer why they do.

Studying Outgroup Activism: Multiple Motivations

As will be detailed below, studies on social movement participants offer only scattered, and sometimes contradictory findings of the characteristics associated with activists. Given that a clear, unitary picture of the specific person-variables of social activists does not emerge from the literature, it is probable that the characteristics separating social activists from non-activists comprises a list of variables relevant to personality, social context, personal history, and attitudes. While it is unlikely that outgroup activists share a single common set of attributes, it is possible that their reasons for helping outgroup members are similar.

Like most complex social phenomena, one would expect outgroup activism to be the result of a number of variables, some person-specific, some general-psychological, and some external-environmental. Although psychological theories often develop from single-causation hypotheses (Levy, 1997), it is more likely that there are many factors accounting for the phenomenon. A multiple-motivational model of outgroup activism was therefore constructed to expand the theoretical conceptualization of “helping” in social psychology to include collective political behaviours.

My immediate goal was to understand social activism in personal and intergroup terms. This involved performing two studies, one using questionnaire methodology to assess the role of personality characteristics, personal histories, and attitudes as possible motivators of outgroup social activism, and another using interview methodology to explore activists’ own understandings of their motivations for engaging in cross-identity alliances. These studies were intended to be complementary rather than parallel. In other words, the same variable or theme was not explored in each study. Instead, the quantitative study A was intended to identify key motivational variables from a general sample, while Study B capitalized on a phenomenological approach to explore the themes of self, intergroup perceptions, social context, and the rewards of activism offered by activists themselves.

The theoretical component of this project begins with a critical analysis of the literature on helping and prosocial behaviour, and an overview of the literature on social activism, focussing specifically on the psychology and personal characteristics of social activists. Outgroup activism is presented in terms of intergroup relations, highlighting the

need for an intergroup perspective in examining people involved in social justice movements. The rationale, methods and results of two studies about activist alliances are outlined and discussed in terms of their application to a framework for understanding the motivations for becoming involved in social justice movements. As social activism aimed at outgroups is a phenomenon that has not yet been isolated or studied systematically, the literatures reviewed in this project are not discipline-specific, but run through social psychology, feminist analysis, and political science, and the research described in this thesis is necessarily exploratory.

STUDY A: PREDICTING ACTIVISM FOR OUTGROUPS

Overview

Different research traditions in psychology have linked personal variables to political activism by focussing on personality characteristics, political beliefs, and group consciousness (Duncan, 1999). Because of this project's emphasis on *intergroup* activism, it seems possible that an additional characteristic is relevant to the present research, which is intergroup consciousness, a collective sense of self which transcends intergroup boundaries.

Three types of characteristics, found in various literatures, are therefore considered relevant to decisions to engage in intergroup activist alliances. One, as previously noted, is the literature on helping and prosocial behaviour, including the variables altruism and empathy. The second relates to the personal histories and backgrounds of people who get involved in social activism, including education about social issues, gender of social movement participants, prior experiences of social activism, and level of social status. Finally, political and intergroup attitudes will be explored, especially in terms of political power arrangements and perspectives on universalism.

Altruism and Empathy

Some studies of intergroup intervention have determined that individual-difference characteristics such as altruism and empathy separate out those who would intervene on behalf of others, from those who would not. For example, Oliner and Oliner's (1988) sample of Holocaust rescuers measured higher on altruism and empathy

than did a comparison group of non-rescuers. And although Monroe's (1994, 1996) studies were qualitative rather than quantitative (i.e., altruism was constructed discursively rather than through a standardized measurement instrument), she concluded that altruism was central not only to Holocaust rescuers, but to philanthropists and heroes as well, and hypothesized that altruism is responsible for creating or maintaining a perspective of "common humanity" (Monroe, 1996). In specific reference to social activists, Franz and McClelland (1994) found that the essential difference between 1960s activists and non-activists was a higher level of altruism in those who had participated in social protests, while Seaton (1995) reported higher scores on altruism measures for anti-abortion activists than for a comparison sample of non-activists. Regardless of the debates surrounding the selfless versus selfish nature of altruism, it is clear that a number of research studies have found that the degree of personal helpfulness is related to individuals' decisions to engage in social activism or intervention.

Social exchange theories of altruism, emphasizing as they do cognitive decision-making aspects, have been criticized for leaving emotional variables unaccounted for. In response, psychologists began to consider the importance of empathy, the emotional reaction an individual experiences when observing others in need. Empathy, a prosocial construct related to altruism, has been described as the ability to take the perspective of another (cognitive empathy), and to feel for another as well (emotional empathy) (Davis, 1994). The dominant empathy-arousal theory (Batson, 1991; Batson & Coke, 1981) stipulated that empathic concern for others, developed through perspective taking, may lead to altruism. The ability to take the perspective of another person is thought to be

generated through emotional attachments, similarity, or attention to others (Cialdini et al., 1997).

It is believed by some prosocial researchers that greater-than-average levels of personal empathy are the key to the so-called 'altruistic personality.' Rushton (1981), a strong proponent of individual-difference theories, claimed that empathy, which he defined as "experiencing the emotional state of another" (p. 260), is a trait found in varying degrees across individuals. Other scholars have linked empathy to intergroup process, and have examined the role of empathy in intervention with outgroups. For example, Oliner and Oliner (1988) used the term "extensivity" to describe their rescuer sample's ability to feel empathy and responsibility for a group other than their own. Recently, Stephan and Findley (1999) applied the construct of empathy to intergroup relations, and postulated that empathy mediates intergroup attitudes and behaviours. They concluded that empathy is related to people's willingness to reject status quo intergroup relations (Stephan & Findley, 1999), which is likely to also be implicated in social activism.

Hoffman (1989) has argued for a direct relationship between empathy and justice, claiming that emotional empathy can lead to "existential guilt" (p. 290), wherein more advantaged individuals experience guilt regarding their privileged position relative to others. Hoffman believed that white social activists exhibit this existential guilt, which spurs a response to take action for the justice interests of less privileged groups: "... if one's group or class is viewed as contributing to or even benefiting from the victim's misfortune, one's empathic distress may be transformed into a feeling of guilt by

association” (p. 291). In essence, Hoffman’s proposed model, which corresponds well to outgroup activism, combines self-blame, empathic distress, and guilt to produce a response of intervention for disadvantaged others.

Personal Factors and Personal Histories of Social Activists

Researchers studying social movements, as well as social psychologists interested in individuals who become social activists, have focussed a great deal of attention on the personal histories and characteristics of individuals involved in social movements.

Research into the individual characteristics of social activists in general, as well as of adherents of particular movements, such as the feminist movement, has revealed a wide and inconsistent variety of factors that explain why some people become social activists (Vela-McConnell, 1999). These factors include self-concept and socialization, as well as the search for meaning and identity, values, personality attributes, political consciousness, a quest to join community life, and a need for status (e.g., Bettencourt, Dillman, & Wollman, 1996; Davidson & Cotter, 1989; Duncan, 1990; Hercus, 1999; Lofland, 1996; Seaton, 1990; Youniss & Yates, 1999), among others.

Some researchers have determined that there are, in fact, no individual differences between activists and non-activists beyond situational variables such as biographical availability, which is the amount of time and energy one's lifestyle allows (Wiltfang & McAdam, 1991). The role-identity model of volunteerism (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998), which has also been applied to social activism (Teske, 1997), predicts that as one's level of commitment to a cause or movement increases, accompanying changes are made in self-concept to a point where the volunteer or activist role becomes an intrinsic part of

that person's personal identity. Consequently, one consistent finding about social activism, as well as about volunteering in general, is that the best predictor of future involvement is a previous experience of involvement (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; Stewart, Settles, & Winter, 1998; Yates & Youniss, 1998).

Without question, more women are involved in the feminist movement than are men, just as more people of colour are involved in civil rights work than are White people. Such self-evident statements imply that identity categories themselves are antecedents for political activism. However, because experiences of social marginality and membership in an identity category have not proven to be 'perfect' predictors of activism (Crosby et al., 1989), it has been proposed that group consciousness mediates the relationship between personal experience and political acts (Duncan, 1999).

The personal history of social activists has been allotted more research attention than has the study of personality characteristics. A number of researchers have focussed on activists', especially feminist activists' personal histories of disempowerment, and/or the concomitant consciousness or identity resulting from experiences of marginality (e.g., Cole & Stewart, 1999; Crosby et al., 1989; Duncan, 1999; Gurin & Townsend, 1986; Stewart & Healy, 1986; Unger, 1999; Unger, Draper, & Pendergrass, 1986). As research on Black personality development has shown (e.g., Cross, 1991), encounters with a dominant majority is often the first step to developing a structural critique, or an ideological world-view. As Stewart and Healy (1986) wrote, "We have begun our exploration of ideological development with the assumption that political attitudes do not spring forth fully formed and integrated into one's personality..." (p. 13). Rather, they

claim, it is necessary to examine the relationships between personal experience, ideological attitudes, and political behaviour.

Unger, Draper and Pendergrass (1986) did examine these relationships in a study of personal epistemology and demographic markers. They found that the consciousness of one's membership in a disempowered group was correlated with beliefs in the social construction of reality, and that participants identifying themselves as "feminist" held a multiple interpretations world-view. This finding raises the possibility that the consciousness resulting from experiences with social injustice may play a key motivating role for their activism on behalf of outgroup members who also experience oppression from a dominant social group. On the other hand, it has also been noted that a marginalized social status is more highly related to having a 'dichotomous groups' perspective, wherein one perceives the social world as divided into opposing social categories (e.g., rich/poor, Black/White); in the same vein, higher-status individuals view the social world as being composed mainly of autonomous individuals and not of social categories at all (Deschamps, 1982). With this understanding, it would appear that neither marginalized group members, nor high-status self-perceived individuals would tend to devote efforts on behalf of another marginalized outgroup.

Particular markers of social marginality can also influence responses to oppression. For example, Stewart and Cole (1999) found that Black and White women did not share similar motivations for engaging in political activism; Black women were more likely than White women to be discontented with present power arrangements, and to believe that systemic factors (rather than personal factors) impede racial and sexual

equality. However, the degree of importance placed on those attitudes was a predictor of White women's involvement in social justice causes, but not of Black women's involvement, suggesting that discontent with one's own group status is not always a sufficient motivator of political activism. Furthermore, as Duncan (1999) noted, it has not been established whether group consciousness influences social activism, or whether involvement in political activity results in an expanded group consciousness. In summary, then, findings on the relationship of group status and an attendant group consciousness to social activism remain unclear.

However, studies on personal characteristics offer clearer findings about social activism. As noted earlier, people with previous experience of involvement in volunteer or issues-based engagement tend to return to similar behaviours later in their life (Yates & Youniss, 1998). Those in higher socio-economic positions, in general, devote more of their time to all types of volunteer activity than do the working classes, as do women over men, and students over their parents (Franz & McClelland, 1994). And finally, activism tends to be associated with people who have higher levels of education, and, in particular, higher levels of knowledge about social issues (Henderson-King & Stewart, 1999; Lee, 1997).

Political Attitudes, Values, and 'Intergroup Consciousness'

In addition to personality variables and life experiences, the attitudes, values, and perspectives of activists are relevant to motivations for social activism. Social movement organizations commonly incorporate a critique of political or power structures into their knowledge base, and it has been thought that adherents of social movements work from

particular ideological attitudes that allow them to oppose systems upholding these power structures (Klandermans, 1997). A number of attempts have recently been made to assess the relationship of knowledge or attitudes about political structures to social activism. For example, Lee (1997) found that Korean students who participated in activism had higher levels of knowledge about political issues, and a greater acceptance of left-wing ideology than non-participants.

Researchers studying the feminist movement do not usually measure ideology alone, but also examine the ways that ideology interacts with consciousness, underscoring the feminist principle of combining the personal with the political. For example, Cole and Stewart (1999) wrote about a construct they termed “political identity,” part of which reflects the belief that “collective actions are the best response to social problems, and disadvantaged groups are limited by systemic obstacles rather than individual shortcomings” (p. 161). Both Cole and Stewart (1999) and Duncan (1999) also applied Stewart and Healey’s (1989) “political salience” to samples of feminist activists. Political salience describes how much people feel personally affected by or connected to specific social, political, and historical circumstances.

Schwerin (1995) was interested in the way that “political awareness” contributed to personal change as a result of being involved in a social change project. Political awareness, as used by Schwerin, is one dimension of empowerment, and may be likened to the notion of critical consciousness developed in writings on ideological pedagogy by Friere (1970) and other liberationists who sought to educate the oppressed to think in terms of structuralist power analyses. In essence, all of these political constructs, in

slightly different ways, represent attempts to assess the interaction between knowledge of political power structures, a critique of power structures, and the personal impact that such an awareness may have on an individual. All three of the above formulations of political awareness are meant to be applied as measures of individual levels of the construct, although the construct itself combines a psychological aspect (personal change or personal attitude) with a sociological aspect (events or power structures in society).

Personal values may also play a role in social activism. Kilby (1993) described the valuing process at its most elemental as “a subjective ‘that’s right,’ ‘this is wrong’” (p. 62) evaluation, but added that when applied to group functioning, values may take on a more sophisticated role of protecting and respecting others in one's social group. Rokeach (1973) addressed the importance of values to political ideology and political involvement, writing, “The language of values is an ingenious language admirably suited to the enhancement of all kinds of self-interest, whether enlightened or unenlightened, selfish or altruistic” (p. 168). Rokeach demonstrated that the two terminal values of freedom and equality were sufficient to distinguish between political ideologies, and argued for a two-factor model of political ideology, with those on the moderate left high on both freedom and equality (1973, p. 184). Thomas (1986), in applying the two-factor model to social activists, found that the value of equality alone (an indicator of the extreme left, according to Rokeach, 1973) was the key discriminator between school desegregation activists and non-activists in the United States.

More recent investigations into the influence of values on behaviour have led to the development of value types that are more relevant to social justice values than is

Rokeach's two-factor model of political ideology. Schwartz' (1992) value types are based on multi-value associations that incorporate the motivations for the values. For example, the primary motivation of benevolence is directed toward the well-being of the ingroup, with value associations consisting of helping, forgiving, honesty, and loyalty. By contrast, the primary motivation of universalism targets the well-being of outgroups as well as ingroups, with value associations of peace, equality, and social justice (Schwartz, 1992). Of universalism, he wrote, "This value type, with its goal of tolerance and acceptance even of those with different ideas and life styles, is most relevant to outgroup contact," but added the qualification: "But benevolence values are mainly expressed in everyday relations with close others, not with outgroups" (p. 17). In fact, Schwartz (1996) found universalism (but not benevolence) value types were positively correlated with readiness for outgroup contact in a study of Israelis Jews and Arabs.

The notion of universalism corresponds very well to the process of intervening on another's behalf in the context of social activism aimed at overcoming group oppression. Universalism may be likened to having an intergroup consciousness that allows one to move away from an ingroup consciousness, toward an awareness of the particulars of another group. However, with much recent attention being paid by social psychologists to intergroup differences and distinctions (see, for example, Abrams & Hogg, 1990; Taylor & Moghaddam, 1987), the possibilities of forming intergroup alliances based on a shared humanity or fate (Lewin, 1948) have been overlooked.

The very conception of outgroup helping implies that humans form social groups based on self-identity variables, that they perceive themselves as members of social

groups, and that they behave according to implicit standards governing ingroups and outgroups, all of which are key tenets of social identity theory. Social identity has been conceptualized as a subset of self-concept (Tajfel, 1981), and theoretically plays an important role in shaping and regulating social behaviour. An intergroup relations approach in general lends itself to an analysis of power inequities between social groups (Apfelbaum, 1979), and social identity theory raises the potential for social activism in that those who are unable to achieve a positive social identity may engage in change-seeking strategies if the status quo is perceived to be inequitable and remediable (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1987). The assumption, however, is that collective change-seeking strategies (often involving political or social activism) are performed on behalf of the group to which one belongs (e.g., Gurin & Townsend, 1986). In terms of intergroup helping behaviour, social identity theory predicts that because the presence of intergroup boundaries results in social discrimination (including ingroup bias and outgroup hostility; Brewer, 1979), we would be less likely to help people identified as outgroup members than ingroup members.

Experiments in intergroup helping have supported this prediction. For instance, White and Black Americans were found to be more likely to come to the aid of someone from their own race than to engage in interracial helping (Gaertner, 1973). Hornstein's (1978) theory of "promotive tension" — a Lewinian concept stemming from another's needs or goals which can be reduced through acts of altruism — has been shown to operate only when there is similarity of beliefs, attitudes, and interests between the actor

and the other. Hornstein (1978) applied an intergroup relations interpretation to this result, writing,

The tendency of subjects to withhold help from those who disagreed with them on the items of high importance suggests that subjects acted as if they were placing these others 'outside' some imaginary boundary that momentarily separated their 'we-group' from their 'they-group' (p. 193).

Sole, Marton and Hornstein (1975) had earlier tested the social identity proposal that discrimination will occur when intergroup boundaries are clear and unambiguous. They concluded that "subjects divided their world and then granted help only to those strangers who were included in what can be described as their 'we-group'" (p. 8). In other words, outgroup helping was an unlikely outcome in these studies, even when outgroup members were in some ways similar to the participant. Gaertner and Dovidio (1986) also found evidence for the similarity principle in studies of intergroup helping, especially when participants operated under ambiguous conditions.

In summary, an intergroup relations perspective fails to predict or explain people who engage in social and political activism on behalf of an outgroup. Instead, there is strong experimental evidence that people perceive their social worlds in terms of ingroups and outgroups, and that people have biases toward ingroup members and against outgroup members, which leads to social discrimination, especially in helping situations. However, there is ample historical evidence from the civil rights and other justice movements (e.g., Bishop, 1994) that some people do engage in helping behaviours on behalf of denigrated outgroups, and that they do so even in the face of personal risk, which suggests that in certain situations for some people, intergroup biases are overcome.

It may be helpful at this point to recall Sherif's (1961) summer camp study,

wherein he and his collaborators were able to reverse the social discrimination resulting from intergroup competition by introducing superordinate goals. This can be read a number of ways, but what the superordinate goals created for the competing groups was a sense of interdependence of fate, a concept used to describe a common outcome that affects members of all groups (Lewin, 1948).

Although interdependence of fate has been demonstrated to be an important component of ingroup consciousness (e.g., for gender; Gurin & Townsend, 1986), phenomenological data derived from Holocaust rescuers suggest that the perception of a potential common fate with outgroup members was a prime motivator in decisions to intervene (Monroe, 1994; Oliner & Oliner, 1988). It is possible that an intergroup orientation entailing interdependence of fate is itself a key predictor of outgroup helping, in that the “shared perception of themselves as part of all humanity” (Monroe, 1994, p. 202) leads some to widen the boundaries of their perceived ingroup beyond single identity variables (e.g., gender or religion).

To use the terms of intergroup relations theory, this flexibility of intergroup boundaries can be viewed as an application of intergroup recategorization, involving the cognitive re-coding of ingroup and outgroup members from two separate groups to one. There is recent evidence that orientation toward former outgroup members becomes more positive when recategorization is achieved (Gaertner et al., 1996). The implication of the effect is that one's ingroup may grow ‘larger’ as perceptual boundaries between former outgroup members dissolve.

If, therefore, there are those (of higher-status) who perceive the social world in terms of individuals, while others (more marginal) are likely to perceive the social world in terms of multiple or dichotomous groups (Deschamps, 1982), the question for outgroup activism becomes: Are there those who, regardless of status, perceive the social world according to a universalist or ‘one-group’ orientation, under which is subsumed many social groups?

A social psychological conceptualization that is close to this speculation about universalism is found in the work of Gaertner et al. (1996), who conducted a field experiment in a multicultural high school. The researchers measured intergroup orientations of “one group” (a single transcendent identity), “two groups” (particular racial identities), “separate individuals,” and “same team” (different sub-groups within a common transcendent identity). It was found that students with a one-group orientation exhibited less outgroup bias than those with other orientations. These findings suggest the presence of a common ingroup identity that may be shared amongst people of different racial groups. While the study of a common ingroup identity model is in its earliest stages, the exploration of these different intergroup orientations may well shed light on the phenomenon of outgroup activism.

The reviewed literatures thus provided clues to the motivations for outgroup activism. Based on various theories and research findings, it could be expected that some individuals, with personalities high in altruism (Oliner & Oliner, 1988; Seaton, 1996) and empathy (Hoffman, 1989; Irons, 1998), with a personal history of marginality (Unger, 1999; Stewart & Healy, 1986; Unger, Draper & Pendergrass, 1986), and emphasizing

universalist values (Schwartz, 1996), would transcend intergroup boundaries and ingroup loyalties (Gaertner et al., 1996) to participate in a social movement on behalf of a denigrated outgroup. Consequently, a model of outgroup activism was constructed wherein personality characteristics, personal histories, and political and intergroup attitudes would lead to social activism or to activism on behalf of a social outgroup.

Study A explored the relationship of three substantive sets of participant characteristics with outgroup social activism, namely: (1) altruism and empathy as personality characteristics; (2) personal history, including demographic variables, prior social activism, and social marginality; and (3) an understanding of political power arrangements in society and a universalist or 'transcendent' perspective regarding the relationship of ingroup and outgroup members. It was expected that participants measuring higher on these variables would be more likely to form and support alliances with members of a social outgroup.

Method

Participants

Participants for this study were recruited with two criteria in mind. First, given the number of variables being examined, it was necessary to have at least a moderate-sized sample, and university undergraduates were most likely to be available in larger numbers. However, it was also a concern that because of their age, the usual pool of student participants — first year psychology students — may not have had the opportunity to have participated in social activism. The compromise, therefore, was to recruit from a variety of lower- and upper-level classes at Carleton University. Second, in order to obtain variability in social activist behaviours, a concerted effort was made to sample from courses that focus explicitly on inequality and power relations. Therefore, it was decided to recruit at least some participants from among those who had been exposed to structuralist socio-political viewpoints.

Participants were recruited from the following Carleton University courses: Psychology of Women; Introduction to Human Rights; Introduction to Women's Studies (two sections); and Conflict Analysis and Mediation. Participants from these courses constituted the “social critique” participants. The rest of the sample was recruited from two more general second-level courses, namely Introduction to Social Psychology, and Introduction to Methods in Psychology. One hundred and three participants took part in Study A, 41 from social critique courses, and 62 from the general courses.

Procedure

Recruiting was conducted during class time by the researcher, who described the research as “a study on social activism for my doctoral thesis in the Department of Psychology,” and asked for volunteers to fill out questionnaires. Those who volunteered put their names and contact information on a sign-up sheet, and the researcher called them within a few days to schedule a testing time. All testing was done on the campus of Carleton University, at a time convenient to the participants. In all, 103 students participated in Study A.

Instructions to participants were limited to welcoming and thanking remarks, and to giving students an idea of how long the questionnaires may take to be completed. The researcher was not in the room when the questionnaires were completed; in many cases, participants shared a room with 3 or 4 other participants. Informed consent forms (see Appendix A) were explained to the participants, and signatures were requested before the questionnaires were administered. When the questionnaires were completed, the participant was given a written debriefing (see Appendix B). In many cases, questions directed to the researcher launched conversations about social activism; however, none of these sometimes-lengthy discussions took place within the hearing of other participants.

Predictor Measures

The first set of measures was used to explore possible motivators/predictors of outgroup activism. They include standardized scales relating to altruism (Rushton, Chrisjohn, & Fekken, 1981), empathy (Davis, 1994), and benevolence and universalist value types (Schwartz, 1992); political awareness (Schwerin, 1995); and three separate

measures of ingroup orientation. Crowne and Marlowe's (1960) measure of social desirability was also administered to assess response bias in participants (see Appendix C for predictor measures).

Altruism

Based on the belief that altruism is a stable personality trait subject to individual differences, the Self-Report Altruism Scale (Rushton, Chrisjohn & Fekken, 1981) is a widely-used 20-item instrument similar to a personality inventory, requiring respondents to attest to the frequency of helpful behaviours (e.g., "I have given money to a stranger who needed it"). For the present study, only 18 items from the scale were used. The items reading "I have given a stranger a lift in my car" and "I have helped an acquaintance to move households" were eliminated because they were thought to be biased toward men and students, respectively. Responses are given on a 5-point scale based on the respondent's reported frequency of engaging in such behaviours, from 1 (never) to 5 (very often).

The Self-Report Altruism Scale has been found to yield alpha coefficients from 0.78 to 0.86 in split-half reliability tests, and to be independent of measures of social desirability ($r = 0.05$; Rushton, Chrisjohn & Fekken, 1981). Normal means for this scale have been reported between 2.60 and 2.85 (Rushton et al., 1981).

Empathy

While many measures of empathy rely on physiological indicators such as palm sweating, the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI; Davis, 1994) was based on earlier versions of self-report indices of empathy (e.g., Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972). Two 7-item

subscales of the IRI were employed in the present study: the Emotional Concern subscale (e.g., “I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me”), intended to assess the level of emotional empathy with distressed others, and the Perspective-Taking subscale (e.g., “I try to look at everybody’s side of a disagreement before I make a decision”), intended to assess the level of cognitive identification with others. The IRI requires respondents to report the degree to which the 14 items are personally relevant using a scale ranging from 0 (does not describe me well at all) to 4 (describes me very well).

Like the Self-Report Altruism Scale, scores on the IRI are reported to be independent of scores on the Crown and Marlowe (1960) social desirability scale ($r = 0.06$; Davis, 1994). Reported internal reliabilities for each subscale range from 0.70 to 0.78, and it has been found that, as is true of other self-report measures of empathic tendency, women outscore men (Davis, 1994).

Value types

Participants were assessed using Schwartz’ (1992) Survey of Value Types, which presents 56 values representing ten distinct value types, including benevolence and universalism. In this instrument, participants were asked to rate the personal importance of 56 values, representing 10 distinct values types using a 9-point scale ranging from 7 (supreme importance) to -1 (contrary to my values). The importance of each value type is computed by averaging the ratings of the relevant values (Schwartz, 1996). Research has indicated that this instrument performs reliably across 20 different cultures (Schwartz, 1992).

The benevolence and universalism value types together constitute what Schwartz (1996) has termed a Self-Transcendence value dimension. However, the primary motivations of the two value types differ, and an important cultural distinction between the two types has been found. The primary motivation of benevolence (which includes values such as *helpful, forgiving, and honest*) is a concern with the well-being of close others, especially members of one's ingroup, and is more commonly espoused in collectivist than in individualist societies. The primary motivation for universalism (which includes the values *equality, social justice, and a world at peace*), however, is tolerance and concern for all people and the natural world. Individualist societies tend to place equal emphasis on benevolence and universalism, in comparison with collectivist societies which value benevolence over universalism (Schwartz, 1992).

Political Awareness

Schwerin's (1995) measure of political awareness was derived from conceptualizations of socio-structural awareness as an integral element of personal and group empowerment. First developed by Torre (1986), the original instrument included 14 items intended to assess attitudes towards ideological and political power and social change. Schwerin's subsequent factor analysis resulted in a five-item scale which he administered to volunteer mediators, and reported a reliability value of 0.89. These five items (e.g., "Power should be more equally shared between people") were used in the present study as a measure of the extent to which participants endorsed a structuralist perspective on social power. Participants were asked to rate their agreement with the five statements on five point scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Ingroup Orientation

Three scales were developed to assess the aspects of participants' identity orientation (see Gaertner, et al., 1996 for a discussion of the common ingroup identity). The three ingroup orientations included: individual, reflecting the view that one does not belong to a social group at all (e.g., "People would be better off if they could live far away from one another and never have to do anything for them"); multiple groups, reflecting the view that social groups are dichotomous and competitive (e.g., "It is natural inclination to focus on a person's gender or race"); and transcendent, reflecting a common connection with, or intergroup consciousness between oneself and all others (e.g., "Sometimes I feel a oneness with all humanity"). Each scale originally contained 10 items scored on 5-point scales ranging from 1 (strong disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Prior to the present study, these scales were piloted with 60 participants in a third year psychology class. Because the pilot study revealed low inter-item correlations in some scales and low internal consistency in all three scales, some items were deleted and others were revised. As a result, the measures administered in Study A had 8 items per scale (see Appendix C).

Social Desirability

While not administered as an intended predictor of outgroup activism, Crown and Marlowe's (1960) Social Desirability (SD) scale was used to determine if participants were responding on the criterion variables in socially desirable ways. In essence, the SD scale measures participants' need to win approval with 33 items (e.g., "I have never intensely disliked someone"), to which participants respond True or False. Two items

were deleted due to an assumption of non-relevance to many of the student participants (“I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car” and “I am always careful about my manner of dress”).

Higher scores on the SD scale indicate a higher need for approval. Reported means for the measure with different samples have been found between 13.3 and 16.4, with a possible range of 0 (indicating a very low need for approval) to 33 (an extremely high need for approval). Alpha coefficients have been reported from 0.73 to 0.88 (Robinson, Shaver & Wrightsman, 1991).

Criterion Measures

The second set of measures, constituting the criterion variables, was used to assess respondents' willingness to engage in outgroup activism as well as their feelings of solidarity with outgroups. The first of these was a behavioural measure, focussing on participants' immediate willingness to engage with an outgroup, while the second, a resource allocation measure, was designed to gauge participants' feelings of outgroup solidarity. Participants' past experiences with social activism, measured by the Activist Checklist, was also examined as a criterion measure. These measures are found in Appendix D.

Outgroup Activism

The outgroup activism instrument was designed to assess the respondents' willingness to participate in specific activist behaviours in a social movement organization targeting an outgroup, namely, the Action Group on Afghan Women. The measure gave participants an opportunity to become involved in an activist group that

was recently formed at Carleton University to educate and promote the cause of ordinary people living under the restrictive Taleban regime in Afghanistan. Items on this measure represent examples of actual engagements with social movement organizations as taken from the literature on social movements (e.g., Klandermans, 1997; Wiltfang & McAdam, 1991).

It was a challenging task to choose an appropriate group to represent a social outgroup in need of activist efforts for this study for the following reasons. First, because the sample would include participants with knowledge of international human rights, it was deemed unwise to invent a fictional outgroup as has been done in other studies on intergroup prejudice (e.g., Esses, Jackson & Armstrong, 1998), as this would risk the face validity of the study. Secondly, on a multicultural campus such as Carleton University, a large range of ethno-cultural groups are represented in the student body, thereby increasing the likelihood that any international outgroup would, in some way, be an ingroup for some participant in the sample. Finally, it was thought that if the sample was limited to those representing particular identities (e.g., all men, or all heterosexuals, etc.), thus making the outgroup the negative dimension of that identity (i.e., women, or gay people), this study would be guilty of psychologically essentializing participants' social identities. Therefore, it was decided to use a real social group that was authentically in need of international pressure for social change, one that would exclude as few participants as possible on the dimension of ethno-cultural background, and one which featured a social movement organization already operating on campus. As gender was an identity dimension that was being forwarded as a variable for analysis, it was thought that

the fact that the group was Afghan women would raise interesting possibilities.

Furthermore, at the time this study took place, the issue of human rights in Afghanistan was receiving a significant amount of attention from the Canadian and the local media.

The questionnaire gave background information on the Taleban regime ruling Afghanistan, and its effects on the daily lives of Afghan women, taken from published journalistic sources (Armstrong, 1997), as well as information on the Action Group for Afghan Women. Scores for this measure were determined by Yes-No responses to 11 items requesting involvement with the Action Group (e.g., I will attend a demonstration). Because every participant ($n = 103$) responded positively to the first item ("I would like more information on the Action Group"), this item was eliminated from analyses. As Hinkle et al. (1996) noted, grassroots social movements typically have more difficulty mobilizing people to take action than finding people who implicitly support their efforts.

Resource Allocation to Outgroups

A resource allocation measure was used as a second indicator of participants' willingness to ally themselves with outgroups. Rather than focussing on political behaviours, this measure was aimed at examining the likelihood of allocating resources to groups that represent interests and/or identities other than one's own. In essence, this measure assessed participants' level of solidarity or support, through allocation of rewards, for outgroups. Whereas the outgroup activism measure focussed explicitly on intentions of activist behaviours for a particular outgroup, the resource allocation measure provided data on whether participants would choose to support outgroups or ingroups.

Participants were asked for their help with decision-making regarding the allocation of money to various multicultural and interest groups on campus. The groups represent a subset of 15 Carleton University Students' Association's Clubs and Societies, as well as other groups operating on campus, and were chosen to present a range of ethnic/gender/sexual orientation/cultural identities. Because participants were given the opportunity to allocate five sums of money to groups of their choice, this measure yielded a score of between 0 and 5, denoting the number of possible outgroup resource allocations. Choices from this measure were cross-tabulated with demographic information about each participant to determine whether the group receiving an allocation was, in fact, an ingroup or outgroup. For example, if a participant had described herself as a White, Christian, heterosexual woman, and she allocated her five sums to the Womyn's Centre, the Gay/Bisexual/Lesbian/Transgendered Centre, the First Nations Club, the Chinese Students' Society, and Intervarsity Christian Fellowship, she was given a score of 3 out of a possible 5 to reflect her support for the outgroups First Nations, Chinese students, and Gay/Bisexual/Lesbian/Transgendered people.

At the bottom of the resource allocation checklist, participants were asked to describe in an open-ended fashion why they had chosen to support the club or group that they did, and whether or not they were a member of any of the listed clubs/groups.

Prior Social Activism

An activist checklist was used to identify participants who had been involved in social action causes in order to explore the range and type of their involvements. The checklist of social activist behaviours was devised through a brainstorming meeting

between the researcher and social activist acquaintances, as well as from activities cited in the research literature. As the social movement literature emphasizes, a role identity developed from previous social activism may well be the best predictor of intentions for further social activism (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; Yates & Youniss, 1998); therefore, the present study was interested in differences on the criterion measures between those with many past activist experiences, and those with few or none.

Data from this questionnaire yielded scores between 0 and 25, based on the number of social activist involvements. The behaviours listed included activities that, in a democratic society, were relatively common to participate in (e.g., “signed a petition”) to those that were expected to be relatively rare occurrences (“been arrested at a political demonstration”).

Lastly, all participants were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire that yielded information such as age, income, gender, social class, sexual orientation, and ethnicity to identify if these variables are predictive of intergroup orientation. Members of less socially-dominant groups, for example, were expected to be more likely to have a multiple groups orientation than an Individual or transcendent orientation (Deschamps, 1982).

Results

The initial analyses involved examining participant characteristics, assessing the internal consistency of the various scales, creating a measure of marginality from the demographic information, examining the descriptive statistics for the predictor and criterion variables, and documenting the inter-relations within the predictor and criterion variables.

The main analyses included examining the effects of participants' sex and the type of course from which participants were recruited (the "education" condition) on the criterion variables. Also, relationships between social desirability and the criterion variables were examined to determine whether concerns existed regarding participants' response patterns. Finally, using hierarchical multiple regression equations, the hypotheses concerning the relationships between outgroup activism and outgroup solidarity with each of the personality, personal history, and attitudinal variables were tested.

Preliminary Analyses

Participant Characteristics

Demographic data were obtained through an open-ended participant demographic form, which asked participants to describe their race, sexual orientation, and social class, etc., in any manner they chose. As the number of categories generated by respondents were relatively few, little content analysis was necessary; categories are reported as they were generated by the participants themselves. Table 1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the participants.

The participants ranged in age from 18 years to 56 years ($M = 26.15$, $SD = 8.77$), and most ($n = 74$) were between the ages of 21 and 31 years. Likely because of the age of the respondents, at the time of the study, only 11.7% ($n = 12$) were parents. More women ($n = 60$) than men ($n = 43$) participated in the study, and more participants were recruited from general courses ($n = 62$) than from the social critique courses ($n = 41$).

In terms of demographics, 79.8% ($n = 79$) of the sample who reported religious affiliation were of either the majority (Christian) religion or had no religious affiliation, while 20.2% ($n = 24$) belonged to a minority religious group. Of the 97 respondents who replied to a question about sexual orientation, the majority reported being heterosexual, while the rest described themselves as either gay/lesbian, bisexual, or, in two cases, as “fluid/not definable.” Also, most participants reported that their family’s social class while growing up and their own social class at present were either middle-class, upper middle-class, or upper-class; in other words, less than a quarter reported being poor, working-class, or lower-class both while growing up, and currently.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants in Study A

Participant Characteristic	<i>N</i>	%
Sex:	<i>N</i> = 103	
Female	60	58.3
Male	43	41.7
Religious Affiliation:	<i>N</i> = 99	
Christian	40	40.4
No religious affiliation	39	39.4
Muslim	6	6.1
Jewish	2	2.0
Other*	12	12.1
Sexual Orientation:	<i>N</i> = 97	
Heterosexual	88	90.7
Lesbian/Gay/Other	9	9.3
Social Class:	<i>N</i> = 98	
Middle/upper-middle/upper class	76	77.5
Poor/working class/lower class	22	22.5
Country of Origin:	<i>N</i> = 103	
Canada	78	75.7
Other	25	24.3

(Table 1 continues)

(Table 1 continued)

Race/ethnicity:	<i>N</i> = 96	
White/European	67	69.8
Asian	13	13.5
Mixed	6	6.3
Black/African/Caribbean	5	5.2
Arab/Middle Eastern	2	2.1
Latin/South American	2	2.1
Aboriginal Canadian	1	1.0

**Note.* Other religious affiliation responses included Buddhist, Pagan, and “Spiritual.”

Nearly a quarter of the participants had been born outside of Canada, and 30.2% ($n = 29$) were of mixed ethnic heritage or were non-White. The largest group of racial/ethnic minority participants was Asian, followed by mixed heritage, Black/African/Caribbean, Arab/Middle Eastern, Latin/South American, and Aboriginal Canadian (see Table 1).

Almost all ($n = 102$) participants had taken part in at least one social activist effort including signing petitions for a social justice initiative. As anticipated, those who were specially recruited reported more activist experiences ($M = 8.98$, $SD = 4.41$) than those who were not specially recruited ($M = 5.63$, $SD = 4.05$), $t(101) = -3.96$, $p < .001$.

Descriptive Statistics for Predictor Variables

As shown in Table 2, the measures of altruism, emotional concern, perspective taking, benevolence and universalist value types, political awareness, and social

desirability were internally consistent, with alphas ranging from 0.56 to 0.89. Scale scores were therefore formed by calculating the mean scores or ratings across the items, resulting in higher scores reflecting more of the attribute in question. For the social desirability scale, a score was formed by summing the number of correct responses.

As no remuneration had been offered for participating in Study A, it had been anticipated that a sampling bias may have occurred in that participants of a “volunteerist” or helping nature, as well as those interested in the topic of political activism, would self-select into the study. In fact, the mean scores for altruism ($M = 3.14$) and political awareness ($M = 4.09$) for the present sample did exceed norms reported in the literature (Rushton, Chrisjohn, & Fekken, 1981; Schwerin, 1995).

Principal components analyses were performed on each of the three 8-item ingroup orientation scales (see Appendix E for factor loadings for each of the scales). Examination of the scree plots revealed one factor consisting of either three or four items each for individual, multiple groups, and transcendent ingroup orientations. Items loading > 0.5 on the first common unrotated factor, and not loaded on other factors, were retained for inclusion in scales.

This procedure resulted in a 3-item measure of individual ingroup orientation (“It is difficult to truly know another person”, “People should for the most part go it alone, depending only on themselves”, and “People would be better off if they could live far away from one another and never have to do anything for them”); a 3-item measure of multiple groups orientation (“It is a natural inclination to focus on a person’s gender or race”, “I tend to see the world as divided into many social categories such as rich and

Table 2

Internal Consistency and Descriptive Statistics For Predictor Variables

Predictor variable	Number of items	Possible range	Alpha	<i>M</i> inter-item Correlation	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Altruism	18	1 - 5	0.89	0.31	3.14	0.68
Empathy –EC	7	0 - 4	0.80	0.39	2.99	0.69
Empathy –PT	7	0 - 4	0.56	0.33	2.43	0.52
Universalist values	7	1 - 9	0.82	0.40	7.31	1.10
Benevolence values	7	1 - 9	0.79	0.37	7.51	0.97
Political awareness	5	1 - 5	0.70	0.33	4.09	0.61
Marginality index	6	0 - 6	n/a	n/a	1.84	1.39
Individualist orientation	3	0 - 5	0.47	0.25	2.87	0.67
Multiple groups orientation	3	0 - 5	0.46	0.26	2.68	0.84
Transcendent orientation	4	0 - 5	0.50	0.26	3.58	0.69
Social desirability	31	0 - 31	0.76	0.56	13.81	0.44

Note. *N*s ranged from 94-103.

poor, men and women, Black and White”, and “People from different parts of the world are fundamentally different”); and a 4-item measure of transcendent ingroup orientation (“We have a responsibility to every person on the planet”, “Each person is an important member of the human community”, “Sometimes I feel a ‘oneness’ with all humanity”, and “There are many universals that hold for all human beings”). Item analyses revealed mostly acceptable levels of internal consistency, as shown in Table 2. Scores were formed by calculating the mean, resulting in higher scores reflecting higher degrees of the ingroup orientation.

From the variables related to dominant and subordinate group membership (sex, citizenship, social class, religion, sexual orientation, and ethnic/racial group), a Marginality Index was calculated by assigning a value to each subordinate category: female, immigrant, lower/working class, religious minority (e.g., Muslim), non-heterosexual, and ethnic/racial minority (e.g., Asian), so that a score of 0 reflected a dominant group status across all 6 categories, while a score of 6 reflected a subordinate group status across all 6 categories. Participants recruited from social-critique courses ($M = 2.12$, $SD = 1.32$) were found to be significantly more marginalised than those from general courses ($M = 1.65$, $SD = 1.41$), $t(99) = 13.23$, $p < .001$.

Univariate normality of the predictor variables was assessed visually through stem-and-leaf plots and through skew and kurtosis coefficients. Visual assessment showed that some of the predictor variables were moderately skewed. For example, Political Awareness scores were moderately negatively skewed, indicating that participants, on average, were well aware of political power structures ($M = 4.09$ on a 5-

point scale). Political awareness has been shown to be a function of education on socio-political issues, as revealed by a study of volunteers who had undergone intensive training in peace-building techniques; their pre-training levels of political awareness ($M = 3.91$) significantly differed from their post-training scores ($M = 4.20$; Schwerin, 1995).

Both the benevolence and universalist value types were also negatively skewed, with means of 7.51 and 7.31, respectively, on a 9-point response scale. However, because a small number of skewed variables does not detract from the power of inferential tests (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983), no transformations were made on the skewed variables. Kurtosis was assessed by examining the probabilities of the critical values for kurtosis against the obtained kurtosis coefficients. Political awareness was found to be moderately platykurtotic, indicating a flattened, rather than peaked, distribution of responses. It has been suggested that when platykurtosis is found on only one variable, there is little reason for transforming the variable (Stevens, 1992).

Participants' level of marginality was bi-modal, with 27 participants each scoring 1 and 2 out of a possible 5 categories, indicating participants' relatively dominant status. This variable alone showed some discrepancy between mean scores ($M = 1.84$) and median scores (2.00). For all other variables, mean and median scores were close in value, including political awareness ($M = 4.09$, median = 4.20).

As shown in Table 3, a number of the predictor variables were intercorrelated. Consistent with the fact that both altruism and empathy are considered prosocial constructs by social psychologists, participants who indicated that they engaged in more altruistic behaviours also reported more emotional concern and perspective taking. Those

who were more altruistic were also more politically aware, and were more likely to have a transcendent ingroup orientation, and less likely to have an individualist ingroup orientation. Although the correlation between altruism and benevolence value types was not significant, as expected, altruism was related to universalist value types. The empathy subscales of emotional concern and perspective taking were moderately intercorrelated, as expected, but scores on these subscales were different enough to treat them as separate variables for the rest of the analyses.

Having a transcendent ingroup orientation was, as expected, related to placing greater importance on universalist values; both a transcendent orientation and universalist values were associated with higher ratings of benevolence values, higher scores on measures of empathy, and greater political awareness. Scores on the transcendent ingroup orientation scale were inversely related to scores on the other ingroup orientations (multiple groups and individualist orientation), reflecting the intent of the researcher to have these scales distinguish between three separate types of ingroup orientation.

In addition to the relationships listed above, it was found that a participant's degree of marginality was related to sex (specifically, to being a woman). More socially marginal participants were more likely to be politically aware; however, marginality was not related to any particular type of ingroup orientation.

A chi square test revealed that the course from which participants were recruited was dependent on their sex, $\chi^2(1) = 3.55, p < .06$. Specifically, the likelihood of being a woman participant in Study A was greater for those recruited from social critique courses, an unsurprising result given that three of the courses used for recruitment

purposes in this category were Women's Studies courses. A cross-tabulation revealed that 28% of the male participants and 48% of female participants were recruited from social critique courses, while equal numbers of men and women from the general courses participated in the study. Because of this finding, a sex $\times$ course type interaction term was created for use in further analyses.

Table 3

Intercorrelations Among Predictor Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Altruism	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2. Benevolence values	.16	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3. Emotional concern	.42***	.42***	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4. Perspective taking	.46***	.33***	.48***	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5. Sex	.07	.13	.20*	-.02	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6. Course type	.27*	-.13	.11	.00	.21*	—	—	—	—	—	—
7. Marginality	-.05	.03	.06	-.09	.49***	.17	—	—	—	—	—
8. Political awareness	.20*	.17	.43***	.24*	.10	.41***	.18	—	—	—	—

(Table 3 continues)

(Table 3 continued)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
9. Universalist values	.25**	.45***	.46***	.36***	.04	.10	.06	.52***	—	—	—
10. Transcendent orientation	.32***	.31***	.42***	.28**	.15	.15	.10	.43***	.40***	—	—
11. Multiple grps. Orientation	-.10	-.12	-.33***	-.26**	.00	.00	.05	-.17	-.27**	-.30**	—
12. Individualist orientation	-.24*	-.04	-.47***	-.25*	-.08	-.33***	.04	-.26**	-.13	-.20*	.27**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

Note. Ns ranged from 94-103.

Note. Course type was coded 1 = social critique courses, 0 = general courses.
Sex was coded 1 = woman, 0 = man.

Descriptive Statistics for Criterion Variables

The outgroup activism measure assessed participants' willingness to engage in political activism on behalf of an outgroup, namely Afghan women, and the Resource Allocation measure assessed the participants' solidarity with outgroups represented by clubs and societies on the campus of Carleton University. Prior social activism was measured through the Activist Checklist. Descriptive statistics for these measures are presented in Table 4.

For outgroup activism, out of a possible 10 political activist behaviours that participants could commit to, the lowest score given by a participant was 0, indicating no commitments to engage on behalf of Afghan women, to 10, indicating that that participant was willing to engage fully on behalf of Afghan women. Responses on the resource allocation measure also ran the entire possible range of the instrument, from 0 to 5, indicating that some participants allocated resources only to clubs representing social identity ingroups, while others allocated resources only to clubs representing social identity outgroups.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Criterion Variables

Variable	<i>N</i>	Possible range	<i>M</i>	Mode	<i>SD</i>
Outgroup activism	103	0 - 10	7.52	7	2.71
Resource allocation	94	0 - 5	2.65	3	1.58
Prior social activism	103	0 - 25	6.96	2	4.49

Univariate normality of the criterion variables was assessed through visual inspection of stem-and-leaf plots, and through examination of skew and kurtosis coefficients. Visual examination showed mild negative skew for the measure of outgroup activism, indicating that respondents revealed a tendency to report high levels of intentions to engage in political activism on behalf of Afghan women ($M = 7.52$ on a 10 point scale). However, non-graphical tests of the coefficient for this distribution showed skewness values were not significant, although the kurtosis coefficient (2.062) on this measure did exceed the critical value for platykurtosis for a sample of the size in Study A. As the other criterion variables exhibited univariate normality, no transformations of scores on these measure were deemed necessary; the modal score on the resource allocation measure of outgroup solidarity was at the midpoint for the measure.

A combined measure of outgroup support, consisting of scores on the resource allocation measure of outgroup solidarity, and the Afghan women score of outgroup activism, could not be supported due to the lack of relationship between the two variables. Participants' scores on these two measures were neither positively nor significantly correlated ($r = .072$). However, as expected, participants' willingness to form an activism alliance with an outgroup was positively related to their number of prior activist involvements ($r = .49, p < .01$).

The resource allocation measure revealed that the organization most rewarded by the participants was the Womyn's Centre, with 134 allocations (participants could allocate more than one amount to any organization). Following the Womyn's Centre

were organizations for Native students, followed by the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgendered Centre (GLBT) (see Table 5 for a ranking of organizations according to allocations).

Table 5

Ranking of Allocations for Campus Organizations by Outgroup Solidarity Measure

Rank	Organization	Allocations (<i>n</i>)
1	Womyn's Centre	134
2	Native groups	101
3	GLBT Centre	68
4.5	Somali students	21
4.5	IV Christian Fellowship	21
6	Muslim students	18
7	Latin American students	17
8	Chinese students	14
9	Others*	<10

Note. Other organizations include Pakistani Students' Association, Jewish Students' Union, Scottish Club, Nation of Islam Students' Association, and Hellenic Students' Association.

In all, approximately half (53.8%) of the total of more than 500 allocations were made to organizations that were not representative of participants' social identity categories, as derived from their demographic data. Open-ended responses detailing the reasons that participants made the allocations that they did represented both ingroup and outgroup solidarity. Examples of comments relevant to ingroup reasons for allocating responses include the following:

Womyn's Centre because I am a feminist and the Scottish Club because we all need fun in life and I presume this is a more social club. I may join it, I didn't know it existed! [This participant defined her ethno-cultural background as "Ukrainian and Scottish"].

I am Jewish so I support the Jewish Students' Union. I won't support either the Muslim Students Association or the Nation of Islam because they promote racism and they hand out hate literature to students.

Because I am from an Asian background, I want to support all the Asian groups. I am a woman so I support the Womyn's Centre. And I feel that chess is a game that should be promoted more to students.

A large proportion of participants (78%) chose to allocate resources to organizations representing both social ingroups and outgroups, and the outgroup solidarity that was exhibited appeared to often be on behalf of friends or acquaintances. For example:

I am Native so I would support any Native groups - I am pro-feminist so I do support the Womyn's Centre and because I have a lot of lesbian friends I would support the GLBT Centre. [This participant was a heterosexual male].

I am lesbian so the Womyn's Centre and GLBT are groups I belong to. I have been involved with the First Nations group before so I chose the First Nations Clubs. As for Latin American Students Association, I have a number of friends who are Latin American.

Scottish because of my heritage. The others because I have friends that are gay, lesbian and bisexual, friends who are Aboriginals and the Womyn's centre because I have been in an abusive relationship.

Finally, some participants chose to support only outgroup organizations. Given that most of the participants ($n = 92$) allocated resources to the Womyn's Centre, those who chose organizations representing only social outgroups were invariably male. As an example, following is a response from a male participant who chose to allocate resources to the Womyn's Centre, to organizations representing religious groups, and to the Aboriginal Students' Association:

Many women face violence and harassment and need support. Religious and spiritual support is important for many people. Many Aboriginal people would need support at university.

Another comment, representative of many, simply read "Interest. Level of oppression." It would appear, therefore, that outgroup solidarity was at least partially provoked by participants' knowledge of social inequities, an unsurprising finding given the high levels of political awareness among the present sample.

The number of different types of prior social activist engagements reported by participants were summed to give a score between 0 and 25 on the Activist Checklist. Participant responses ranged from a low of 0 to a high of 19 past activist experiences. Scores on this measure were moderately positively skewed, reflecting the modal score ($n = 10$) of only 2 activist behaviours out of a possible 25. Unlike the measure of outgroup activism, which assessed participants' *intentions* to be politically active, and which had a high mean score ($M = 7.52$, possible maximum 10) across participants, the Activist

Checklist, assessing *past* activist behaviours, had a much lower actual mean score ($M = 6.96$, possible maximum 25), by comparison.

Main Analyses

Correlations

The main analyses first examined the relations between the predictor and criterion variables. As shown in Table 6, there were a number of moderately sized correlations between predictor and criterion variables. A willingness to engage in activism on behalf of Afghan women was greater among participants with higher altruism and emotional concern scores, as well as for those who ascribed greater importance to universalist values, were more politically aware, and more strongly endorsed a transcendent ingroup orientation. Also, women enrolled in social-critique courses were more likely than other women, and more likely than all men in the sample, to engage in an activist alliance with Afghan women. In contrast, and as expected, participants who more strongly endorsed a multiple groups orientation (a perspective of the social world as organized into competing group interests) were less willing to engage in activism on behalf of a social outgroup.

Unlike the measure of outgroup activism, which was correlated with a number of predictors, the number of participants' resource allocations for outgroups was correlated with their scores on the marginality index, but in an unexpected manner: the more participants were themselves marginalized, according to this index, the fewer resources they allocated to social outgroups. Also, men were more likely to allocate resources to clubs representing social outgroups than were women.

The associations between the predictor variables and prior activism showed a similar pattern of relationships as between the predictor variables and the scores on outgroup activism. Participants' previous experiences with social activism were significantly and positively related to their level of altruism and emotional concern for others, with endorsing universalist values, with having a transcendent ingroup orientation, as well as with political awareness. As expected, there was a negative relationship between previous social activism and holding an individualist ingroup orientation, indicating that those who perceive the social world as being comprised of autonomous individuals are less likely to become politically involved in social issues. Finally, women from social-critique courses had more prior activist experiences than other participants in the sample.

Table 6

Correlations Between Predictor and Criterion Variables

Predictors	Criterion Variables		
	Outgroup activism	Resource allocation	Prior activism
Altruism	.29**	.08	.45***
Benevolence	.07	.01	-.02
Emotional empathy	.26**	.03	.24**
Perspective taking	.15	-.00	.14
Sex	.24*	-.27**	.18
Course type	.31***	.133	.37***
Sex x course type	.34***	.17	.28**
Marginality	.18	-.34**	.16
Politically aware	.48***	.16	.51***
Universalist values	.39***	-.06	.32**
Transcendent orientation	.28**	.00	.31**
Multiple groups orientation	-.19*	.16	-.07
Individualist orientation	-.17	-.18	-.32**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

Note. N s ranged from 94-103.

In summary, participants with prior social activist experiences, and those willing to intervene politically for an outgroup shared similar characteristics: they were more likely to be altruistic, emotionally empathic, and aware of socio-political structures. Further, they perceived a common humanity as comprising their ingroup, and held values reflecting benevolence and universalism. Women participants from social-critique courses were more likely than men from either course type, or women recruited from the general courses, to have had prior activist involvements and to pledge activist support for Afghan women. Participants willing to allocate resources to outgroups, on the other hand, were not identified by any of the hypothesized characteristics.

Finally, because participants' scores on both criterion measures were independent of their social desirability scores, the Marlowe-Crowne (1961) measure of social desirability was dropped from further analyses.

Regression Analyses

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed to test the hypothesis that altruism and emotional concern for others; prior activism, sex, and type of course; and political awareness, universalist values, and transcendent ingroup orientation would predict willingness to form activism alliances with Afghan women. A second regression analysis, intending to assess a similar relationship between personality, personal history, and attitudinal variables with resource allocations for outgroups, was not pursued given that the only significant correlate with outgroup solidarity was the participants' level of marginality, with which it was inversely correlated.

For the multiple regression analysis that was conducted, assumptions of linearity, singularity, normality, non-influential data points, and homoscedasticity of residuals were evaluated by examining the zero-order correlations, residual scatterplots, and both Cook's and Mahalanobis' Distances. Using a $p < .05$ criterion for Mahalanobis' Distance, and CD value < 1 criterion for Cook's D, it was found that no data points influential on X or Y were present. Multicollinearity was not indicated as no zero-order correlations exceeded $r = .52$ (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983), and the standardized errors of prediction visually appeared to be normally distributed around the standardized predicted scores.

In order to assess the additional variance accounted for by the hypothesized predictors over and above that accounted for by prior activism (which was expected to be a strong unique predictor of outgroup activism), prior activism was entered earlier in the regression equation. The final regression equation with all predictors entered was significant, $F(9,93) = 6.21, p < .001$, and explained 37% of the variance in outgroup activism. Furthermore, the change statistic assessing the degree of additional variance contributed over and above that contributed to by prior activism was also significant, $F_{\text{change}} = 2.45, p < .05$, indicating that a linear combination of the other personality, personal history, and attitude variables significantly predicted outgroup activism after the effects of prior activism were removed.

In terms of the unique contributions of predictor variables, the final regression equation revealed that only three of these, prior activism, universalist values, and political involvement were significant predictors of outgroup activism (see Table 7), indicating that a prior history of social activist experiences, an awareness of socio-political

structures, and the endorsement of universalist values was associated with the willingness to form activist alliances with an outgroup.

Table 7

Multiple Regression of Personality, Personal History, and Attitudinal Variables on Outgroup Activism

Predictor	β	t	sr^2
Altruism	0.099	0.96	0.006
Emotional empathy	-0.062	-1.38	0.002
Prior activism	0.236**	2.16	0.031
Sex	0.108	0.982	0.006
Course type	-0.020	-0.138	0.000
Sex $\times$ Course type	0.128	0.790	0.004
Political awareness	0.227*	1.86	0.023
Transcendent orientation	0.006	-0.06	0.000
Universalist values	0.195*	0.72	0.024

Note. ** $p < .05$, * $p < .07$ (two-tailed).

In summary, the findings suggest that while the personality characteristics identified in the hypotheses are not uniquely associated with outgroup activism, some of the personal experiences and attitudes did contribute to increased levels of outgroup activism. Specifically, politically aware individuals with past social activist experiences who endorse universalist values were most likely to form an outgroup alliance. As found by other researchers, a prior history of social activism is a strong indicator of intentions for future activism, although social attitudes about societal power arrangements and values supportive of intergroup connections were also important to outgroup activism, even for those who had not had previous social activist experiences.

Discussion

A number of conclusions may be drawn from Study A about social activism and, in particular, about outgroup activism. Specifically, this research has helped to clarify the role of altruism in social activism, as well as the influence of an awareness of socio-political structures on social activism and outgroup activism. Further, this study points to the importance of universalist values for those who are willing to intervene across a social identity boundary.

Altruism and Empathy

The results from Study A revealed that participants' level of altruism was related to prior social activism, but was not a unique predictor of activism for Afghan women. In terms of simple correlations, scores on measures of both altruism and benevolence values were related to scores on both types of activism, although altruism was most strongly related to past activism.

The fact that participants who had higher scores on the measure of altruism also were more likely to have previously been involved in social activism suggests that social change efforts may, after all, fall within the purview of prosocial behaviours, despite its theoretical construction as a variable with applications mainly at the interpersonal level. However, it is possible that a variable more related to intergroup processes (indicated by the significant association of universalism) surmounted altruism in the case of outgroup activism. In other words, altruism may simply be less important to outgroup activism than the other variables in the present model. It should also be recalled that, as noted earlier, the present sample was more altruistic than reported norms for other samples.

Empathy, on the other hand, was not a unique predictor of outgroup social activism, although emotional concern was associated with both prior activism and outgroup activism. Most surprising was that scores on the measure of perspective-taking, representing the cognitive component of empathy, was not correlated with any of the criterion measures at all. Irons (1998), who interviewed Black and White women active in the civil rights movement, conjectured that empathy was responsible for white women's involvement in civil rights. However, rather than interrogating the notion of empathy, Irons discussed participants' internalized religious beliefs, which she believed provided them with the ability to perceive interconnections between members of different races, touching on the notion of universality without fully exploring it. It is possible that intergroup consciousness, a perspective of connectedness between social groups, was the important factor in Irons' findings (as in the present research), rather than empathy. In other words, the ability to focus on the perceived similarities between oneself and others may be a better explanation for outgroup activism than the ability to respond emotionally or cognitively toward someone perceived as dissimilar.

Personal Factors and Personal History

As expected, Study A found that a history of prior social activism was the best predictor of intentions toward outgroup activism, a finding consistent with the role-identity theory of civic involvement which presumes that a personal identity is constructed around political or social behaviours, ensuring consistency between past and future behaviours (Penner & Finkelstein, 1988). And although education about social issues, based on the courses in which participants were enrolled at the time of the study,

was not a unique predictor of outgroup activism, it was found to be positively correlated with both past activism and outgroup activism. Women participants were more likely than men to commit to outgroup activism, yet were not more likely to have prior activist involvements. However, being enrolled in a social-critique course led women to pledge activist support for an outgroup. And finally, participants' level of marginality was unrelated to either activism measure, although it was inversely related to resource allocation for outgroups.

Horvath's recent (1999) discussion on the relationship between knowledge of issues and social action are useful in light of the present results. Horvath noted that activists in general have more awareness of social issues than the general public, and that those who are exposed to information about such issues become more concerned than they were before. Therefore, gaining knowledge (for e.g., through university courses with socio-political content) may lay the groundwork to stimulate an interest in activism, although as Horvath (1999) pointed out, knowledge, of itself, is probably not enough.

Although the intent that lay behind Study A's sub-sample of participants in social-critique courses was to ensure greater variability in past activist behaviours, another outcome of having data on students enrolled in different courses is that it allowed conclusions to be drawn about these two subsamples. Aside from sex (there were proportionally more women than men from the social-critique subsample than from the general subsample), participants from the two subsamples did not differ significantly on any of the demographic indicators; however, women enrolled in the social-critique courses were more likely to commit to outgroup activist involvements. Lee (1997) also

found that student activists were more likely to be informed about social and political issues than non-activists. Henderson-King and Stewart (1999) noted that one's social environment is likely to affect the development of a group consciousness. In other words, involvement in a university course focussing on social critiques is likely to affect one's conception of oneself as a member of a social group, which is thought to be a requisite for pursuing collective change strategies.

It is not possible to conclude from the present research whether Study A participants were influenced by their classroom environments to seek social change strategies, or whether the direction of causality was in the opposite direction, in that those students who have an interest in social justice seek out such courses. It has been found (Henderson-King & Stewart, 1999) in a quasi-experimental study that certain aspects of a feminist consciousness are increased by participation in women's studies courses. However, Duncan (1999) identified a direct relationship between enrollment in women's studies classes and feminist activism that was not mediated by group (feminist) consciousness.

The finding that women were more likely to commit to outgroup activism than men was not altogether surprising. This is consistent with other research (e.g., Flanagan et al., 1998; Franz & McClelland, 1984) that shows women demonstrate a stronger civic commitment than do men, yet contradicts Lee's (1997) study of Korean student activists, which found men were more likely than women to be activists. Lee explained this difference in terms of Confucian gender roles, and it is very likely that cultural context and gender role expectations do have an influence in these findings. However, it should

be noted that for the scenario used in the present study, the outgroup with which participants were confronted was not a strict outgroup on every dimension; the common experience of womanhood for both female participants and Afghan women may have confounded results. If this were the case, then one cannot conclude that women are truly more likely to cross an intergroup boundary than are men.

It was expected for Study A that participants who were socially marginalised would be likely to have a greater number of past activist experiences, and would exhibit more outgroup solidarity than would those who were less socially marginalised. Further, it was expected that those who were more marginal would be more likely to endorse a multiple groups orientation than an individualist or transcendent ingroup orientation; in other words, that individuals with markers of social marginality (e.g., women) would perceive the social world as a place of embattled and competing social identities (e.g., women vs. men).

In fact, none of these hypotheses bore fruit. Participants' level of marginality was unrelated to past activism and to outgroup activism altogether, and higher marginality was not associated with any particular ingroup orientation. In addition, participants who were more marginalised exhibited *less* solidarity with outgroups than others. Although it had been expected that being in a more dominant social position would be associated with having less concern for social outgroups (empathy measures were also unrelated to outgroup solidarity), a closer interpretation may be that members of higher power groups may feel little reason to reward their own groups precisely because they feel less in need of such rewards. Further, it should be noted that the low modal scores on the marginality

index reflect differences mainly in terms of gender, in that women received higher scores than men simply due to their receiving a score for being women, given the small amounts of variation in the other index categories (e.g., race, sexual orientation, etc).

One implication of this finding is that those with more social power may, when faced with the dilemma of allocating rewards to either themselves or others, respond in a manner of *noblesse oblige* towards disempowered outgroups. In fact, the textual data accompanying the resource allocation measure bears this out: women, racial, and religious minorities commonly gave as reasons for their allocations their own membership in particular social groups (e.g., 'I am Jewish'), while those without denigrated social markers of race, religion or gender spoke in terms of group inequalities (e.g., 'The most oppressed'). Also, the overwhelming support for the Womyn's Centre by virtually all male participants may be due to the heightened visibility of the Centre on campus (as compared with other groups), thus raising the resource allocation scores for men, who in many cases would be less marginalised than women participants.

But why did participants' level of marginality not correspond to any criterion measures related to social activism? Isn't it reasonable to expect that women, gays and lesbians, and racial and religious minorities would have more reason to engage in, and therefore more experiences of, social activism? One possibility is that Study A mistakenly conflated demographic markers (objective group identification) with heightened political or group consciousness (identity salience). Not every woman is a feminist (not even all those who take women's studies courses). Not every racial minority is active in civil rights campaigns. And not every white, straight, Christian male is intent

on holding onto the reins of power. As Sanders Thompson (1999) has recently noted, group identification is not the same as identity salience, which she defined as “the importance of an identity in the definition of the self” (p. 748). In fact, Sanders Thompson found that the strongest predictors of racial identity salience were socialization with members of one’s racial ingroup and a history of discriminatory experiences. The present research did not take into account the strength of affiliation with other members of one’s social group, nor participants’ history of discrimination; in fact, it did not attempt to assess identity salience at all. Because of this, it appears that the hypotheses relating to marginality were based on essentialist assumptions that a particular consciousness is necessarily associated with a lower social status.

Moreover, the marginality index constructed by the researcher failed to take into account other ways that people can experience marginality, which is a subjective, rather than an objective process: “Being a member of a devalued group is not the same thing as identifying with that group” (Unger, 1999, p. 3). As will be demonstrated in Study B, there are many ways of constructing oneself as an ‘outsider’ that are unrelated to gender and race. People may be marginal based on statistical differences between themselves and their primary social group, because of their lack of power relative to others, or “because they have the psychological experience of never fitting in anywhere, of being without a niche, or of feeling unique” (Ostrove & Stewart, 1994, p. 289). It is likely that marginality needs to be measured more subtly than it was in Study A to take into account other ways that marginality is experienced; at that point, it might be possible to establish a link between marginality and outgroup activism.

Political Awareness and Universality

In Study A, political awareness was found to be correlated with both prior social activism and outgroup activism, as well as a significant predictor of outgroup activism, indicating that those endorsing a socio-political critique are more likely to engage in a social justice movement for an outgroup than those without similar political attitudes. Therefore, not only is a history of prior social activism related to the possibility of outgroup activism, but a critique about prevailing power structures is also related to a history of prior activist involvements.

While political awareness itself was not intended to assess *how much* knowledge participants had about political power structures, it did assess participants' *attitudes* toward prevailing power structures. Given that participants enrolled in human rights, conflict analysis, or women's studies courses were, unsurprisingly, more politically aware than other students, it follows that those with more political awareness also had more knowledge about issues. It is likely, therefore, that outgroup activists would, like any other social activist, possess knowledge about social issues, and have developed a critique of power structures.

A key finding in Study A centred on the notion of universalism or transcendence. It had been expected that a transcendent ingroup orientation (the sense of a "shared humanity", in Monroe's [1996] words) would be predictive of outgroup activism, as perceived intergroup social boundaries would be less important than for those who have strongly defined social boundaries (i.e., those who endorsed a multiple groups perspective). Further, it was expected that a transcendent ingroup orientation would be

associated with participants' placing importance on universalist values, which were also hypothesized to predict outgroup activism.

Although the ingroup orientation scales were not significant as either negative or positive unique predictors for either past activism or for outgroup activism, there was a simple correlation between transcendent orientation and both types of activism in the expected direction. Also, as expected, inverse relationships existed between an individualist orientation and prior social activism, and between a multiple groups orientation and outgroup activism, suggesting that the larger one's ingroup is perceived to be (i.e., having a transcendent ingroup orientation), the more likely it is that one will be willing to intervene on behalf of social outgroups. The implication of this finding is that the 'ingroup' is perceived as an inclusive, unitary collectivity rather than as an identity group in competition with other identity groups. A further ramification is that those who perceive the social world as comprised of multiple (competing) groups are unlikely to take part in the causes of outgroup members, because of strong intergroup boundaries and, perhaps, ingroup loyalties. And finally, an individualist orientation reflects an unwillingness to perceive oneself as a member of any social group, thus, individualists are unlikely to take part in any collective action at all. These patterns, while not reflected in the main analysis, were represented by the simple correlations.

One reason that transcendent ingroup orientation may have turned out to not be a significant unique predictor of outgroup activism is possibly because a redundant variable, universalist values, with which it was correlated, explained that part of the variance in outgroup activism. Placing high importance on universalist values, which are

described as an “understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature” (Schwartz, 1996, p. 3), was related to both past activism and to outgroup activism, and contributed (marginally) significantly to the explained variance in the final regression equation predicting outgroup activism, but not prior social activism. This suggests that a willingness to engage in political behaviours *on behalf of a social outgroup* entails a attitude of self-transcendence, which is related to conceiving of the social world in a universalist way.

Miville et al. (1999) have very recently hypothesized a construct called “universality-diversity orientation” (UDO), which they defined as:

...an attitude toward all other persons that is inclusive yet differentiating in that similarities and differences are both recognized and accepted; shared experience of being human results in a sense of connectedness with people and is associated with a plurality or diversity of interactions with others (p. 292).

This construct, developed through work in cross-cultural counselling, is meant to be applied at a community or intergroup level; “such an understanding of people would allow one to ally with others on the basis of similarities (e.g., commonness of being human) while at the same time being able to accept and value others for their differentness from oneself (e.g., race, gender, or sexual orientation)” (Miville et al., 1999, p. 291). The UDO construct appears to be another way to avoid the group solipsism endemic to identity politics, where the conclusion is that if a person is not a member of one’s (racial, gender, ethnic, sexuality, national, etc.) group, then that person is unable to understand one’s situation, and, by extension, should be excluded from one’s political struggle for equality.

However, building on research about racial identity in the United States (e.g., Cross, 1991; Helms & Carter, 1990), the UDO construct allows room for differences based on social group experience. Miville and Guzman have developed the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS), which recently tested as a reliable measure of 3 components of UDO, which are relativistic appreciation (“Knowing about the experiences of different races increases my self-understanding”), diversity of contact (“I attend events where I might get to know people from different racial backgrounds”), and sense of connectedness (“I often feel a sense of kinship with persons from different ethnic groups”; Miville et al., 1999, p. 307). Like the transcendent ingroup orientation scale used in the present research, the M-GUDS correlated with both the EC and PT subscales of the IRI measure of empathy (Davis, 1983) for white participants, and with positive racial identity for black participants. It is likely that had the M-GUDS been available at the time that Study A was performed, it would have been a more reliable scale for measuring intergroup similarities and distinctions than the ingroup orientation scales developed for the present research.

The lack of a relationship between outgroup solidarity, operationalized through the resource allocation measure, and most of the predictor variables was a puzzling finding. The only significant relationships with outgroup solidarity were, first, an inverse association with marginality, in that more socially marginal participants were less likely to allocate resources to social outgroups, and second, with sex, in that men were more likely than women to support clubs representing outgroups. Further, participants’ level of marginality was not related to any of the ingroup orientations; most specifically, it was

not related to a multiple groups orientation, as had been expected. The first finding, that more marginalized participants (including women) chose to allocate fewer resources to outgroups, may be explained quite simply by the fact that those who are more marginal may feel as though they have less to give, and may thus be more likely to allocate to their own needy groups rather than to those they perceive as more powerful outgroup members. Also, the sizable proportion of participants who chose to support the Womyn's Centre and the GLBT Centre (despite the fact that over 40% of the sample were men and over 90% were heterosexual) would have inflated the amount of outgroup solidarity among this sample, likely leading to questions about the validity of the measure of outgroup solidarity. In short, for those who were not marginalized in terms of social group status, there simply may not have been enough choice of ingroups listed on this measure that they could support.

In summary, individual differences on prosocial variables of altruism and empathy were not found to be implicated in decisions to commit to outgroup activism. However, some personal characteristics were found to be predictive of decisions to join in an activist alliance with an outgroup. Specifically, participants who were already social activists were much more likely to engage in outgroup activism than were those with fewer past experiences of activism. Also, although there were no sex differences in participants' prior experiences of social activism, women who were educated about social issues were more likely than men to commit to activist behaviours on behalf of Afghan women. Finally, two important attitudinal variables were common to outgroup activists: endorsing a critique of social power structures, which had a greater impact on outgroup

intervention for those with past activist experiences, and placing emphasis on universalist values, which reflects a concern with all humanity rather than only with ingroup members. These characteristics will be explored further through qualitative analysis in Study B.

STUDY B: INTERVIEWING OUTGROUP ACTIVISTS

Overview

While Study A was concerned with identifying the personality, personal history, and attitudinal correlates of a willingness to intervene politically on behalf of a social outgroup, Study B was interested in the actual experiences of individuals who are practising activists, people who are participants in social movements. At the core of both studies was a concern with the motivations to form activist alliances with outgroups.

It was decided to engage in a qualitative study of outgroup activists' motivations rather than examining the issue through survey or questionnaire methods in order to capture the anticipated complexity by which activists make meaning of their behaviours (Maracek, Fine & Kidder, 1997). Qualitative research methods are recommended when a researcher wishes to access patterns of interrelationship between multiple components of complex phenomena (McCracken, 1988; Rabinowitz & Weseen, 1997). Furthermore, the disparate types of activism, as well as the variety of organizations with which social activists are allied, might very well have rendered the devising of a standardized instrument nearly impossible. In short, a general overview of various types of outgroup activists was sought, rather than a particular type of activist (e.g., feminist; environmentalist). In addition, as outgroup activists had not to this point been identified or studied, it was determined that a detailed description of their experiences could provide rich interpretative data on which to base further research.

Having the opportunity to sample from two different populations for the two studies allowed the use of different methods in order to pursue different questions. Study

B's aim was to expand on the characteristics highlighted in the first study, and to take a closer view of social activism from a qualitative perspective by exploring phenomenologically the reasons that people may intervene politically for an outgroup. This triangulation of methods capitalized on the chance to complement a quantitative approach (which isolates and measures relationships among variables) with an interpretive approach (which allows meanings to be derived from participants themselves) in order to supplement what is known in the empirical literature on social activism. This was viewed as particularly important in light of the present research question, which presents intergroup activist alliances as a new topic for study.

Because Study B employed a community sample of social activists as participants, the following sections will first offer a brief history of social movements to provide a context for activist behaviours. The motivations for outgroup activism that Study B intended to explore, such as political ideology, morality, and social commitment, as well as the social contexts within which activism is currently practised will be outlined. Findings from other primarily qualitative studies on social activism will be introduced, and an overview of the qualitative research method used in Study B will be outlined. Finally, the results of Study B will be described; the major findings related to self-perceptions of activists, motivations for their activism, the rewards and benefits of activism, and a discussion of intergroup issues.

Social Movement Organizations: From Emotions, to Interests, to Identities

In order to provide an appropriate framework for a research study that has social activists as its topic, it is worthwhile to begin with a brief outline of the state of theorizing

on social movements and their adherents over the past two decades. As Vela-McConnell (1999) pointed out, social activism has been “the subject of much sociological and social psychological research under a variety of labels: ‘altruism,’ ‘prosocial behaviour,’ ‘helping behaviour,’ ‘volunteerism,’ and so on” (p. 145). More recently, political psychology has weighed in on studies of social activism as well. Each discipline appears to take a different approach to the study of activism; for example, while social theorists examine the role of cultural influences in social movements (e.g., Johnston & Klandermans, 1995), economists and some sociologists are interested in the organizational theory of social movements (e.g., Gamson, 1992). Social psychology and political psychology have tended to focus their attention on individuals’ activist behaviours, or the motivations for their involvement in social movements (e.g., Lee, 1997).

An early definition of social activism reflected the naïve assumption that all social groups had similar goals of justice; as Hessel (1972) wrote, it was “a process of deliberate group effort to alter community or social structures for the common good” (p. 29). Since the 1970s, however, the notion of a “common good” has become problematized, as post-colonial writers (e.g., Lather, 1991) have brought conflict to the centre of group relations and have questioned the imposition of dominant cultures’ view of “good.” A more recent definition reflects these concerns over the hegemonic imposition of values and standards, typifying social activism instead as collective, grassroots-based, oriented toward conflict rather than consensus, and aimed at direct action for disadvantaged groups (Pilisuk, McAllister, & Rothman, 1996). Thus, social activism is not to be confused with volunteerism, which is usually considered to be a

behaviour located at the individual, rather than the collective level. Thomas (1986) further distinguished between liberal social activism, usually associated with such issues as peace and justice, women's rights, and civil rights, and conservative social activism, focussing on law and order, pornography, and abortion. The literature on social movements tends to address those aimed at liberal social activist causes, as does this project.

Some political theorists have argued that all social movements represent marginalised interests concerned with inequalities in wealth, power, prestige and organization. For example, Lofland (1996) wrote:

Social movement organizations (SMOs) are associations of persons making idealistic and moralistic claims about how human personal or group life ought to be organized that, at the time of their claims-making, are marginal to or excluded from mainstream society . . . (pp. 2-3).

At the very least, suggested Lofland (1996), these claims are contested by the mainstream, requiring organization and mobilization in order to counter dominant discourse as to what constitutes a reasonable, moral reality.

The resource mobilization theory of SMOs was dominant in the 1970s and 1980s, and stressed that as grievances exist in every society or collectivity, grievances alone cannot be sufficient conditions for the rise of social movements, as was previously theorized. Prior to the resource mobilization theory, collective social action was thought to be precipitated by destructive and uncontrolled mass emotional outbursts in reaction to unjust situations (Gamson, 1992; Hercus, 1999). Resource mobilization theory directed attention away from the emotional and spontaneous precursors of social activism, and

toward a model of rational-actor decision-making. Under this theoretical construction, “...the availability of resources and opportunities for collective action were considered more important than grievances in triggering social movement formation” (Klandermans, 1987, p. 24). Resource mobilization theory, therefore, allowed room for a more social psychological emphasis on cognitive decision-making and the importance of costs and benefits to the individuals participating in social movements.

Consonant with the pseudoaltruism view of prosocial behaviour motivation (Batson, 1991), resource mobilization theorists argued that rational actors would not participate in political movements without proper incentives (Bettencourt, Dillman & Wollman, 1996). A problem faced by resource mobilization theory is that people sometimes participate despite the absence of personal incentives, and even sometimes when the chance of success is very slight. Further, the free rider phenomenon, when applied to SMOs, would predict that those who do not join will end up with same benefits from the movement as people who do (Lofland, 1996). If the same benefits – at no cost – are available for all, then participating in a social movement can be seen, from this perspective, as an “irrational” behaviour (Klandermans, 1997).

A further problem faced by resource mobilization theorists is that by emphasizing cognitive processes and rational choices, little attention was paid to the role of emotional responses to injustice as a motivator for social activism. Further, emotional fulfilment as a perceived benefit of involvement was neglected as well, while a functional, rather than relational view of activism was promoted to the chagrin of feminist researchers of social

movements (Hercus, 1999). In short, the resource mobilization theorists were criticized for having swung the pendulum too far towards reason, to the total omission of emotion.

New social movement (NSM) theory, developed in the 1990s, contrasted with resource mobilization theory by explaining SMOs in terms of anti-economic-growth, "postmaterialist" values, unconventional (often small-scale) actions, particular constituencies (those marginalized by modernization), and new aspirations (sustainability; self-actualization) (Thayer, 1997). NSMs tended to be organized at the grass-roots level, participatory democratic, and local, focussing on structural conditions that oppress particular constituencies (Klandermans, 1987). Rejecting state interference in daily affairs and personal lives, NSM activists resisted cultural domination: "...these movements struggled for the right to difference. Construction and defence of identity were central concerns" (Thayer, 1997, p. 387).

As Anner (1996) has noted, in this swing from resource mobilization to new social movement theory, SMOs turned their attention from away from *interests* and toward *identity*. Identity politics – one of the new social movements formed around one element of social identity such as gender, sexual orientation, 'race', ethnicity or nation (Sarup, 1996) – sprang to the forefront of the social movement field. Identity politics has been characterized as a "politics based on the particular life experiences of people who seek to be in control of their own identities and subjectivities and who claim that socially dominant groups have denied them this opportunity" (Sampson, 1993, p. 1219). Best exemplified by the women's movement, identity politics are often characterized by their emphasis on the perceived homogeneity of identity group members, and a clear

distinction, based on historical circumstances, between one group and another. This homogeneity itself has been a source of critique, however, as post-colonial criticism of the dominant “women’s movement” as a White, Western, middle-class movement with a liberal agenda has made clear (Lather, 1991). Further, the danger of assigning strong significance to social identity was that in placing too much focus on differences (between, for example, the lesbian feminist and queer movements), little chance was left for alliances (Lichterman, 1995).

Contrary to the political goals of many SMOs, entrenchment within small, bounded identity communities appeared to serve the interests of exclusion, rather than inclusion. Debates over the relative homogeneity of identity groups and their interests caused further divisions and weakenings of such collectivities. As a result, many began questioning the viability of locating social movements within the realm of identity politics, especially as the new-Right backlash separated the claims of many identity groups even further from the mainstream (Anner, 1996; Sarup, 1996).

The functional promise of alliances for SMOs was the potential for resource-sharing and a strengthened numerical base from which to make socio-political claims. Alliances between SMOs often benefit from ‘cross-over’ members. Cross-over affiliations of SMO members have traditionally been high; for example, a sample of 66 Dutch peace activists revealed linkages with 109 other SMOs (Klarndermans, 1997), suggesting that coalition-building between organizations may in at least some cases simply be a matter of sharing similar memberships. But for SMOs, the possibilities for alliances go beyond resource-sharing and expanded membership lists to an ideology of

connectedness between social groups. As Bishop (1994) wrote, "If we understand how and why some people choose to give up privilege and become allies, we will have an important insight into social change"(p. 12).

Politics, Morality, and Identity-Construction

Unlike experimental research into altruism and prosocial behaviour, which attempts to isolate and predict the causes of intervention under certain conditions, the qualitative study of prosocial and activist behaviours often examines the interplay between various influences such as identity, ideology, social responsibility and moral reasoning without attention to causal sequencing. Because of this emphasis on the interconnection between the characteristics of activists, their social context, and the motivations that are given weight by activists themselves, attempts at isolating the effects of single causes for activism is rare. In fact, some qualitative researchers have discounted the pseudoaltruism debate itself as disingenuous, claiming that it is not possible to separate out personal from collective motives for prosocial behaviour, because the distinction between the individual and the collective is socially constructed (Vela-McConnell, 1999).

Research findings from qualitative studies of those who intervene on others' behalf have shown that political ideology often does contribute to decisions to engage in social action, but so too does a sense of moral or social responsibility (Ostrove, 1999; see Cole & Stewart, 1999 for similar findings from a quantitative study). While ideology and morality may appear to be two very different constructs, in reality, researchers have had difficulty teasing them apart. Findings have not been entirely clear about the causal

direction of ideology (e.g., left/progressive vs. right/traditional), moral beliefs, and social activism (e.g., Emler et al., 1983). In light of this, qualitative research offers the benefit of allowing them to be explored in tandem.

Gross (1994) examined the interplay of ideology, personal variables, and level of morality (pre-conventional, post-conventional, etc.) in an attempt to understand motivations for rescuers' decisions to intervene. At the conventional level of morality, motivation for rescue was operationalized as adhering to social norms of fairness/obedience, and religious norms (fear of God, Christian obligation). Post-conventional motivations were operationalized as postmaterial norms around civic duty, civil rights, and social responsibility. Gross found the relationships to rescue behaviour were with social variables – for example, social and religious norms and collective responsibility – rather than with personal characteristics.

Teske (1997) also argued for a model of intervention that combined political, personal, and community interests. From a field study of social activists, he arrived at what he called the “dual theory of political motivation” (p. 74), asserting that it was not possible to separate moral, or community-interest motives, from self-interest motives for action. Teske labelled the self-interest variable in his research the individual's “identity-construction,” an expression of political interests that would remain dormant without an involvement in social or political causes. He added that “...the construction of one's very sense of self in politics is itself a moral project” (Teske, 1997, p. 74), emphasizing the interplay between moral and self-interest variables.

In the attempt to identify whether moral concerns or self-interest function as the primary source of social action, it is possible to lose sight of the way that these two possible motivators may work together. The following extract from Vela-McConnell (1999) highlights the process whereby his motivations for intervention changed over time from self-interest to community interest:

When I moved from home for college, I ended up joining a community action program and volunteering in a shelter for battered women and their children. I did not join because I felt that domestic violence was an important issue. I did not know much about it at the time. Instead I joined because I wanted to meet people and those in the community action program seemed like the kind of people I would enjoy getting to know. In other words, my motivation was one of pure self-interest even though it meant that I would be reaching out to others. However, my worldview began to change because of my experience... I was made more aware of domestic abuse – and not just the simple facts, but the everyday, lived realities. By viewing life from their perspective, my own point of view began to change (p. 13).

Just as the debate surrounding selfish versus selfless motives for prosocial action ignores the complex interplay between personal and community motives, the accepted dichotomy of “individual versus collective” has also been problematized by qualitative researchers interested in prosocial behaviour. Du Preez (1996), for example, addressed the way that theories of prosocial behaviour have been shaped according to the social-exchange paradigm, which operate solely on an individual level. He argued in favour of a stronger focus on culture and collectivities, wherein the social norms of morality are constructed:

There are many kinds of rationality and each rational calculation depends on the story into which it is inserted. The rational calculations of the martyr are different from those of the hedonist... The rationality of asceticism is different from that of consumerism (p. 565).

The specifics of culture and ideology ultimately shape theories of helping and prosocial intervention; therefore, DuPreez (1996) felt that a single universal motivation for helping others (e.g., genetic explanations; self-interest) was insufficient to cover every complex social situation.

While ideology appears not infrequently in political studies of collective action, the social psychological counterpart, prosocial behaviour, usually neglects this aspect as a motivating force altogether. It is rare that ideological motivations for helping are considered² because the dominant discourses of social-exchange and resource mobilization models are located in non-political individualism. Of course, this particular conceptual discourse itself furthers an ideological position, that of liberal egalitarianism which relies heavily on the presumption of equality in power relations. Yet in the realm of social movements, particularly identity movements, the foundational assumption is precisely one of inegalitarianism, or, more specifically, social and material inequities. As these forces operate on a social level, and activist responses often takes place on a collective level, it is important to explore the way that collective notions of ideology and morality, as well as individual decision-making play a role to activists' motivations for becoming politically engaged.

²

As Brydon-Miller (1997) pointed out, politics and psychology have rarely "mixed" in a way acceptable to defenders of traditional psychological research: "...it seems that mixing our politics and our psychology still presents a challenge to those of us in the field interested in applying our skills and training to addressing social issues, especially when that means working outside the bounds of tradition, quantitative research" (p. 657).

Relational Self-Construals and Confronting the 'Other'

If we are to take seriously the influence that group processes and social forces exert on individual activists, then it becomes important to acknowledge the relational context in which social activism occurs. Gamson (1992) believed that social psychology could offer to the study of social movements an analysis of solidarity and consciousness amongst members, processes which he described as:

how individuals develop or maintain loyalty and commitment to collective actors – that is, to groups or organizations who act carriers of social movements. Consciousness also involves a mesh between individuals and cultural levels... how the meaning that individuals give to a social situation becomes a shared definition implying collective action (p. 55).

In essence, Gamson thought that a true social psychological analysis of social movements and their adherents would focus on the relational aspects that draw members to each other both as individuals and as members of a collectivity, and further, how the collectivity itself would produce shared responses to social forces.

The relational aspects of social activism have only recently been studied, as the rise of NSM theory allowed for the return of both contextual and emotional factors in the study of activism. Because relationships with others are viewed as a large part of the female gender role, it is not surprising that much of the research on the relational aspects of activism have been produced through feminist qualitative research (e.g., Fine & Gordon, 1989).

Recently, Ostrove (1999) and Stewart (1999) both conducted life history interviews with politically involved women. Stewart described civil rights activist's Noma Genné's connection to her neighbours, other activists, classmates, daughters, and

her life-partner, while Ostrove's interviews with two women active in the 1960s protest movement led her to conclude that, "For both women, spiritual and moral convictions about how the world should be have sustained them, as have the personal experiences, needs and support of their family members, and relationships with others who have similar values" (1999, p. 224).

Irons (1998) also found that relational connections were important to women active in civil rights work, especially to African American women who were finding a place in a movement from which they had been previously excluded: "When avenues to the movement opened for Black women, through personal, grassroots networks, they found communities open to their opposition of racial oppression, communities in which they felt empowerment through activism"(p. 704). In fact, Irons found that women's recruitment to the movement took place largely through already-existing church and organizational networks. Woliver (1996) also noted that successful political mobilization is strongly tied to interpersonal contact with like-minded others, to the social aspects of group involvement, and to feelings of connection with a community. Empirical research reinforces these findings about the importance of connectedness; for example, those who feel most attached to a community tend to be most politically involved in social issues (Davidson & Cotter, 1989). Clearly, social networks and relationships with others play an important role in recruitment and maintenance of social activist involvements.

While the importance of relationships between members of a social movement collectivity has been established, what is less clear is the relationship between activists and the intended beneficiaries of their activism. This question is most relevant to activists

who form alliances with social groups across intergroup boundaries, who may have limited interpersonal contact with those whom they wish to benefit, and who often share profound demographic and circumstantial differences with members of the outgroup.

Much has been written in various feminist literatures on constructing the ‘other,’ both in research contexts (e.g., Fine, 1994; Naples, 1996) and in general social relations (e.g., Hill Collins, 1991; hooks, 1981). One outcome of the ‘othering’ process is that sometimes the others are at risk of being conceptualized as homogenous, exotic, or essentially different from a normative subject (Mohanty, 1991). Given that some of the activists interviewed for this study did, in fact, work on behalf of groups that can be viewed as “exotic” (e.g., East Timorese), it was thought that an exploration of how the outgroup is conceptualized by activists was warranted.

Vela-McConnell (1999) described the concept of the “collective other,” which requires assuming a worldview from the perspective of a different group of people. Such an abstract process, however, demands that individuals find a psychological way to concretize or humanize a representation of the collective other – often by grounding the experience of the other in an everyday experience or a personal interest. Vela-McConnell’s interviews with AIDS and homelessness activists produced the finding that feelings of compassion created a bridge between individual activists and the collective other: “By focussing on the concrete manifestations of the collective other, [the activists] have overcome its abstract and ‘invisible’ nature. In this way, they are able to grasp the societal dimensions of these social issues, transcending the divide between themselves and others...” (Vela-McConnell, 1999, p. 123). Empathy, role-taking, and moral

principles were all implicated in the achievement of overcoming the boundary between the activist and the 'other.'

Monroe (1996) included personal identity-construction as another important step in bridging the boundary between self and other in an intervention context. She argued that constructing one's identity as part of all humanity rather than as 'us (and our interests) versus them (and their interests)' builds a cognitive framework for moral political acts; further, this particular identity-construction results in a cognitive framework that allows one to perceive the choice to help as the only morally responsible behaviour. Self-perception in relation to others, then, is a key characteristic that leads to the moral decision to help (Monroe, 1996).

The implications of the above conclusions for a profile of outgroup activism are significant, because the possibilities are raised that first, activists may construct their behaviour as a 'moral project' rather than as an attempt to help. Second, the understanding of one's behaviour in terms of either self-rewarding or other-rewarding may prove to be an insoluble problem, or perhaps one with little actual relevance to activists. Third, the perception of a relationship with social outgroup members may be an important component in activists' motivations. Finally, reinforcing findings about universalism from Study A of the present project, it is possible that the perception of belonging to a social group that encompasses 'all humanity' – that is, the perceptual size of one's 'ingroup' – may be related to a commitment to political causes on behalf of a social outgroup.

Method

As one purpose of this project was to explore the first-hand experience of outgroup social activism, Study B consisted of open-ended semi-structured interviews with social activists. The aim of this study was to expand on the results of Study A to determine whether special motivations lie at the heart of outgroup activism; in particular, personal experiences of marginality, beliefs about relationships with others, and particular self-construals, and to explore other motivations for outgroup activism that are not represented in the literature.

Given the results of Study A on marginality, the present study attempted to examine, from a more subjective standpoint, the connection between personal experiences or feelings of marginality and an involvement with lower-status outgroups. Also, Study B investigated whether activists attributed their behaviours to religious, philosophical or spiritual motives, and further, to probe the meaning of 'costs' and 'rewards' in a social change context. Given that interactions between interdependent or collectivist-oriented people tend to be focussed more at the intergroup level (as opposed to the interpersonal; Triandis, 1995), representations of self-construal were also observed. Finally, the participants' intergroup consciousness, or their sense of intergroup boundaries between their own social groups and that of the 'collective other' was analysed.

Participants

Eight outgroup activists were interviewed, all of whom were engaged in social activism on behalf of different outgroups. Kvale (1996) considers interview saturation – the point at which no new information arises – to occur within five and 25 interviews.

Saturation is considered achieved when analyses yield no further new information or insights into a question of interest. McCracken (1988) noted that to achieve an understanding of the categories by which participants organize their social world, “it is more important to work longer, and with greater care, with a few people than more superficially with many of them. For many research projects, eight respondents will be perfectly sufficient” (p. 17). In the present study, as large amounts of data (i.e., long interview texts) were collected from each participant, the number of new categories being generated during analysis began to wane in the seventh and eighth interviews. At this point, it was considered that saturation on the original, limited number of thematic research questions had been achieved.

Prior to recruitment, the definition of the specialized sample of participants was formulated; the category ‘outgroup activists’ was limited to those who were working or had worked in a social change or social movement organization intended to benefit or empower a group of people with whom the activist did not share a primary social identity, or “first people boundaries” (Johnson Reagon, 1983). As Brink (1991) has noted, it is not uncommon for qualitative research projects to define a new ‘population’ of participants through the choice of a specialized topic of inquiry, and therefore the representativeness of the sample is often based on the researcher’s own decisions regarding the suitability of the participants for inclusion in the study: “The researcher must use his/her judgement, based upon the best available evidence, that the sample does indeed possess the characteristics needed for the study (in other words, ‘represents’ the population on some trait or variable)” (p. 170).

The activists included in Study B were recruited from a variety of sources, including informal networking within the activist community, and making cold calls or email contacts to organizations that specialize in outgroup efforts. The snowball, or chain-referral method (Brink, 1991; Teske, 1997) was used as well, wherein interviewees suggested the names of other potential participants after debriefing.

Materials

In surveying the literature on qualitative research methods (e.g., Fine, 1994; Kvale, 1996; Mishler, 1990; Mostyn, 1995), it became apparent that there existed a range of perspectives on how to structure and conduct interviews, ranging between two extremes. The first extreme position is that testable hypotheses must be fully articulated before the interviewing begins (e.g., Mostyn, 1985), and the second extreme, represented by the grounded-theory approach, allows hypotheses to rise (rather than fall) from the interview data (e.g., Rennie, Phillips, & Quartaro, 1988).

As initial hypotheses have, to a degree, already been deduced (i.e., fallen) from the literature on prosocial behaviour, social activism, and intergroup relations, Study B sought to explore possible motivations for outgroup activism from a middling position. Certain ideas formulated theoretically (e.g., personal experiences; self-other constructions) were brought to bear in the research interview through the use of a semi-structured interview protocol, which still allowed open-ended opportunities for research participants to impart other information outside the researcher's expectations.

The research themes and questions focussed on the experiential component of activism, in that activists were asked to reflect upon and interpret the meaning of their

behaviours. This emphasis on the phenomenology of activism was purposeful; Study B was intended to capture activists' own understandings of their motivations for being involved with an outgroup. Activists' narratives and interpretations, therefore, provided the data for analysis. Like Mishler (1990), this study was not concerned with possible "distortions" in participants' accounts that could threaten the reliability of their interpretations, but instead an interpretive paradigm was settled on, wherein the intent was to gain an "understanding of how individuals interpret events and experiences, rather than assessing whether or not their interpretations correspond to or mirror the researcher's interpretive construct or 'objective' reality" (Mishler, 1990, p. 427).

The interview protocol was structured to cover five main themes: (a) background information about participants' involvement with social activism (e.g., organizations in which the participants had been active), (b) participants' own view of their motivations for engaging in outgroup activism (e.g., role of empathy or personal experiences), (c) the social situation surrounding their activism (e.g., involvement of friends and family), (d) relationship to and/or perspective of the social outgroup (e.g., similarities with outgroup), and (e) the personal meaning of activism (including the role of emotions). The interview protocol was refined with the aid of one pilot interview conducted in the Fall of 1998, after which the pilot participant was encouraged to give feedback as to the appropriateness of the questions. Research questions and themes were translated into actual interview questions (as per Kvale, 1996), and are found in Appendix F.

In the interviews, participants were asked to reflect on issues that likely do not arise in their day-to-day activist experiences. More than one participant told the

researcher that they had anticipated more “objective” questions during the interview, such as their opinions on actual social issues, rather than an exploration of their own motivations and ways of making meaning about their behaviours. Regardless of this slippage in understanding between anticipated and actual intent of the research interview, the questions posed by the researcher appeared well-received, and did provoke a number of digressions which were mutually of interest. It should be noted that the interview protocol was not in all instances a helpful device. One interviewee in particular took little notice of the questions actually put to her, and instead spent nearly three hours constructing a narrative of her life in social activism in some great detail, thereby imparting much information that was of value to the study, but along perhaps more unconventional lines. Overall, it was found that the younger the participant, the more easily was the interviewer able to direct the structure of the interview with the use of the protocol.

In addition to the interview protocol, the other instrument used in this study was a Demographic Questionnaire (see Appendix G) in which the participants were asked to record or describe their age, sex, socioeconomic position, marital status, sexual orientation, etc. This information was not identified by participant, although considering the small number of interviews, the researcher was able to identify the participant through these demographic forms.

Procedure

Participants were initially contacted by either telephone or e-mail, depending on the contact information the researcher had available to her. After having made introductions and explanations of how the researcher had gotten his or her name, the theme of the study was described to the potential participant. In some cases, this person was no longer involved in outgroup activism, yet was able to provide the researcher with the name of an activist who was. If this contact person was, in fact, interested in participating and fit the criterion of an outgroup activist, arrangements were made to meet for an interview. Potential participants were made aware during the initial contact that the interview was for the purposes of a doctoral dissertation, would likely take in excess of two hours, and would be tape-recorded. Verbal assurances of confidentiality were also given at the pre-interview stage.

In-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with activists at a place and time convenient for them. Three of the interviews were conducted in private office space at Carleton University, and the rest in the homes of the participants. Prior to the interview, an informed consent form was described and presented for signatures (see Appendix H). Following this, the demographic information form was presented along with a large manila envelope, and the participant was asked to fill out this form and place it in the envelope and seal it. This was done in order to assure the participant that the researcher would not be privy to any personal information about the participant before the interview was conducted. At this point, when the participant was ready, the tape recorder was started and the interview proceeded. Written notes were also taken in a notebook

during the interview in order that the researcher would have some record of the interview in case the tape recorder failed.

Interviews lasted between one and half and two and a half hours each. In a number of cases, the time spent with interviewees exceeded three hours, as participants invited the researcher to share a cup of coffee or tea after the interview. In one case, the interview lasted most of an afternoon because the participant's infant needed tending several times during the interview, at which times the tape recorder was turned off for a period, then resumed when the participant was once more free to proceed. In other cases, relatives and children arrived during the interviews, at which time the researcher suggested suspending the questions and answers for a short while until privacy was re-established.

Once the interviews were finished, the researcher presented the debriefing form (see Appendix I) and also verbally described the research in more detail. The debriefings in many cases led to further lengthy discussions with the participant, often about the social issue and organizations they were involved in. However, as the interviews were by this time completed, these discussions were not recorded for research use. Offers were made to the first three participants to send a copy of the transcribed interviews back to them as a method of gaining validity for the data, and to promote co-authorship in the research discourse by opening the opportunity to add or delete comments according to the principles of Participatory Action Research (McGuire, 1987), but as the first three participants declined to do this (citing time problems and a lack of interest), this principle was abandoned in further interviews.

Results

Working with the Data

The transcripts were not officially verbatim transcripts, as pauses and other minor speech markers were omitted by the transcriptionist on the researcher's request, as it was not the intent that a discourse analysis be pursued. The tapes were re-heard immediately after the interview, and interview notes were augmented with ideas about possible categories contained within for future analysis. Interview tapes were professionally transcribed in batches of two or three, and as soon as the transcriptions were available, the researcher compared the written transcription to the audio tape. Minor adjustments were often necessary to the transcriptions, especially in cases of acronyms of organizations.

Ongoing analysis continued while more data were collected. Overall, interviews were read and re-read approximately 25 times each as different layers of analysis occurred.³ The qualitative data analysis software NUD*IST (Richards & Richards, 1994) was employed as an aid to indexing data points (text or meaning units) from the interviews, in searching transcripts for terms or string patterns, to make research 'memos' (theoretical comments, connections, and ideas), and to do basic content analyses (e.g., text searches, reference counts, etc.).

³

This is known in qualitative research as the constant comparative approach, whereby the process of analysis moves slowly through meaning units (pieces of text) both within each account, and later, in comparison with meaning units in other accounts (Rennie, Phillips, & Quartaro, 1988).

Levels of Qualitative Analysis

Although grounded theory methods were used to analyse the interview data (e.g., giving multiple readings; coding, categorizing and subcategorizing; clustering and uniting categories, etc.; Rennie, Phillips, & Quartaro, 1988), this study was not considered a grounded theory project because its intent was not the generation of a unified theory; rather, an exploration of some key hypotheses relating to social activism and outgroup activism was the aim. Although there are a myriad of different numbers of analytic levels that can be applied to qualitative data, depending on one's approach (see, for e.g., Brown, 1997; Glaser & Stauss, 1967; Miles & Huberman, 1989), this study used four levels of analysis which closely corresponded to Maxwell's (1992) typology of validity in qualitative research. Maxwell paralleled the issue of validity of qualitative findings to different levels of understanding, the first four of which were descriptive validity, interpretive validity, theoretical validity, and internal generalizability.

Descriptive validity refers to gaining an accurate account of behavioural events. It is a type of "reportage" that presents an unproblematic and undisputed first-person history (Maxwell, 1992). Accordingly, the first level of analysis in Study B consisted of coding information that was narrative and descriptive, and took a within-subject approach in that each participant's interview was treated as a single set of data separate from each other participant's interview, and was not analysed in comparison with other interviews. This level focussed mostly on coding behavioural events pertaining to the "four Ws" in each interview text: Who, When, Where, and What. In short, this first level of analysis focussed on background information, behaviours, involvements, chronology, and simple

causal statements (e.g., “My husband had been posted to east Africa, and I went along”) in the context of the participant’s life history.

The descriptive analysis focussed on the details of individuals’ narratives or life histories (Mishler, 1990). From this overall story of a life, with activism given foreground, general meanings were eventually inferred, and prominent narrative themes (e.g., social responsibility) for different participants arose. These narrative themes emerged solely from the life descriptions of the participants, but not necessarily from their attempts to make meaning of their activism. The themes were arrived at through coding each interview individually, and searching for internally consistent themes marked by emphasis and repetitions. As McAdams (1993) wrote,

We are all tellers of tales. We each seek to provide our scattered and often confusing experiences with a sense of coherence by arranging the episodes of our lives into stories. This is not the stuff of delusion or self-deception. We are not telling ourselves lies. Rather, through our personal myths, each of us discovers what is true and what is meaningful in life (p. 11).

The second level of analysis was aimed at uncovering and decoding respondents’ answers to the two main research questions: why is this individual an activist (rather than a non-activist), and why has this individual chosen to work on behalf of an outgroup? In this phase of the analysis, the researcher worked closely with interpretive or psychological aspects of the texts in order to move toward an understanding of the participants’ own explanations for their activist behaviours, thereby taking an emic, rather than an etic approach. Maxwell’s (1992) application of interpretive validity is relevant to this process, as he described a type of understanding that is “concerned with what these objects, events, and behaviours *mean* to the people engaged with and in them... I include

intention, cognition, affect, belief, evaluation, and anything else that could be encompassed by what is broadly termed the ‘participants’ perspective’”(p. 288).

The interpretive level of analysis emphasized the participant’s own explanations, which were first coded into general categories (e.g., family influences, peer influences, books and ideas, experiences, moral beliefs, etc.). The participants’ own words formed the titles of the categories, so at this level the analysis was still very much data-driven. At this point, an indexing system was developed, and the researcher began to integrate the participants’ explanations with the themes developed earlier through the first-level narrative analysis.

The third phase involved looking behind participants’ words to arrive at conclusions about general themes as applied to particular ideas, and reflects Maxwell’s (1992) theoretical validity, the point in the process where understanding “goes beyond concrete descriptions and interpretation and explicitly addresses the theoretical constructions that the researcher brings to, or develops during, the study” (p. 291). Memoing (Richards & Richards, 1994), a process of making comments on and relating text to particular theoretical ideas, was the main method in this level of analysis, as was the beginning of unifying or making connections between categories that had been generated by the data. In this third level of analysis, the researcher took a much more active and reflective role, as the categories begin to be index-driven rather than simply driven by the words of the interviewees.

The fourth and final level of analysis was the point at which the research project itself took a role in imposing order on the hitherto developed chaos. The original research

questions again resurfaced, and were compared against the categories and memos generated through the first three levels. This phase combined previously generated categories to form larger, subsuming themes encompassing personal narratives, participants' meaning-making, and the researcher's own memos. The constant comparison method was ubiquitous at this point in the analysis, as individual participant accounts were no longer viewed as unitary narratives, but the meaning units contained therein were fully cross-indexed with those in all other texts. This process is, in some ways, akin to Maxwell's (1992) idea of internal generalizability, in which a researcher begins to question to what extent findings may be common among members of a specialized community (in this case, outgroup activists). It is important, at this point in the analysis, to be aware of the ways in which the data have *not* fit nicely into coded categories; in other words, for the researcher to remain critical and self-reflexive (Rabinowitz & Weseen, 1997; Thorne, 1997).

During this final phase, any index category that had generated only a few data points or comments was abandoned in order to return the whole system back to the research questions and decide on what was relevant to the project as a whole. This process has been described as "determining the most central, or core category... that is mostly densely related to other categories and their properties" (Rennie, Phillips, & Quartaro, 1988, p. 144). To illustrate, at the end of the third analytic phase, 47 major categories had been developed through coding and text searches, with subcategories totalling to 197. At the end of stage four analysis, the major or "root" index of categories had been reduced, through parsimonious cutting or judicious combining, down to four

major categories. These categories are Self as Social Activist; Main Motivations; Us and Them – Thoughts on Ingroups and Outgroups; and Giving and Taking – Cost/benefit Analyses.

Participant Characteristics

Interview participants ranged in age from 20 to 64 years (see Table 8 for interviewee characteristics). Four women and four men participated in Study B. In terms of national background, five were born in Canada, one was born in the United States, one in Pakistan, and one in England. All except the American were living in Canada at the time of interviewing. Five were either Christian or of Christian heritage and no longer practising; one was a non-practising Jew, and one was a practising Muslim.

Table 8

Self-report Characteristics of Interviewees.

Participant Pseudonym ⁴	Age	Sex	Highest Level of Education	Ethnocultural Background	Social Class	Activist Outgroup
Ashmir	20	M	Some university	Pakistani	Student	East Timorese
Gilly	32	F	Grade 12	White Canadian	Poor	AIDS movement
David	34	M	Graduate degree	Jewish/Norwegian American	Middle	Latin Americans
Jean	64	F	University degree	White Canadian	Middle	Poverty rights
Helen	54	F	University degree	WASP	Middle	African women
Kevin	57	M	University degree	Anglo Canadian	Middle	Women's rights
Susan	60	F	Some university	British	Middle	Refugees
Gord	39	M	Grade 10	White Canadian	Working	Native rights

⁴ Pseudonyms were assigned by the researcher for two reasons: first, more than one participant had a distinctive given name; second, two participants had identical given names.

A diversity of social class backgrounds was represented by participants in this study, ranging from a single mother collecting public assistance, to a full-time university student supporting himself through student loans and part-time work, to a working-class labourer, to several who were comfortably middle-class. As for the activist groups whom these activists supported, some operated on the local level (e.g., the poverty rights advocate worked on a very local level in an adjoining neighbourhood), and some on the international level (e.g., a breast-feeding activist whose primary involvement had been with women in Kenya). In terms of personal situation, five of the eight were working either part-time or full-time in occupations unrelated to their activism, while one was retired, one was on social assistance, and one was supported by a spouse. It is notable that four of the eight had been trained as teachers, although only one had ever worked as a teacher. Four of the eight were married or living with a partner, and four were divorced. Six of the eight had either children or step-children. One participant identified as a lesbian, and the others as heterosexual with the exception of one participant who identified as “straight - so far.”

Themes

Self as Social Activist

As the interviews were intended to explore the phenomenology of participants' activist behaviours, the present analysis paid attention to the ways in which notions of ‘self’ were constructed in the context of social activism. As Triandis (1989) has noted, individuals tend to sample different selves in different contexts. Each participant spoke variously of the ‘self’ in terms of both an individual self, reflecting the idea of oneself as

an independent, autonomous actor, as well as of the self-in-context, encompassing environmental surroundings such as friends, family, and social arrangements.

Dialogue on the 'self-as-individual' theme focussed on issues such as experiencing a stigmatized position because of their activism, or feeling like an outsider to their primary social group. These ideas often reflected a type of self-construction that posited the activist as a "lone voice" for social justice. Another notable aspect of the self-as-individual theme was the subject of strength, which arose regularly; strength of will, and strength of commitment were commonly referred to in the context of self. The labels that participants lived with, or resisted, also pointed to an independent self.

The "self-in-context" theme often took the form of exploring the participant's position within the activist community or in a social movement organization, the roles they played in those groups, and their feelings of affiliation with like-minded individuals. The contextual, or interdependent self, was often summoned in descriptions of and beliefs about the ideal of community. Finally, the self-in-context theme was raised in discussions of how activists viewed the way their actions would influence others in their environment, especially their own children.

Individual self. The ways that participants talked about their involvement in social causes at times underlined their view of themselves as "rugged individuals," set apart from others. The forwarding of this independent self (Triandis, 1994) was marked as being in opposition to what was seen as prevailing norms and values. By positioning themselves (by virtue of their political activities) at the margins of mainstream society, in many cases they set up a heroic mythology which included instances of being arrested,

having an RCMP file, being intimidated by government officials, and being indirectly involved in running weapons to rebels. All of these instances served to reinforce the notion that several participants defined themselves as self-reliant individuals making, in some cases, risky choices.

It was apparent that most of the respondents felt that one risk of engaging in outgroup activism was being shunned by the larger community, or experiencing less power, prestige, or financial privilege than other members of their ingroup. The young Ashmir, speculating on the way that social activism may affect his future, remarked:

A lot of times I question myself. I ask, where are you going? You're going to end up like a homeless bum somewhere. Then another part says that I won't because I sort of have a unique place, and I'm a driven person and I've achieved a lot in my life. I'll be okay. It's [degree of activism] a personal choice for everyone. Some people are more scared than others. I'm not scared. I know I'll be fine.

Ashmir appeared to be facing the fact that a strong commitment to social change is rarely financially rewarding. As a university commerce student, his immediate environment was comprised of people planning their futures in such a way as to reap financial rewards; he noted his apartness from them. However, he also emphasized that the decision to engage in activism was a personal choice he had made, and implied that his own values were not tied to fearing financial insolvency. In the context of Ashmir's life story, this is quite captivating, as his own history includes being part of an immigrant family that struggled to succeed in Canadian business, often, according to Ashmir, by exploitative means of which he disapproved. In this sense, he also saw himself as existing outside his own family's values. Ashmir spoke of confronting an elderly relative with his social justice values, and of being rebuked by the relative. In many ways, then, Ashmir's activities

threaten his membership in multiple social identity groups, as his position in university, his family, and his religious community become more perilous.

The topic of feeling at odds with one's primary social group arose in other interviews. The ways in which participants felt like outsiders to their own group varied according to each's own personal history; for some, the perception of being an outsider had persisted since childhood, while for others, it was perceived as a direct consequence of their immersion in activism. Jean, for example, underscored the differences she had long noted between herself and others, and based her understanding of these differences in explanations of social class:

Well, I was always an outsider. Partly temperamentally. I mean, aggressive girls are not... usually perceived very well. First, I went to a school where I was a total outsider. I wasn't picked on, I was just such a completely different animal that neither the teachers nor the kids knew what to do with me.

Jean, a poverty rights advocate, attributed her outsider status while growing up to her family's being part of the "poor intelligentsia," where money was spent on books and music, but never on extravagances such as new clothes or home furnishings. It was not the poverty but the intelligentsia component that made her an outsider in the poverty-stricken community her family resided in.

Gord, on the other hand, constructed his personal self as conventional and "normal" until the time that he weighed heavily into Native rights issues. Until that point (which came suddenly), he had been marginally involved in the environmental movement, but not more than he perceived a typical student would. As he said,

Mostly I was a university student, with everything that goes along with that. You know – studying for exams, pulling all nighters, looking for love and fun and sex and beer. I was quite typical, as a student. But yeah, I did get involved with some [activist] things. With the people I was hanging out with, it was just normal. Expected. Not that unusual.

However, after Gord's initial experience with a Native leader (which triggered his involvement in Native issues), his self-description turned from "typical" to "a crank": "So that's my role [as a Native activist]. I'm paying attention. I'm yelling about it, and so what if they think I'm a crank. This is bigger than me." When asked if people did think he was a crank, he responded, "Yeah, some do. Even some Natives think I'm a crank. They don't trust me, they want to know my motives." In essence, Gord was setting himself in opposition to those who questioned his involvement, but saw himself as holding a unique set of values, and being committed to a vision of justice which he pursued regardless of the opinions of those in and outside of the movement.

Other activists constructed their personal selves as residing outside the norms for their ingroups. For example, Kevin, an activist who had been involved in a great number of outgroup causes throughout his life, described himself thus:

I live in the top 2 or 3 percent income bracket...And there's a part of me that says, that's wrong. Or there's a part of me... I don't know. My point is, I still feel like an outsider in the midst of the establishment I'm part of. I mean, I'm a white male who has means. And I don't feel like I belong there, in a way.

Having grown up without a father, surrounded by girls and women in the 1950s, further served to make Kevin feel disconnected from other men. He noted that "as a boy, I didn't have the instincts for a good fight," and he believed that put him outside of male

affiliation. However, Kevin, like other participants, believed he had developed a certain strength that allowed them to live comfortably with his ‘apart-self.’”

Helen, who worked with African women to resist infant-formula corporations, talked about the reaction of others to her activities. Of her marital relationship, she said,

I think it intimidated my [then] husband a bit to see how powerful women can be. I would come home and talk about these amazing women and what we had done and I had developed some very close friendships there with women. And we weren’t by any means rabid, but we were also not to be messed with. I think that intimidated him.

These constructions of self as separate from the norms or expectations of the primary identity groups, therefore, appears to have bolstered participants’ reliance on themselves. In construing oneself as apart from the norm, a personal strength was achieved, but by no means was it always celebrated. Kevin, in particular, spoke explicitly of seeing himself as a “hero,” but added, “And I wish I could divest myself of that. It’s really tormenting at times. I’m in terribly difficult straights right now with 50 angry farmers who are threatening to close my business because I’m threatening the status quo...”

A final way that self was constructed in an individual sense was related to the labels that participants chose to identify with. The Western independent self typically eschews labels in order to achieve a sense of uniqueness (Marcus & Kitayama, 1995). In this small sample, the respondents covered the range from the innocuous (e.g., “volunteer”), to the extreme (e.g., “radical”), but most respondents problematized the use of labels altogether. In trying to describe his commitment to Latin American solidarity and other left-wing political movements, David showed caution in choosing his labels,

pointing out that “‘Activist’ is sort of like ‘feminist. It’s a moveable feast.” He attempted to contextualize the meaning of various labels in an American political climate, explaining that it is difficult to identify as a socialist in the US, where “some rabid McCarthyite is saying, well are you a socialist.... and what they mean by socialist is a sort of combination of Hitler, Stalin and the devil.” Both he and Jean preferred to present their definition of self as activist as being bound up with their behaviours, rather than with a label. As Jean said about a woman who replied “I’m just a volunteer” when asked what she did for a living: “I didn’t ask you who paid you, I asked you what you did!” And Gilly, when asked whether she considered herself a social activist, simply responded, “I am a voice.”

Self-in-context. While it was clear from the male participants, especially, that an independent self may serve to bolster self-reliance while engaging in unpopular or risky activist behaviours, the female participants appeared more willing to embrace an interdependent self, and to paint their involvement in social activism as part of a collective effort. The interdependent self, commonly associated with collectivist cultures, emphasizes its sense of belonging and connection to others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

It should be noted that not all male participants resisted an interdependent self, nor did all female participants resist constructing an independent self; rather, these selves appeared interchangeably throughout discussions. As an example, Kevin was quick to point out that his role in one organization was a rather commonplace one, not at all associated with heroic quality: “I was the plumber. I looked after about 120 units in terms of electricity, heating, plumbing locks and keys.” It is perhaps notable that Kevin, who

identified as a feminist, was much more willing than other men in the sample to speak of his caretaking roles in organizations (as well as within his family) while at other times advancing views of himself as participating in a heroic struggle.

For the most part, however, the women activists spoke not so much of playing caretaking roles in organizations as in connecting with others and forming communities. Even the language used by women to describe their activities indicated more of a connectedness than the men. For example, Susan described her many activist involvements by saying, “The student Christian movement plugged me into the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament. I was a peacenik from the late fifties on . . . I was plugged into that network from the very beginning.” By contrast, Kevin gave a similar rundown of his background in activism, but using different language: “In the early fifties and sixties I was raising money for SNCC. Because an activist came to our church and I was president of the youth club and she represented the kind of integrity I found really amazing.” And Gord’s description of his early involvement similarly places his own self at the forefront: “I was mostly just very visible at the blockades and the protests. The media were always interested in the white guy who was at these things – they always head straight for the one white guy.”

The self-in-context promoted by the participants often took the form of viewing the self in relation to a community. Susan spoke at length of how her vision of community surrounded most of the political activities of her life. For example:

One day when my children were young.... I met a woman, and she was involved in pre-school playgroups in the area and she immediately drew me into a community that was right in the little area where I lived. And I realized then, what a

difference. At this point I had already lived in London for three years, perfectly happy, but I realized the difference it made just to walk down the street and meet people that you knew and just stop for a couple of minutes and chat here and there. . . . And it changed my whole idea of what it meant to live in a community. And from then on, because I have done a lot of moving since then, and wherever I would move to I would not wait to be found, but I would immediately look for a community group.

Gilly described her early months in the AIDS movement as being very difficult emotionally, but also, to her surprise, “so much fun. You became part of a community all of a sudden.” Later in the interview, she added that while being involved in activism had certainly been responsible for generating personal changes in her life, the main reason she became involved was because “It changes the whole scenario. It makes it more of a community. And that’s what we as a society needs is more of a sense of community, a sense of belonging, of having an obligation to, and being owed something from society.”

One cannot conclude, on the basis of four interviews with men and four with women, that women activists’ understandings of their activities are more related to an interdependent self than men’s understandings. However, one interviewee herself attributed a sex-difference explanation for women’s roles in community organizations. In describing the process of community empowerment, Jean said

The other side of community empowerment is community abuse. You constantly have to watch out for people who are trying to use it as a base for various kinds of abuse of power. It’s surprising how few men can handle it. If they haven’t got the skills . . . they usually haven’t got the skills to handle the power of a community. Whereas the women know more about working together. They’re much better at it. And so their socialization is more useful.

A final way that participants displayed the self-in-context in regards to their activism was related to their sense of influencing those around them to take responsibility

for social action. Every participant who was a parent spoke of providing a role model for their children. Helen, for instance, said about her sons that “I would be very unhappy if they didn’t make a contribution in some way.” Gilly spoke of her baby daughter:

“Especially since I’ve had her, I’ve wanted her to grow up in a world where she knows she has to contribute.” Kevin also referred to his children, saying, “I’ll be goddamned if I haven’t left behind the best message I can possibly leave for my sons to pay attention to. Whether they actually do anything with it or not is their business.”

In summary, participants variously invoked the themes of self-as-individual and self-in-context, depending, at least in part, whether the activist was male or female. Self-as-individual statements were often related to being in opposition with the values and standards of their primary social group, and reflected an awareness that outgroup political efforts set the activists apart, in some way, from their peers. In addition, the resistance to using labels to define themselves, and frequent references to personal strength suggested that the construction of an independent self was related to feeling marginalized by their social ingroup, whether as a result of their social activism, or because of other reasons.

The self-in-context theme was particularly prominent in participants’ reflections about communities and their place in a community. Also, an interdependent self was advanced through discussions of relationships with others involved in social movements. Finally, frequent references to participants’ hopes of impelling others, especially their own children, toward a life of community activism reflected the idea of an interdependent self that is influenced by and, in turn, influences others.

Main Motivations for Activism

Although it was not possible to reduce participants' explanations of their motivations to a single categorical theme, a number of recurring themes regarding motivations did arise. Some of the self-ascribed motivations given by activists were more descriptive, including recounting the initial triggers that sparked their involvement, while other motivational explanations were more causal, focussing on their fundamental reasons for being an activist and continuing to be an activist.

The descriptive explanations – those dealing with 'triggers' for involvement – focussed largely on people and circumstances. In fact, the analysis of triggering motivations turned up the theme of inevitability more than once. Further, given that actors are always making decisions based on their environment, it is not surprising that the influence of others such as friends, parents or spouses also played an important role in triggering initial involvements.

Some activists provided quite thoughtful explanations for what motivated them to enter a life of activism. A few engaged in psychological speculation, focussing on early experiences, family impact, and even birth order effects to explain their commitment to social justice causes. Most, however, referred often to a system of beliefs and values which at times encompassed philosophical doctrines such as anarchism, and at other times spiritual convictions such as the interrelatedness of all beings.

Triggers. The first type of trigger for initial involvement was the influence of friends and family members on decisions to engage in activism. For example, Ashmir

noted that “Once I started university, I sort of went through a personal revolution. All my ideals changed. I attribute that to certain people and maybe more information being available.” Gilly, who spoke of finding herself in the AIDS movement almost by accident, said that her commitment to the movement was strengthened upon becoming friends with a central member of the movement:

G. was the centre of everything... He touched everyone he met. He was such an incredible person. And when he died, it was like the world fell apart. The [organization] probably lost a dozen volunteers because he was so important to so many people, who at that point just said I can't do it anymore.

After the death of this community leader, however, Ginny's resolve intensified and she became more involved in her activism.

Susan, who had some interest in international politics earlier in her life, discovered an outlet for activism through her spouse: “It was marrying somebody who was very, very politically oriented. He eventually did a bibliography on left-wing movements in Canada so he provided me with the books, anything I was interested in.” As a further testament to fortuity, Gord vividly described a demonstration against clear-cutting that eventually became the focal point for his Native solidarity activities:

It's cold, and raining heavily. Pouring. . . We were going to set up our tents on the logging road for the next day, and block the trucks and machines so they can't get in. God, it was wet and cold and miserable. And there were about 30 people there. That's it. And I remember thinking, if I didn't love this woman, I wouldn't be here.

It was during this uncomfortable and rather unsuccessful demonstration that Gord met the Aboriginal man who impassioned him to become a Native activist. There is in this account a semblance of accidental-ness that leads the analysis toward the theme of

inevitability. In more than one case, a fairly random meeting or circumstance propelled participants toward the path of activism. Gilly, for example, described her own circumstances:

After I got divorced, I really wanted something to do to occupy my mind. And I went to the Volunteer Bureau and they were no help at all! But I don't remember who suggested it, but I called the AIDS Committee of Ottawa, and they just happened to have a training session coming up.

At another point in the interview, Gilly laughingly said that during difficult times in the AIDS movement, she wished she had taken up the Volunteer Bureau's original suggestion to become a Brownie leader.

Helen spoke of her own experience in Kenya of being told by a maternity nurse that her infant son would become ill unless she bottle-fed him with infant formula. This experience spurred her to join an existing group that provided information on breast-feeding to local women. But it was a particular event that mobilized this group into social action:

We heard through the grapevine that they had called in the national representative from Nestles to write the code on the banning of breast-milk substitutes. So, this was it. This was what we had been saving ourselves for, to be around that table which included the Kenyan Bureau of Standards and the Nestle Corporation. And then, ourselves.

Hence, the people and events attributed to triggering their initial involvement in social activism were most often described by participants as fortuitous and circumstantial, rather than as imbued with metaphysical or fatalistic meaning.

Causal motivations. In the above cases, it is apparent that seemingly-random circumstances spurred some of the participants to begin to take action. Their earliest

activities are described in terms of being reactive to such events, rather than stemming from long-term planning.

But in other cases, it appears that long-held principles and beliefs prepared the activists to be ready for such events. As Kevin noted, “Look at my record [of involvement in many causes]. I’m like a moth to a flame. I don’t feel happy unless I’m connected.” In other words, he attributed his motivation to a way of being, or a personality characteristic. In fact, it was Kevin who referred the researcher to a book entitled *Born to Rebel* on the effects of birth order and community participation.

Morals and a sense of social responsibility often answered the question of why these activists continued their efforts, in some cases, over a life-span. During the interview, Ashmir struggled with the problem of cultural relativism as he talked about East Timor and Burma. He concluded: “I can understand what their suffering is and that they’re being taken advantage of by those in high places or Western powers. That I can understand, that I know to be wrong, and that I can oppose.” Gord described his long-term involvement in Native issues by saying “It’s the right thing to do. It’s the truth as I see it.” However, at other times, both of these participants struggled with the idea of moral absolutism, and appeared to have difficulty maintaining consistency on questions of right and wrong. As Ashmir added a little later, “Who’s to say if anyone’s right. It’s a matter of belief and ideals.” David spoke of his beliefs and values contributing to his political activities, as well as his own suitability for such a life: “Why don’t I run over animals in the road? It’s a social responsibility. It’s just something I’ve always done. I enjoy it. I think I do it well. I think it’s something that needs to be done.”

Others spoke of possessing a well-developed sense of right and wrong. For example, Helen spoke of having this sense from the time she was a little girl, yet added that it made it actually more difficult to work with people at times: “It’s when things come down to right and wrong, it’s very difficult to find a middle ground.” David was less equivocal, stating that for him, the decision to work for justice for Latin American people “is totally a moral decision. If most Americans faced the truth about how they [Latin American people] have been treated by this nation, ... they’d be out there too. There’s no choice any longer, once you admit the truth.”

Altruism as a motivator was not endorsed by any of the participants. Their responses to a direct question about the significance of wanting to ‘help others’ was invariably negative. Helen’s reply was characteristic: “I think the altruistic motivator is old-fashioned. I think it goes back to the British Lady Bountiful, and it just doesn’t stand up anymore from my experience.”

Instead, when asked to explore their own motivations, participants appeared to prefer focussing on issues related to their own individual development: family histories, personal experiences, and their subsequent pointing to psychological explanations for their behaviours. It is likely that the older and better-educated participants, who were more practised in terms of thinking about psychic cause-and-effect, as well as having had a lifetime of experiences to reflect upon, were more vocal in offering psychological explanations than were other participants. Helen, for example, speculated that she felt a need to actively engage in social justice and community-building because of an unsettled childhood. She said, “I wonder if moving a lot through my childhood and youth required

me to fit in and fit in and fit in again, you know.” Ashmir pointed to the fact that at some point during his life, his family situation changed drastically: “Our financial situation went from very high to very low. And I found out things about my Dad and the way he conducted his business. . . And the guilty feeling you get, because all along you took advantage of it, then you find out later it wasn’t quite right.” David also referred back to his childhood, psychologizing his early experiences:

I have this theory that because I was odd, I was an intellectual, skinny kid with glasses, played the violin – definitely not popular. Picked on in junior high school. That could contribute to a dislike of injustice. I think so. I’d like to think that that is the case.

With regard to motivations, it would appear that moral beliefs and a philosophy of social responsibility counted as explanations for why activists engaged in the activities that they did. Furthermore, some of the participants made sense of their behaviours through introspecting about their personalities and early experiences, drawing links between instances of being in awkward or marginal positions, and responding to community need. The actual events that triggered activists’ initial involvements, however, appeared to be rather random, resting largely on unplanned circumstances and people who spurred them to act on their beliefs.

Us and Them: View of Outgroups

This analysis was concerned with the manner in which participants viewed the outgroup on behalf of whom their activist efforts were concentrated. Given that the activists in the sample were involved with a diverse range of outgroups, representing different dimensions along which they were outgroups to the activists (e.g., gender,

nationality, sexual orientation, social class, etc.), there was not a consistent view of outgroups across all participants. Evidence was found that some participants engaged in a universalist viewpoint, in that they perceived fundamental similarities between themselves and outgroup others; however, there was also evidence that participants acknowledged differences between themselves and members of the outgroup. Furthermore, not all participants displayed a perception of outgroup members as belonging to a social group per sé, but spoke rather of the personal interactions between themselves and individual members of the targeted group.

Universalism. Many participants acknowledged that they perceived few differences between their primary group and the outgroup, save for circumstantial matters. Ashmir, when asked to describe the Burmese, East Timorese, and Afghani people on whose behalf he has attended dozens of meetings and demonstrations, replied: “We’re all human beings. They’re not different from me in any consequent way.” He noted the main difference between Canadians and these others lay in the levels of oppression and opportunities for self-determination experienced by each group. Gilly said simply of her early experiences in an AIDS organization: “There wasn’t a difference between the people who were actually working, and the people who were classified service-users. A lot of times you couldn’t tell who was who.”

Other participants, especially those from whom a narrative theme of spirituality had emerged, applied a metaphysical understanding to the idea of universalism. For example, Susan, a Quaker, said:

Some Quakers hold that there's a God in everyone. I wouldn't use the term God. I would use the shared energy that holds us all together. That we are all one, and not just human beings but all forms of life and everything.

On a more practical level, she spoke of her knowledge of the refugees she had worked to resettle in Canada:

They have had the guts to organize themselves, get out, get to here. . . They were often the middle-class, they're the same people as ourselves, from these other countries. Some of them were activists, they're highly educated often, not always. But they were the activists there.

Jean, a woman who is comfortably middle-class, found that what separated her and her ingroup from the poor was entirely circumstantial: "What sets them apart from others is simply, they lack money. . . And many of their problems are invented for them, by those who try to help." In other words, many of the differences between her own group and the poor were, in fact, in Jean's view, manufactured by the middle-class, perhaps to put distance between them.

Other participants focussed on the ways in which they personally felt a connection or similarity to the outgroup members they worked for. For example, when Helen described her activities by saying "The focus of that [breast-feeding promotion] work was very much on what's going to make it the best for our kids. All our kids," she was clearly including herself in the group that would reap benefits from her organization's efforts. In her case, she found that the experience of motherhood or parenthood was a common thread.

While acknowledging that different realities exist for highly stigmatized groups compared with high-status groups, some participants reflected on the way that they

themselves fit into the sub-culture of an outgroup. In fact, more participants talked about their position in the outgroup than about the ways that outgroup members tried to fit into activists' often more high-status groups. Kevin, speaking of his experiences working with low-income African Americans, said: "I think our identities and values are very similar. When I go to a ghetto, I feel very at home. I mean, they may not let me feel at home with them sometimes or ever. But it's not a barrier to me." When asked whether he found the people he had met in any way interesting or 'exotic' because of their circumstances, he answered emphatically: "No. No. No. No. No."

David also talked about how he felt while in the environment of the outgroup, although he betrayed some ambivalence about being part of the outgroup culture: "I'm pretty comfortable [in El Salvador], even when I'm there to visit for lengthy periods. But there's no question it's a hard place to live. You get sick all the time. You have to worry about getting killed. . . But even if you got rid of all that, the cultural differences are significant."

Gord, on the other hand, felt more comfortable in the environment of the outgroup than in his own "white" community: "Part of the year I live on reserve, I work construction for band council. I feel at home there. I don't feel at home living in a city, or among Whites or with my family." Gord, however, also acknowledged that Native people did not or could not experience the same level of comfort in a non-Native setting due to inequalities and stigma. His description of the role he played in Native organizations made it clear that the main similarity between himself and Natives was in their shared goals for equality and justice for Aboriginal people.

Acknowledging differences. Despite feeling or believing in a sense of connectedness between social groups, all of the participants had had enough practical experience to acknowledge that, in fact, real social divisions existed between themselves and members of the outgroups they worked with. It appeared that everyone in the sample encountered these separations in different ways, such as being careful not to ‘speak on behalf of’ any particular group, or feeling intimidated by the struggles they perceived outgroup members to have to contend with. Jean was blunt about the difference between her and the poor:

I’m not poor, I can’t pretend I am. But the injustice of how society deals with the poor! They’re the best money-managers we have. They have to be. Yet we persist in trying to teach them how to budget. Now, middle-class people who cry poor, they drive me crazy.

However, Jean focussed more on individual instances of differences, than group differences themselves. To illustrate the differences between members of her own social class and the poor, she told the researcher about a scene she witnessed between two women making posters at a planning meeting for a political demonstration:

The middle-class person immediately fell into the middle class ‘this is the way you do it.’ And I just watched my low-income friend pull back.... [The middle-class woman] was not being pushy, she was not being aggressive. She was simply using skills that she had that were part of her breeding. You make posters this way. You’ve been making posters since you were in high school. This is the way you do it. [The low-income woman] came from a background where she was never one of the ones who made posters.

Helen also spoke in interpersonal terms of the disparities she noticed between herself, as part of the expatriate community in Africa, and the Kenyan women she worked

with on the anti-Nestle project. She found that personal connections were hard to forge between herself and outgroup members:

It was very, very difficult to have Kenyan friends. A Kenyan, at an equivalent professional level was certainly not at an equivalent monetary level. And so to be socially reciprocal was very difficult for them. You know – ‘come on over for dinner.’ It didn’t happen.

Not all participants initially encountered lower-status outgroup members with reactions of empathy or respect. Kevin described being forced to confront his own social position and his assessment of others when as a student he first engaged with an outgroup through a literacy project in low-income communities across Canada:

That was my first time out of the Glebe. It was a real eye-opener. And all of a sudden I was surrounded by alcoholics, Metis people and, we didn’t have the word then, but guys in their late thirties who were suffering from post-traumatic stress, they were vets from the second world war who would never re-integrate... All I thought at the time was that these were wackos.

Gord, who believed his connection with his primary outgroup was through a set of shared goals for Native justice, talked about his awareness of being part of a movement that wasn’t necessarily his: “It’s the bloody least I can do! Look, I’m giving myself to their struggle, yes. Like they gave how many of their people so Europeans could make this their nation. I’m giving them myself.” In Gord’s view, the differences between his situation and those of First Nations people became the foundation on which to base a reciprocal arrangement; he felt his group had taken from *them*, so he would reciprocate by having them use *him* in their struggle for justice.

Activists often spoke about ingroup-outgroup differences in terms of exercising caution over imposing their own group values, norms, or language. A number of

participants highlighted the dangers of ‘speaking on behalf’ of the outgroup. Helen, for example, described her role in various organizations as someone who brings a particular skill set, but will not make decisions for an outgroup:

It’s not me going in and doing it and getting all the ducks lined up and then saying, okay, it’s your job to keep them in line. It’s me going in and saying, how many ducks have you got around here? And what do you want them to look like, and what do you need to maintain this flock once I’m gone.

Gord echoed this theme of maintaining a ‘hands off’ role in terms of decision-making:

“My role is to take orders from the leadership, from the chiefs and the elders. If they say stay, stay! Then I should stay.” And Ashmir spoke explicitly about how he exercises caution when speaking publicly about the East Timorese to guard against outgroup homogeneity:

One of the biggest lessons that I’ve learnt, and I’ve been guilty of this, is to speak on behalf of someone without actually speaking to them. This is a situation where you have to be extremely careful. Because I don’t believe in any way that you can speak about someone without actually finding out how they feel, how they think. And in a case like East Timor, where I have spoken to a few people, what I’ve gathered from them is that the whole community of East Timor has one thing in common. Even though they have sixteen different ethnic groups, they all do have one thing in common. They want self-determination, and they want Indonesia out. Knowing that, I can describe them in such a way, but no further.

Although participants acknowledged that they themselves were not part of the outgroup they worked for, and at times expressed that they had joined in a struggle that was not directly theirs, still an indication of universalism arose in interviews. At times this was a philosophical or spiritual belief in the interconnectedness of people, while at other times it took the form of strong assertions that only circumstantial realities separated activists’ ingroups from the outgroup members. It would seem that many

activists was quite aware of the need to avoid homogenizing the outgroup, and expressed caution about imposing their group's values or norms on the outgroup, displaying a sensitivity for the differences that they did acknowledge to exist.

Giving and Taking: Cost/Benefit Analyses

The final analysis concerned participants' insights into the question of altruism. In essence, the question they faced was whether their activities were purely selfless, intended solely to benefit another⁵, or whether they themselves benefited in any way from their activism.

The response was unequivocal: all participants acknowledged that they also benefit from their social activism, and further, were much more easily able to list ways in which they themselves benefit than the ways in which outgroup members benefit from their actions. As Helen responded, when asked to think of who benefited from her actions: "You've got to put me at the top of the list!" Even with no prompting, a number of participants spoke glowingly of what they perceived to be the personal rewards of involvement in particular organizations; with further questioning about who else benefits, most were able to give rather specific responses.

However, if activism were all about rewards, no doubt the activist community would be much larger than it is. The participants in this study were also easily able to list the costs – to themselves – of their social activism. Although overall, participants felt the

⁵

Which is the formal, social psychological definition advanced in textbooks; see, for e.g., Alcock et. al, 1997.

benefits far outweighed the costs, in quantitative terms, the sample as a whole itemized a sacrifice for every payoff.

Benefits to self. The primary benefit of being involved with a social movement organization, according to the participants, was social interaction with others, both activists and outgroup members. A number expressed that they truly enjoyed being connected with other activists or with international people. Many had made close friends as a result of their involvement, and that acted as a motivating factor to continue their work; in effect, a subgroup of activists apply social norm pressure to keep one another in the movement. David said, “I enjoy it. I like the social aspect of it. I enjoy accomplishing something, or working together with people on something that is common to us all.” Jean noted, “It’s the relationships that are the primary rewards.” Gilly observed that when she became involved in the AIDS movement, she felt she had found a community which would accept her: “The most important people in my life are part of the AIDS movement. The majority of people I’m close to are [HIV] positive.” Because of this, she believed that her involvement had enriched her life: “People wonder how you can be involved with such a depressing thing, and you make it clear it’s not all depressing. It’s not all about people dying. There’s something affirming about it.”

Other participants spoke about gaining a sense of purpose from their activism, or of the ways that activism provided meaning to their lives. Gord said, “I do have a sense of satisfaction. I have a purpose in my life. And many people don’t,” once again setting himself in opposition to those who are part of his non-Native identity group. Helen said of her present involvement with local community groups, “It’s right for me because I get

so much back out of it. I remember when I was first recruited ... my husband said, and is it going to get you a job? And I thought, what's that got to do with it!" Many participants framed the question of "who benefits" according to a cost-benefit equation, indicating that this was something they had previously given thought to. Susan, among others, was quite explicit that "helping" or "giving" was an act that showed up on both sides of the accounts ledger:

The people who are truly happy doing this work are getting as much as they're giving. There always has to be that equation and gradually over a lifetime you learn that the act of giving, and I think Jesus probably said something about this, giving is a form of love and it comes back to you.

Among the positive things that participants viewed as "coming back to them" included not only a sense of purpose, but also satisfaction with one's achievements, and some framed this in a way that spoke to their feelings of self-efficacy. Gilly, for example, who said that being an activist was a "huge" part of her self-identity, also noted:

It was a really, really good thing that happened in my life. It's given me a lot of strength, a lot of purpose, a lot of self-confidence, and a lot of pride in myself. Because this is something that is hard. It's really, really hard. But I can do it.

Most respondents noted that for various reasons, participation in a social movement is a challenging endeavour. Balancing out the skills, knowledge, energy and time that such a challenge entails, however, is not only satisfaction with accomplishments, but also personal learning, growth, or improvement. Gilly added, "It's made me so much better than I was before," speaking to another benefit of giving time to the AIDS movement.

Others noted that various forms of self-improvement acted as a payoff to the time they gave to social activism. Ashmir talked about the skills he gained from being

involved in organizations: “It teaches you discipline, time-management ... even how to organize a conference.” Helen noted that her participation was “...a way of being the best that I can be and at the same time help people be the best they can be at whatever it is they’re doing.” And both Kevin and Susan spoke of the opportunities to travel and learn about the world and other cultures in their activist work.

A final benefit that was frequently referred to was the perception that other people had of participants, of their reputations being enhanced by their community participation. For example, Ashmir recounted how he enjoyed telling his friends about some of his activist exploits such as sleeping in a freedom camp on the street, because “they get a kick out of it, all the things I’ve done.” Similarly, Helen said that her children “think it’s kind of cool that I do these things, that I’m involved in these ways.” A perhaps more serious sentiment was expressed by Jean, who said that “Being loving is a pretty good recipe for being well thought of.” She then added, somewhat self-consciously, “It’s a neat trick if you can really do it.” As these examples illustrate, the bolstered reputation enjoyed by participants were experienced mainly by close others, rather than casual observers. Interestingly, “getting a reputation” was considered as often to be a cost of activism as it was a benefit, because in many cases, participants spoke of being considered negatively by other members of their primary ingroups. Ashmir, for example, said that his family exerted pressure on him to spend less time being an activist: “... the idea of ‘what you’re doing is useless. Stop wasting your time. You should be studying.’”

Costs to self. While a number of the self-benefits of participation in activism remained somewhat nebulous (such as ‘satisfaction’ or ‘purpose’), the costs were fairly

clearly explicated by participants, who were able to offer very tangible examples like money, intimidation, and criminal records.

Nearly every participant spoke of costs in financial terms, although a few noted that their observations were merely objective – in other words, they didn't subjectively *feel* as though they had lost anything by forsaking monetary rewards in favour of other rewards, but they were able to reason that their lives would have been more financially profitable had they focussed their attentions elsewhere than on activism. For example, when asked if there were any personal costs to the life she had chosen, Jean responded, "Not with my value system." Then she immediately added, "But we would have been better off. Every so often I do the arithmetic, if I'd been a school teacher..." This sort of ambivalence about financial costs was echoed by David, who noted about his work with El Salvadorans:

I probably have gotten as much out of them as they have gotten out of me. In a way. I mean, okay, I haven't earned a dime in terms of the work I've put in. But in terms of the things I've learned, who I've become, you know, the experiences I've had. I'd stack that up any day with the money I've raised for them, the ads I've put in the paper with my own money, all the political work...

For some of the participants, the financial losses associated with spending unpaid time devoted to social justice work seemed to be accepted as simply a part of life. It appeared that Kevin even took a certain pride in saying, "With a wife and two kids, we lived on less than \$54,000 for that whole period [16 years]. I mean, living communally, and living in India, you could live on \$200 a year. You could, and we did."

Along with monetary disincentives, loss of time was also frequently mentioned as a personal cost of activism, especially for those who also had paid employment. Helen

noted this by saying, “Sometimes you think, oh God I’ve got another board meeting which is going to go on all afternoon. Just in terms of time, you know, you get very limited.” In fact, Helen spoke of the ways that her commitment to social activism affects both her time and her finances:

I have literally limited my ability to earn a living by one week a month. I have certainly lost [business] opportunities because I’ve said I’m not available this week, I’m in Ottawa, I can’t go anywhere. And I made that decision because the cost to me of making a commitment to an organization and then not being able to be there is emotionally horrendous. But I’ve given my word that I will be there for an organization, and then I’m not and it drives me wild. So I said okay, what’s the bottom line here? Am I going to do this, or am I not?

In addition to these costs of activism, other equally tangible problems such as arrest and intimidation were described as having arisen for the participants because of their decisions to be involved in organizations. However, most activists did not construct these other costs as ‘problems,’ for the most part, but as natural byproducts of being involved in often-unpopular activities. To illustrate, Susan described what she called an “indirect cost” of her years of involvement with left-wing causes:

I just read in an article, how to apply for your RCMP files and I decided to do it. So I’ll find out soon. But... at times we knew we were being watched. Because all our friends were Communists, the leaders of the Communist party were our close friends. So we knew. It never bothered us, oh no. Because we had heard these horrendous stories of how our older friends had been imprisoned and had all their papers destroyed and everything else. We got off easy, really.

Similarly, having been arrested and sentenced to a jail term for blocking a logging road was not portrayed by Gord as a daunting experience; he appeared off-handed as he said, “I’m not too caught up in my own life, my career, my prospects. I haven’t got any prospects. I’ve got a criminal record.” Kevin appeared equally blasé about threatening

letters and phone calls he had received as a result of involvement in activist causes: “I’ve had this habit of being heroic and applying it to any situation that comes up and boy, you really have to pay for it now. You can’t just walk in and change things and get away. You’re here for life. This is your home. No escape, chum.” However, many activists appeared more concerned with the outgroup on whose behalf these ‘problems’ had been incurred. Helen, who stressed that “certain people” were pleased to see her leave Kenya, nevertheless noted, “They [African women] had the most to lose. They would be forced to lose their jobs, they were being pressured to change their views, to stop speaking out against the companies. They really put themselves on the line.”

Thus, the respondents were able easily able to recount both the benefits and the costs to themselves of being involved in activism, and some explicitly formulated these in terms of a cost/benefit equation. However, this type of ‘rational actor’ discourse was also balanced by their willingness to confront the emotional aspects of their involvement. For example, both David and Gord spoke of the anger that maintained their desire to seek social change, while others spoke of hope and the happiness brought by small victories. Kevin spoke of the importance of expressing emotions to overcome male gender roles in his continuing efforts to support women: “... and to deconstruct the socialization of Western masculinity was like WOW! Look at this! Kissing another man, my God! Or sharing your innermost feelings with people that you normally compete with.”

Helen, who wept twice while talking about the perilous circumstances of Kenyan women with whom she had worked, laughed when asked about the role of emotions in her activist work. She retorted, “What do you think? I’ve cried through half of this!” and

proceeded to list the many emotions connected with the day-to-day features of community organizing, including frustration, pride in accomplishments and sadness. Gilly, also, spoke often of sadness, especially in terms of grief over those who had died of AIDS. She described her role in an annual memorial service held by an AIDS organization:

... you read the names of the people who have died in your community. And I'm the one who keeps track of everyone who died. Just because that's a huge part of my grieving process. I have on my calendar . . . I have every person I've known that's died, and the year they died, because I know at least once a year I'll remember them. And that's it, that's part of me. I don't like the thought that someone could die and never be remembered.

In summary, while activists were quite ready to speak about the costs and rewards of their involvement, it was not clear that this actual 'accounting process' explains why these people have become, or why they continue to be activists. While a readiness to engage in cost-benefit analyses may seem indicative of a cognitive process, activists were equally willing to speak about the emotional byproducts of their involvement. Confusion, anger, fear, satisfaction, and joy were all mentioned as either emotional outgrowths or contributors to their activism.

Discussion

Overview

Study B attempted to gain a phenomenological understanding of the motivations for being involved in political efforts on behalf of a social outgroup. This study intended to obtain, through qualitative interviews, information related to activists' histories of involvement in a variety of social movements, their own views of the role of altruism and personal experiences as motivators for their behaviours, the social context in which they advocated for an outgroup, and their perspective of the 'other,' as well as their own perceived role as a member of a social ingroup. As the data from the interviews were analysed according to the principles of grounded theory analysis (Rennie, Phillips, & Quattaro, 1988), other major themes became part of the findings as well.

Self-Construals

The main findings about the self revealed that participants variously constructed themselves as both an individual self and as a self-in-context. The individual self became salient when participants were outlining the ways in which they felt marginal to their primary social groups; for example, when discussing their opposition to prevailing social values, or choosing behaviours that were commonly viewed outside the social norms for their groups, or when explaining their choice to engage in high-risk activist behaviours. This is consistent with Triandis' (1989) notion of the individualist, who perceives ingroup norms as relatively unimportant and holding less validity, and with Markus and Kitayama's (1995) independent self, whose actions are made meaningful by reference to one's own internal standards. Evidence for the independent self included a disparaging of

others' perceptions, references consistent with heroic mythology, and a propensity to resist taking on labels, but rather to define one's self by behavioural manifestations.

It appeared from the small sample interviewed that men were more likely to construct the self as an individual, although both men and women relied on this particular self-representation at times. This self-as-individual reflects the independent self described by Triandis (1995) as a hallmark of Western culture: an autonomous person self-defined according to unique characteristics, and reluctant to unquestioningly follow social norms. Interestingly, Oliner and Oliner (1988) also found in their sample of Holocaust rescuers a tendency toward unconventional behaviour, and a downgrading of customary social norms. Further, it has been demonstrated that the development of an ideal self is dependent on engaging in actions consistent with a particular moral identity (Hart, Atkins, & Ford, 1998). In a rare interview study of one White woman who was heavily involved in civil rights work in the U. S., Stewart (1999) noted that the activist experienced feelings of alienation from other White people in her community. It is possible that those who choose to become involved in outgroup activism, especially as a life-long practice, as was true for most of the present sample, are people who are to some extent alienated from their group or community, and feel they have less to lose in terms of self-presentation, but more to gain in terms of achieving the ideal self.

At other times, and even within the same participant, the self was constructed as interdependent, a self-in-context. This interdependent self appeared to value a sense of community, as well as having a role in a community, and to advocate that others engage in community activism as well. The interdependent self was evident in women more

often than men; some (e.g., Cross & Madson, 1997) have argued that women's self-construals in Western societies tend to be more interdependent than independent, reflecting a desire to "maintain relatedness and connectedness with close others" (Cross & Madson, 1997, p. 17). However, all participants demonstrated strong evidence of the self-in-context in describing the relationships they formed as a result of their activism, and the effect of their behaviours on others in their environments. For example, every parent expressed concern that their values would be picked up by their children, and when asked about the rewarding aspects of their involvements, noted the friendships they had made. These concerns signified the development of a relational identity (Paul, 1994), which in some ways parallels the interdependent self common to collectivist cultures.

Another indicator of the self-in-context was repeated reference to the meaning and importance of community, which was presented as an ideal outcome of being involved in social justice. In fact, there appeared to be a connection between being a member of a community and experiencing self-transformation, as in the case of one participant who talked about having become a better person as a result of being accepted into a community of people working in a social movement. Morgan (1998), in a study of Mexican women activists in a social change group called the MYD, also found that participants had discovered a new sense of self after being involved in high-risk activism.

She wrote:

One thing is clear; for the individual women involved, there is no going back to exactly the way things were before the MYD was founded. . . They have become important members of the activist community and have organized political protests, documented election irregularities and confronted the state about human rights. Their self-definition has changed. . . (p. 534).

Horvath (1999), also, noted that one outcome of involvement in social activism is personal change, which is related to the social environment of an organization: “Social expectations and support are environmental factors that moderate or help to actualized the potential for empowerment of individuals or groups” (p. 224). Others (e.g., Davidson & Cotter, 1989) have found that a feeling of belongingness to a community increased the likelihood of continuing in social change efforts. Overall, then, there is evidence that the self-as-individual, or the independent self, may be useful for dealing with the feelings of alienation from a primary social group; however, the self-in-context appears related to personal change, a concern with relationships, and beliefs about the function of a community.

Motivations

The motivations for activism were presented as of two types. One was the set of triggers that initially spurred participants to become involved in activist behaviour, and often involved chance meetings or events, or were presented as ‘accidental.’ It was suggested that for some, an air of inevitability surrounded their early forays into activism. Stewart (1999) has written about the role of “serendipity” in women’s lives – discontinuities based on chance or circumstance – and argued that more agency than is usually credited accounts for what is often construed as serendipity. This may also be the case with the present study: as participants emphasized the significance of others and of circumstances to their own actions, they then downplayed the decisions they made, or the importance of moral sympathies they already harboured.

The other type of motivations was more agency-driven, and was presented by participants as comprising the causal explanations for their actions. For instance, some activists spoke about the role of their personal experiences and personal beliefs, while others gave credence to deterministic psychological explanations. Moral beliefs in right and wrong, moral imperatives to be on the 'right side,' and personal values reflecting a need for individuals to take social responsibility were common motivations. Reflections about personal development, such as the influence of birth order on adult personality, were also called upon as motivations, as were other psychological explanations such as feelings of being marginal to a primary identity group.

Evidence from interviews in Study B suggested that political beliefs about social justice were more commonly associated with participants' feelings of having a moral commitment to social change than were religious beliefs. In other words, it was demonstrated that a moral commitment can be about politics rather than spirituality or metaphysics. Activists tended to frame their actions from a political position when discussing morality, rather than from a religious position, and conceded connections with a variety of political groups. Amongst this sample of activists, then, ideology arose as an important component of motivations.

Altruism and the 'Selfish Maximizer'

A desire to help others was not supported as a primary motivation by any of the participants, although several communicated a sense of moral responsibility to others, or to a community at large, which may be seen as a form of altruism in a collective, rather than an individual sense. It should be noted that as a result of recent influences from

international development models, it is not considered particularly sensitive to express desires to ‘help’ members of oppressed social groups; such discourse appears condescending, a product of colonial thinking in which ‘helping’ is a liberal practice of exposing ‘them’ to ‘our’ solutions (Long & Long, 1992). Therefore, a type of normative social influence may explain why participants were wary of talking about ‘helping’ anyone except themselves. However, some participants did name empathy, particularly perspective-taking – the ability to cognitively understand the circumstances of others – as a motivation for their actions. Interestingly, emotional empathy, the feeling of “walking in another’s shoes,” was a topic that was avoided by participants in Study B, as it also seemed to be implicated in the maligned or seemingly-insensitive practice of “speaking on behalf” of others.

The resource mobilization theory of social activism, which promotes the idea that the rewards of political involvement must exceed the costs to individuals, was given some credibility in the present study. The activists did convey an awareness of cost/benefit ratios, but in an unexpected manner. Although most expressed that qualitatively, the benefits outweighed the costs of activism, quantitatively, they were more easily able to enumerate specific sacrifices that go along with their activism. However, a commonly off-hand manner of enumeration suggested that participants placed more value on the benefits than on the costs. These included quality-of-life issues to which they clearly attached importance, such as enrichment, self-improvement, and purpose in life.

On the ‘expense’ side of activists’ ledgers were listed their reputations, time, money, and criminal records, to which they seemingly assigned less importance. It appeared that although participants could easily engage in a rational actor cost-benefit analysis, it was unclear whether they did so because this truly reflected their own cognitive process, or because such an analysis is a deeply-entrenched part of the culture in which they reside. In other words, this willingness to engage in equations with the researcher may have reflected prevailing discourses, rather akin to their unwillingness to construct their behaviours as ‘helpful’ – merely because it is, or isn’t, commonly done. One participant talked explicitly about wanting to “sacrifice” himself for others, which conforms very well to the classic definition of altruism. This participant’s rational-choice equation was illustrated by his attempt to balance the harm done by his ancestors through his own good deeds in the present. In general, however, the interviewees did not only communicate the perceived costs and rewards of activism in cognitive terms. While the costs tended to be tangible things such as time and money, the rewards appeared to related more to emotional satisfaction, personal meaning, and personal growth, which are more intangible.

Hercus (1999) has recently written about the role of emotions in collective action, and maintained, based on interviews with feminist activists, that anger and other “active” emotions are important motivators to political involvement. She also noted that activism, for her participants, was seen as an outlet for emotions which are perceived as being deviant for women. While none of the participants in Study B spoke about emotions

being perceived as deviant, they did allude to the importance of emotions such as grief and anger as motivators to continuing to be involved in difficult political work.

Marginality and Outsider Status

Although Study A's attempt to discover the effects of social marginality on decisions to ally with outgroups was unsuccessful, Study B was able to examine the subtle ways in which people construct themselves as marginal. The qualitative results point toward the conclusion that subjective marginality can create a psychological possibility for an interest in social justice issues. Other recent research (Unger, 1999) has shown that some forms of concealable personal stigma – being Jewish, for example, or having a working-class background, or having a non-obvious illness or disability – may be related to a commitment toward social change, a process called “positive marginality” (Mayo, 1982).

In Study B, of seven participants who spoke extensively about their childhoods, three used the same word, “outsider,” to describe themselves. But every participant in Study B described themselves in terms consistent with feeling marginal: being in a family whose values did not match the values of neighbourhood families; being the son of a single mother; being, as a girl, too smart and outspoken in school; moving cities constantly as a child; being an “intellectual, skinny” boy who “played the violin” rather than participating in sports. This construction of oneself as an outsider, therefore, entailed deviating from gendered social norms, family social norms, and normative cultural values, and to experiencing some type of social disapproval commensurate with the perceived rule breaking. While the type of social disapproval associated with an

individual challenging norms may not be comparable to that faced by members of socially disadvantaged groups, there is a similarity in that deviance and stigma are functions both of the marginalised individual, and the marginalised group. As Unger (1999) described,

Stigmatization was originally defined as the process of responding to a person in terms of some psychically negative or socially undesirable characteristic he or she possesses. A stigma was defined as a trait that intruded itself on our attention and prevented the person who exhibited it from engaging in normal relationships with others (p. 2).

Thus, it appears that some form of subjectively experienced marginality is in fact implicated in participants' decision to ally themselves with lower status social outgroups. One reason for participants' feelings of marginality may have been because of their social role as outsiders to their ingroup. These activists were not, it should be noted, working with or within their own ingroup to change attitudes toward stigmatized outgroup members, but had instead rejected their own location within their ingroup in order to, in effect, "join" the outgroup. In other words, this sample was not necessarily representative of the movement toward "coalition politics" (Johnson Reagon, 1983), wherein members of the ingroup work together in solidarity with a disenfranchised outgroup, but instead had built intergroup bridges mainly through individual choice.

Intergroup Boundaries and Universalism

It would appear that outgroup activists did, to an extent, view the social world as being constituted of a single universal social category, rather than as a collection of identity-based social categories. While acknowledging the real social distinctions that set them apart from the social outgroup on whose behalf they were active, participants

nonetheless took pains to present the outgroup as not significantly distinct from themselves. When identity-based distinctions were made, it was usually between the individual activist and his or her own primary ingroup, and the differential noted was usually related to social norms and personal or societal values. As for group distinctions between the ingroup and the outgroup in question, the differences referred to were seen as largely circumstantial. While acknowledging circumstantial differences, there was evidence that activists did feel a sense of kinship or “shared humanity” (Monroe, 1994) with the outgroups with whom they were allied.

Study B participants revealed facets of the Universality-Diversity Orientation described by Miville et al. (1999) in that they recognized the social group differences between themselves and members of the outgroup, but held nonetheless to the idea of a fundamental similarity between members of diverse groups. In other words, participants were well aware of the sociological differences between groups, but believed in a psychological or emotional connectedness. Similarly, Monroe (1996) found that the “altruists” she interviewed also acknowledged a similarity between themselves and the targets of their behaviours, in that they spoke of having a feeling that “it could be me” (p. ix). Among Study B participants, differences were concentrated on social circumstances, to which any of ‘them’ were at risk of falling prey. Therefore, regardless of whether universality is a value, an attitude, or a religious or moral imperative, there appears to now be evidence that transcending intergroup boundaries is implicated in decisions to intervene in the lives of others.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Overview

This project examined social activism from an intergroup relations perspective by focussing on those whose primary activist behaviours are performed on behalf of a social outgroup. This research adds to current knowledge about the motivations for social activism, which until now has not taken intergroup processes into account.

The social identity model proposes that behaviours leading toward social change occur only when members of denigrated identity groups perceive no other cognitive alternatives to challenging the status quo of social power relations that have affected their ingroup (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1987). Researchers studying intergroup helping behaviour have found that people are more likely to help, sacrifice for, or reward those who are perceived as similar in terms of group membership (Sole, Marton, & Hornstein, 1975). Such theories and findings, in essence, provide a social psychological justification for identity politics, which has been the basis of new social movements that place elements of social identity at the centre of social change (Sarup, 1996). One critique of identity politics is that it leaves little room for multiple social identities that “cross-cut” ethnic and racial and gender groups (Alperin, 1990); another is that it divides and separates those whose common interests for social justice lay at the heart of their movements, thus playing into the hands of social power holders (Anner, 1996).

Recently, some representatives of social movement organizations (e.g., Alperin, 1990; Anner, 1996; Bishop, 1994; Johnson Reagon, 1993) have promoted the idea of forming alliances between members of social groups in seeking social justice. Such alliances are intended to overcome the problems of multiple identities and the division of activist resources that the move toward identity politics created. Alliances allow for people who do not necessarily share “first people boundaries,” or primary group identities (Johnson Reagon, 1983) to work on behalf of low power groups. While this idea has been fostered by those active in social movements, it does call into question scholarly theories (e.g., resource mobilization) of social activism which presume that self-interest is the necessary condition under which people will be mobilized into social action.

By identifying the motivations of those who either would commit to forming activist alliances with outgroups, or those who already have, this thesis opens the door to an area of scholarship that is relevant to the changing climate in which social movement organizations are currently functioning.

Combining Methodologies

The present project benefited from the use of two different methodologies to approach the same question. Findings from the two studies were in some cases congruent, yet in other areas, the results were incompatible. For example, Study B highlighted the difficulty of engaging in discussions about the nature and role of altruism, so that consequently, the researcher was left with the sense that activists confronted the concept of “helping” as outdated. However, given their ideas about the importance of community and civic involvement, as well as their expressed regard for others, it is likely these

activists would also have scored “abnormally” high on a standardized measure of altruism. But it was not possible to get beyond the images of “Lady Bountiful” that were raised through questions about desires to help others.

An example of the confluence between the two studies presented itself through findings on universalism. Not only did those participants identified as outgroup activists in Study A endorse universalist values, but Study B activists also spoke of feelings of connectedness with and concern for all humanity. In fact, one participant from Study B even echoed the language of “shared humanity” found in qualitative studies of Holocaust rescuers. This willingness to downgrade the significance of intergroup boundaries by Study B activists was especially noteworthy, given the general level of caution exhibited by these participants about ‘speaking on behalf of’ outgroup members.

In many ways, findings from Study B complemented and augmented the results of Study A. For example, whereas the relationship between the individual-difference variable empathy and outgroup activism appeared to be subsumed by the attitudinal variable political awareness for participants in Study A, some activists in Study B acknowledged that while they did, at times, experience empathy toward individual members of the outgroup, it was their beliefs about ideology and moral responsibility that acted as prime influences in their decisions to form alliances. Further, while Study A showed the importance of political awareness to social activism and outgroup activism, Study B was able to explore the personal meaning that an awareness of power structures had on individuals.

Finally, had this research begun and ended with Study A, it is likely that no useful findings about the role of marginality would have emerged. Fortunately, in their attempts to explain the causes of their activism, participants in Study B regularly invoked images of themselves as marginalized outsiders, prompting the theoretical parallel with positive marginality.

Limitations of the Present Research

While this project has advanced insights into the ways that intergroup processes are associated with social activism, as in all research studies, there existed some concerns with the manner in which it was carried out. Most of these relate to the methodology of Study A, the difficulty of confronting a problem with multiple research methods, and the challenges of working with a new topic of research.

As noted earlier, one limitation of Study A is that for the outgroup in question, namely Afghan women, gender as a social identity dimension may well have influenced female participants to commit to activism because of perceived similarity along gender lines. In hindsight, this difficulty could have been remedied by use of an outgroup that was, at the time of the study, in similar human rights straits such as the East Timorese.

A second limitation involves the use of the ingroup orientation scales. Due to low levels of internal consistency in the original 10-item and 8-item measures, each of these scales consisted of only three or four items which were questionable in terms of internal reliability. Although principle components analyses confirmed that the three scales did have the ability to distinguish between intergroup attitudes, it is probable that in future studies, Miville et al.'s (1999) scale measuring the Universality-Diversity construct would

serve the purposes with sounder psychometric properties. Also, it was unforeseen that the resource allocation measure would have resulted in the outpouring of support for the Womyn's Centre as it did. Because of this, indices of outgroup solidarity were inflated for all men in the sample, and may have yielded so few of the expected relationships with other variables that it did. The attempt to measure marginality and a marginal consciousness in Study A was also unsuccessful, likely for reasons that have been thoroughly examined above.

Another area of concern warranting a mention relates to sampling bias. The sample of participants recruited for Study A appeared to be 'abnormal' on some accounts. First, as suspected, they were more altruistic, as represented by the norms that have been reported for the altruism scale (Rushton, Chrisjohn & Fekken, 1981). Second, they were more politically aware in comparison even with other post-treatment means on the Political Awareness scale (Schwerin, 1995). It would appear that the manner of sampling (in which the participants were offered no recompense for their participation in the study) resulted in a self-selection bias of students wishing to be helpful to the researcher – in other words, of altruists. Therefore, the external validity of results from the present sample may have been compromised in this way; yet in another way, including atypical university students (i.e., mature students, etc.) may in fact have improved the possibility of generalizing from the present findings. In any case, future research of a similar nature would do well to consider the use of a community sample of participants.

A limitation of Study B was the relative homogeneity of the sample of activists that was interviewed. While a diversity of experiences and respondents had been sought,

it turned out that the situation the researcher had initially feared, that the sample be composed mainly of white, middle-class, articulate 'baby boomers' did in part come true. It was difficult to recruit participants for this study because of the condition that their primary interventions be on behalf of a social outgroup, and the reality of the community in which the study was conducted is that there is a good proportion of middle-class, middle-aged white people who are activists. However, as most of the other studies of social activism reviewed earlier have focussed solely on student activists, or on feminist activists, it is likely that those samples were no more heterogeneous than the present sample.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this project sheds light on a phenomenon that is becoming increasingly relevant to social movements: activist alliances with outgroups. The results of this project show that a sense of universalism is important to those who would involve themselves in political efforts specifically targeting a social outgroup. It may be that emphasizing intergroup similarities based on the philosophy of a common humanity, while de-emphasizing differences based on intergroup boundaries, allows intergroup alliances to be forged. Furthermore, ideology, or the development of a socio-political critique that questions power arrangements in society has been shown to play an important role in both social activism and outgroup activism.

While a sense of the self as independent and individualist may be meaningful in countering feelings of being apart from the norms and values of one's primary ingroup, the development of a collective self is a major component of, and reward for outgroup

activists. Feelings of being an outsider may contribute to a positive marginality, which allows for a sense of connectedness with members of lower power groups. Interestingly, it was found that people with more social power may give up some rewards if faced with the needs of less powerful groups, especially if those groups are well-known. And finally, with regard to the costs and benefits of social activism, interpersonal connections and a sense of meaning provide key benefits to social activists; however, it remains unclear whether this finding provides evidence for or against the depiction of prosocial actors as 'selfish maximizers.'

References

Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1990). An introduction to the social identity approach. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 1-18). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Ajzen, I. (1987). Attitudes, traits, and actions: Dispositional prediction of behavior in personality and social psychology. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 20, pp. 1-63). San Diego: Academic Press.

Alcock, J. E., Carment, D. W., Sadava, S. W., Collins, J. E., & Green, J. M. (1997). *A textbook of social psychology: Brief edition*. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall Allyn & Bacon.

Alperin, D. J. (1990). Social diversity and the necessity of alliances: A developing feminist perspective. In L. Albrecht & R. M. Brewer (Eds.), *Bridges of power: Women's multicultural alliances* (pp. 23-33). Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

Anner, J. (Ed.) (1996). *Beyond identity politics: Emerging social justice movements in communities of color*. South End Press: Boston.

Apfelbaum, E. (1979). Relations of domination and movements for liberation: An analysis of power between groups. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 188-204). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Armstrong, S. (1997, summer). Veiled threat. *Homemakers Magazine*.

Batson, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question: Toward a social psychological*

answer. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.

Batson, D. & Coke, J. S. (1981). Empathy: A source of altruistic motivation for helping? In P. J. Rushton & R. M. Sorrento (Eds.), *Altruism and helping behavior* (pp. 167-188). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.

Bar-Tal, D. (1976). *Prosocial behavior: Theory and research*. Washington: Hemisphere Publishing Corp.

Bettencourt, B. A., Dillman, G., & Wollman, N. (1996). The intragroup dynamics of maintaining a successful grassroots organization: A case study. *Journal of Social Issues*, 52 (1), 169-186.

Bishop, A. (1994). *Becoming an ally: Breaking the cycle of oppression*. Halifax: Fernwood.

Borshuk, C. (1999). Altruism and activism: Challenging conceptual limits. *History and Philosophy of Psychology Bulletin*, 11(1), 22-28.

Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal group situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 307-324.

Brink, P. J. (1991). Issues of reliability and validity. In J. M. Morse (Ed.), *Qualitative nursing research: A contemporary dialogue* (Rev. ed., pp. 164-186). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Brown, L. M. (1997). Performing femininities: Listening to white working-class girls in rural Maine. *Journal of Social Issues*, 53(4), 683-701.

Brydon-Miller, M. (1997). Participatory action research: Psychological and social

change. *Journal of Social Issues*, 53(4), 657-666.

Burman, E. (1994). Experience, identities and alliances: Jewish feminism and feminist psychology. *Feminism and Psychology*, 4, 155-178.

Cameron, D. (1997). Preface. In D. S. Ralph, A. Regimabld, & N. St-Amand (Eds.), *Open for business closed to people: Mike Harris's Ontario* (pp. i-vi). Halifax: Fernwood.

Campbell, D. T. (1975). On the conflict between biological and social evolution and between psychology and moral tradition. *American Psychologist*, 30, 1103-1126.

Cherry, F. (1995). *The 'stubborn particulars' of social psychology: Essays on the research process*. London: Routledge.

Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Lewis, B. P., Luce, C., & Neuberg, S. L. (1997). Reinterpreting the empathy-altruism relationship: When one into one equals oneness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 481-494.

Cole, E. R., & Stewart, A. J. (1999). Meanings of political participation among Black and White women: Political identity and social responsibility. In L.A. Peplau, S. Chapman DeBro, R. C. Veniegas, & P. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Gender, culture and ethnicity: Current research about women and men* (pp.153-172). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Crosby, F. J., Pufall, A., Snyder, R. C., O'Connell, M., & Whalen, P. (1989). The denial of personal disadvantage among you, me, and all the other ostriches. In M. Crawford & M. Gentry (Eds.), *Gender and thought* (pp. 79-99). New York: Springer-

Verlag.

Cross, W. E. (1991). *Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349-354.

Davidson, W. B., & Cotter, P. R. (1989). Sense of community and political participation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 17, 119-125.

Davis, M. H. (1994). *Empathy: A social psychological approach*. Madison, WI: Brown and Benchmark.

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113-126.

Deschamps, J-C. (1982). Social identity and the relations of power between groups. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duncan, L. E. (1999). Motivation for collective action: Group consciousness as mediator of personality, life experiences, and women's rights activism. *Political Psychology*, 20(3), 611-635.

Du Preez, P. (1996). The evolution of altruism: A brief comment on Stern's 'Why do people sacrifice for their nation?' *Political Psychology*, 17, 563-567.

Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-

analytic review of the social psychology literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100, 283-308.

Emler, N., Renwick, S., & Malone, B. (1983). The relationship between moral reasoning and political orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 1073-1080.

Esses, V. M., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (1998). Intergroup competition and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: An instrumental model of group conflict. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(4), 699-724.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 70-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Flanagan, C. A., Bowes, J. M., Jonsson, B., Csapo, B., & Sheblanova, E. (1998). Ties that bind: Correlates of adolescents' civic commitments in seven countries. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 457-475.

Flax, J. (1992). The end of innocence. In J. Butler and J. W. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the political* (pp. 445-463). New York: Routledge.

Franz C. E., & McClelland, D. C. (1994). Lives of women and men active in the social protests of the 1960s: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 196-205.

Gaertner, S. L. (1973). Helping behavior and racial discrimination among liberals and conservatives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25, 335-341.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61-89). Orlando: Academic Press.

Gaertner, S. L., Rust, M. C., Dovidio, J. F., Bachman, B. A., Anastasio, P. A. (1996). The contact hypothesis: The role of a common ingroup identity on reducing intergroup bias among majority and minority group members. In J. L. Nye & A. M. Brower (Eds.), *What's social about social cognition?* (pp. 230-260). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Gamson, W. A. (1992). The social psychology of collective action. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp 53-76). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a difference voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1966). The purpose and credibility of qualitative research. *Nursing research*, 15(1), 56-61.

Gross, M. L. (1994). Jewish rescue in Holland and France during the Second World War: Moral cognition and collective action. *Social Forces*, 73, 463-496.

Gurin, P., & Townsend, A. (1986). Properties of gender identity and their implications for gender consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 139-148.

Hart, D., Atkins, R., & Ford, D. (1998). Urban America as a context for the development of moral identity in adolescence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 513-530.

Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1990). Development of the White Racial Identity Inventory. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 67-80). New York: Greenwood Press.

Henderson-King, D., & Stewart, A. J. (1999). Educational experiences and shifts in group consciousness: Studying women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(3), 390-399.

Hercus, C. (1999). Identity, emotion, and feminist collective action. *Gender and Society*, 13, 34-55.

Hessel, D. T. (1972). *A social action primer*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Hill Collins, P. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Hinkle, S., Fox-Cardamone, L., Haseleu, J. A., Brown, R., & Irwin, L. M. (1996). Grassroots political action as an intergroup phenomenon. *Journal of Social Issues*, 52(1), 39-51.

Hoffman, M. L. (1989). Empathic emotions and justice in society. *Social Justice Research*, 3(4), 283-311.

hooks, b. (1981). *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. Boston: South End Press.

Horvath, P. (1999). The organization of social action. *Canadian Psychology*, 40, 221-231.

Hornstein, H. A. (1978). Promotive tension and prosocial behavior: A Lewinian analysis. In L. Wispe (Ed.), *Altruism, sympathy, and helping: Psychological and sociological models* (pp. 177-207). NY: Academic Press.

Irons, J. (1998). The shaping of activist recruitment and participation: A study of women in the Mississippi civil rights movement. *Gender and Society*, 12, 692-709.

Johnson Reagon, B. (1983). Coalition politics: Turning the century. In B. Smith (Ed.), *Home girls: A Black feminist anthology* (pp. 356-368). NY: Kitchen Table Press.

Johnston, H. & Klandermans, B. (Eds.) (1995). *Social movements and culture. Social movements, protest and contention Vol. 4*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kilby, R. W. (1993). *The study of human values*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Klandermans, B. (1997). *The social psychology of protest*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Klandermans, B. (1987). New social movements and resource mobilization: The European and American approach revisited. In D. Rucht (Ed.), *Research on social movements: The state of the art in Western Europe and the USA* (pp. 17-46). Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research*

interviewing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lerner, M. J., & Meindl, J. R. (1981). Justice and altruism. In P. J. Rushton & R. M. Sorrento (Eds.), *Altruism and helping behavior* (pp. 213-232). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.

Levy, D. A. (1997). *Tools of critical thinking: Metathoughts for psychology*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Lewin, K. (1948). *Resolving social conflicts: Selected papers on group dynamics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lichterman, P. (1995). Piecing together multicultural community: Cultural differences in community building among grass-roots environmentalists. *Social Problems*, 42, 513-543.

Lofland, J. (1996). *Social movement organizations: Guide to research on insurgent realities*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Long, N., & Long, A. (Eds.) (1992). *Battlefields of knowledge: The interlocking of theory and practice in social research and development*. London: Routledge.

Maguire, P. (1987). *Doing participatory research: A feminist approach*. Amherst, MA: Center for International Education.

Maracek, J., Fine, M., & Kidder, L. (1997). *Working between worlds: Qualitative*

methods and social psychology. *Journal of Social Issues*, 53(4), 631-644.

Marcus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1995). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98,224-253.

Maxwell, J. A. (1992). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(3), 279-300.

Mayo, C. (1982). Training for positive marginality. In L. Bickman (Ed.), *Applied social psychology annual 3* (pp. 57-75). Beverly Hills: Sage.

McAdams, D. P. (1993). *The stories we live by: Personal myths and the making of the self*. New York: William Morrow.

McCracken, G. D. (1988). *The long interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mehrabian, A., & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality*, 40, 525-543.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miville, M. L., Holloway, P., Gelso, C. J., Pannu, R., Liu, W, Touradji, P., & Fuertes, J. (1999). Appreciating similarities and valuing differences: The Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity scale. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 46(3), 291-307.

Mohanty, C. T. (1991). Introduction: Cartographies of struggle. In C. Mohanty, A. Russo, & L. Torres (Eds.), *Third world women and the politics of feminism* (pp. 1-43). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Monroe, K. R. (1994). 'But what else could I do?' Choice, identity and a cognitive-perceptual theory of ethical political behavior. *Political Psychology*, 15, 210-226.

Monroe, K. R. (1996). *The heart of altruism: Perception of a common humanity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Morgan, J. (1998). Bound-risk: The Mujeres de Yucatan por la Democracia. *Sex Roles*, 39, 515-537.

Mostyn, B. (1985). The content analysis of qualitative research data: A dynamic approach. In M. Brenner, J. Brown, & D. Canter (Eds.), *The research interview: Uses and approaches* (pp. 115-145). London: Academic Press.

Naples, N. A. (1996). A feminist revisiting of the insider/outsider debate: The "outsider phenomenon" in rural Iowa. *Qualitative Sociology*, 19 (1), 83-106.

Oliner, S. P., & Oliner, P. M. (1988). *The altruistic personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*. New York: The Free Press.

Ostrove, J. M. (1999). A continuing commitment to social change: Portraits of activism through adulthood. In M. Romero & A. J. Stewart (Eds.), *Women's untold stories: Breaking silence, talking back, voicing complexity* (pp. 212-226). London: Routledge.

Ostrove, J. M., & Stewart, A. J. (1994). Meanings and uses of marginal identities: Social class at Radcliffe in the 1960s. In C. E. Franz & A. J. Stewart (Eds.), *Women creating lives: Identities, resilience and resistance* (pp. 289-308). Boulder, CO:

Westview Press.

Paul, E. L. (1994). The complexities of a young adult woman's relational world: Challenges, demands, and benefits. In C. E. Franz & A. J. Stewart (Eds.), *Women creating lives: Identities, resilience and resistance* (pp. 173-186). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Penner, L. A., & Finkelstein, M. A. (1998). Dispositional and structural determinants of volunteerism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 525-537.

Pilisuk, M., McAllister, J., & Rothman, J. (1996). Coming together for action: The challenge of contemporary grassroots community organizing. *Journal of Social Issues*, 52(1), 15-37.

Rabinowitz, V. C., & Weseen, S. (1997). Elu(c)i(d(at)ing epistemological impasses: Re-viewing the qualitative/quantitative debates in psychology. *Journal of Social Issues*, 53(4), 605-630.

Ralph, D. S., Regimbald, A., & St-Amand, N. (Eds.)(1997). *Open for business, closed to people: Mike Harris's Ontario*. Halifax: Fernwood.

Richards, T. J., & Richards, L. (1994). Using computers in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 445-462). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reagon Johnson, B. (1983). Coalition politics: turning the century. In B. Smith

(Ed.), *HomeGirls: A black feminist anthology*. New York: Kitchen Table - Women of Color Press.

Rennie, D. L., Phillips, J. R., & Quartaro, G. K. (1988). Grounded theory: A promising approach to conceptualization in psychology? *Canadian Psychology*, 29(2), 139-150.

Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1991). *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes vol. 1*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: The Free Press.

Rowland, R. (1986). Women who do and women who don't, join the women's movement: Issues for conflict and collaboration. *Sex Roles*, 14, 679-692.

Rushton, J. P. (1981). The altruistic personality. In P. J. Rushton & R. M. Sorrento (Eds.), *Altruism and helping behavior* (pp. 261-266). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rushton, J. P., Chrisjohn, R. D., & Fekken, G. C. (1981). The altruistic personality and the self-report altruism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 2, 293-302.

Sampson, E. E. (1993). Identity politics: Challenges to psychology's understanding. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1219-1230.

Sarup, M. (1996). *Identity, culture and the postmodern world*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries.. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.

Schwartz, S. H. (1996). Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The psychology of values: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 8, pp. 1-25). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schwerin, E. W. (1995). *Mediation, citizen empowerment, and transformational politics*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Seaton, C. E. (1990). *Altruism and activism: Character disposition and ideology as factors in a blockade of an abortion clinic*. Lanham Maryland: University Press of America.

Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. E., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robbers' Cave experiment*. Norman, OK: Institute of Group Relations.

Sole, K., Marton, J., & Hornstein, H. A. (1975). Opinion similarity and helping: Three field experiments investigating the bases of promotive tension. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11, 1-13.

Stephan, W. G., & Finlay, K. (1999). The role of empathy in improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(4), 729-743.

Stevens, J. (1992). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (2nd Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stewart, A. J. (1999). 'I've got to try to make a difference': A white woman in the civil rights movement. In M. Romero & A. J. Stewart (Eds.), *Women's untold stories: Breaking silence, talking back, voicing complexity* (pp. 196-211). New York: Routledge.

Stewart, A. J., & Healy Jr., J. M. (1986). The role of personality development and experience in shaping political commitment: An illustrative case. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42(2), 11-31.

Stewart, A. J., Settles, I. H., & Winter, N. J. G. (1998). Women and the social movements of the 1960s: Activists, engaged observers, and nonparticipants. *Political Psychology*, 19(1), 63-94.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (1983). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York: Harper.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1987). *Theories of intergroup relations: International social psychological perspectives*. New York: Praeger.

Tec, N. (1986). *When light pierced the darkness: Christian rescue of Jews in Nazi-occupied Poland*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Teske, N. (1997). Beyond altruism: Identity-construction as a moral motive in

political explanation. *Political Psychology*, 18, 71-91.

Thayer, M. (1997). Identity, revolution, and democracy: Lesbian movements in Central America. *Social Problems*, 44, 386-407.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelly, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.

Thomas, Jr., C. B. (1986). Values as predictors of social activist behavior. *Human Relations*, 39, 179-193.

Thompson Sanders, V. L. (1999). Variables affecting racial-identity salience among African Americans. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 139(6), 748-761.

Torre, D. (1986). Empowerment: Structured conceptualization and instrument development. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Cornell University, Cornell, NY.

Triandis, H. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Triandis, H. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 506-520.

Unger, R. K. (1999, Aug. 21). Outsiders inside: Positive marginality and social change. Presidential address to the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Boston, MA.

Unger, R. K., Draper, R. D., & Pendergrass, M. L. (1986). Personal epistemology and personal experience. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42(2), 67-79.

Vela-McConnell, J. A. (1999). *Who is my neighbour? Social affinity in a modern world*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Woliver, L. R. (1996). Mobilizing and sustaining grassroots dissent. *Journal of Social Issues*, 52(1), 139-151.

Wiltfang, G. L. & McAdam, D. (1991). The costs and risks of social activism: A study of sanctuary movement activism. *Social Forces*, 69, 987-1010.

Yates, M. & Youniss, J. (1998). Community service and political identity development in adolescence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 495-512.

Youniss, J., & Yates, M. (1999). Youth service and moral-civic identity: A case for everyday morality. *Educational Psychology Review*, 11(4), 361-376.

Appendix A

Informed Consent Study A

The purpose of informed consent is to ensure that you understand the purpose of the study and the nature of your involvement. The informed consent provides sufficient information such that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in this study.

Purpose of the Study and Task Requirements

This study looks at people's worldviews, and their interest or involvement in particular social groups and social justice causes. You will be asked to fill out questionnaires related to your beliefs, your philosophies of life, and your involvement in social groups. It will take you approximately 45-60 minutes to complete the questionnaires.

Research Personnel

The following are involved in this project and may be contacted if you have any questions:

Principal Investigator: Catherine Borshuk 520-2600 ext. 2655 cborshuk@ccs.carleton.ca

Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Fran Cherry 520-2600 ext. 2702

For ethical concerns/questions, please contact:

Chair of Psychology Department: Dr. Kim Matheson ext. 2648

Chair of Ethics Committee: Dr. Mary Gick ext. 2664

Potential Risk/discomfort

There are no potential physical or psychological risks to this study.

Anonymity/Confidentiality

The information collected in the study will be coded and analysed so that your name and personal identity will not be used or associated with your responses. Data collected in this study will be kept confidential, and will be used only by the researcher.

Right to Withdraw

You have the right to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty. You are under no obligation to complete the questionnaires once you have begun.

Signatures

I have read the above information and understand the conditions of my participation in the study. My signature indicates I have willingly agreed to participate.

Name: _____

Researcher: _____

Signature: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix B

Written Debriefing, Study A

Thank you for participating in this study! I would like to tell you a little more about this research. Please contact me if you have more questions after reading this page.

The questionnaires you have completed are being used to study the ways that a person's beliefs, values, and personality characteristics may affect the likelihood that they will support or engage in social change strategies on behalf of a different social group (an "outgroup"). The primary research question addresses the personal variables that allow some people to become involved in issues that are outside the range of their own "backyards". Your participation in this study, along with an interview study I have completed with social activists, will help to answer this question. The hypothesis of this study is that particular personal characteristics such as empathy, altruism, past experiences and certain beliefs and values will determine whether someone will be involved in a cause that is not necessarily their own.

You completed a questionnaire to measure something called *intergroup orientation*, which is how people see the social world: in terms of separate individuals, competing groups, or in a transcendent way, such as "we are all one". This study explores if people with one type of perspective are more likely to become involved in causes to help different types of people. Also, you have filled out questionnaires that will allow me to explore whether factors such as *altruism*, or *empathy*, or having particular *values* or *political attitudes* may be related to social activism. The questionnaires were not given to see if you, in particular, are a helpful or caring person, but to test whether people in general who score higher on these measures of altruism or empathy may be more likely to become involved in social justice.

In order to find out people's interest in social justice for "outgroups", I had to come up with ways of measuring the likelihood of their joining such a group as the Action Group on Afghan Women. While this particular group does exist, I stress that any activities you committed to during the study were for my research only, not recruiting purposes. You are not expected to actually take part in any activities, and the information you gave will not be shared with organizers of that group. If you are, however, interested in this or any other social justice groups, please contact OPIRG-Carleton (520-2757) for a list of groups operating on campus, or the Peace & Environment Resource Centre (230-4590) for other groups in the city.

Finally, please note that the scenario regarding funding cutbacks for particular groups on campus was fictitious. To my knowledge, none of Carleton's Clubs and Societies are in danger of being cut due to financial problems. The responses you gave to the scenario asking about which clubs you would or would not support are being used only for this research project, to determine whether people are more likely to support groups that they feel represent themselves and will not be interpreted as though you felt any unchosen groups were 'unworthy'.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this research. Your time and responses will be of great help to me in this research project. For further questions or concerns about this research project, you may contact Dr. Fran Cherry (faculty sponsor) at 520-2600 ext. 2702, or Catherine Borshuk, researcher, at 520-2600, ext. 2655 (cborshuk@ccs.carleton.ca). If you have any ethical concerns about this research, please contact Dr. M. Gick (Chair of Ethics Committee) at 520-2600 ext. 2664 or Dr. K. Matheson (Chair of Psychology) at 520-2600 ext. 2648.

Appendix C

Predictor Measures, Study A

Intergroup Orientation Scales - Original Questions

(Note: I = Individualist Orientation, MG = Multiple Groups Orientation, T = Transcendent Ingroup Orientation.)

Please rate how much you agree with the following statements, where:

1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=neutral 4=agree 5=strongly agree

1. ____ I don't see many differences between myself and other people. T
2. ____ We have a responsibility to every person on the planet. T
3. ____ A good portion of Canadians' tax dollars should be spent on international aid for other countries. T
4. ____ It is a natural inclination to focus on a person's gender or race. MG
5. ____ I tend to see the world as divided into many social categories such as rich and poor, men and women, Black and White. MG
6. ____ It is difficult to truly know another person. I
7. ____ Despite differences, everyone is the same under the skin. T
8. ____ People from different parts of the world are fundamentally different. MG
9. ____ People are 'social animals' who need to identify with groups. MG
10. ____ Each person is an important member of the human community. T
11. ____ We have a responsibility to look out for ourselves. I
12. ____ People would be better off if they could live far away from one another and never have to do anything for them. I
13. ____ It is not possible to categorize myself. I

14. ____ I tend to spend most of my time with people from the same racial background as myself. MG
15. ____ Canadian tax dollars should be spent on solving problems in our own country, not on other countries. MG
16. ____ Sometimes I feel a "oneness" with all of humanity. T
17. ____ All people are unique individuals. I
18. ____ Canadian tax dollars should not be spent on social programs; people should learn to take care of themselves. I
19. ____ I feel most comfortable with people who are similar to me. MG
20. ____ People should for the most part 'go it alone', depending only on themselves. I
21. ____ We have a responsibility to care for our own. MG
22. ____ All humans share a fundamental similarity. T
23. ____ It's not possible to generalize from one person's experience to everyone else's. I
24. ____ There are many 'universals' that hold for all human beings. T

Political Awareness Items (Schwerin, 1995)

Rate your agreement with the following items, where:

1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=neutral 4=agree 5=strongly agree

____ It is a good idea for people to question the behaviour of people in powerful positions.

____ If people hope for a more just world, they must learn how and why some are oppressed.

____ Power should be more equally shared between people.

____ Before our society can truly guarantee freedom, social change must occur.

____ This country would be a better place if all people understood how the political system really works.

Survey of Value Types (Schwartz, 1992)

Read over the list of values, and rate each value using the following scale from -1 to 7, where:

- 1 = opposed to my values
- 0 = not at all important
- 1,2 = not very important
- 3 = important
- 4,5 = quite important
- 6 = very important
- 7 = of supreme importance

-1	3	7
opposed to my values	important	supremely important

1. ___ EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all) U
2. ___ INNER HARMONY (at peace with myself)
3. ___ SOCIAL POWER (control over others)
4. ___ PLEASURE (gratification of desires)
5. ___ FREEDOM (freedom of action and thought)
6. ___ A SPIRITUAL LIFE (emphasis on the spiritual, not material)
7. ___ SENSE OF BELONGING (feeling that others care about me)
8. ___ SOCIAL ORDER (stability of society)
9. ___ AN EXCITING LIFE (stimulating experience)
10. ___ MEANING IN LIFE (a purpose in life)
11. ___ POLITENESS (courtesy, good manners)
12. ___ WEALTH (material possessions, money)
13. ___ NATIONAL SECURITY (protection of my nation from enemies)
14. ___ SELF-RESPECT (belief in one's own worth)
15. ___ RECIPROCATION OF FAVOURS (avoidance of indebtedness)
16. ___ CREATIVITY (uniqueness, imagination)
17. ___ A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict) U
18. ___ RESPECT FOR TRADITION (preservation of time-honored custom)
19. ___ MATURE LOVE (deep emotional and spiritual intimacy) B
20. ___ SELF-DISCIPLINE (self-restraint, resistance to temptation)
21. ___ DETACHMENT (from worldly concerns)
22. ___ FAMILY SECURITY (safety for loved ones)
23. ___ SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, approval by others)
24. ___ UNITY WITH NATURE (fitting into nature) U
25. ___ A VARIED LIFE (filled with challenge, novelty, change)
26. ___ WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)
27. ___ AUTHORITY (the right to lead or command)
28. ___ TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close, supportive friends) B
29. ___ A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts) U
30. ___ SOCIAL JUSTICE (correcting injustice, caring for the weak)U
31. ___ INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)

-1	3	7
opposed to my values	important	supremely important
32. ___ MODERATE (avoiding extremes of feeling and action)		
33. ___ LOYAL (faithful to my friends, group) B		
34. ___ AMBITIOUS (hardworking, aspiring)		
35. ___ BROAD-MINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs) U		
36. ___ HUMBLE (modest, self-effacing)		
37. ___ DARING (seeking adventure, risk)		
38. ___ PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (preserving nature) U		
39. ___ INFLUENTIAL (having an impact on people and events)		
40. ___ HONOURING OF PARENTS AND ELDERS (showing respect)		
41. ___ CHOOSING OWN GOALS (selecting own purpose)		
42. ___ HEALTHY (not being sick physically or mentally)		
43. ___ CAPABLE (competent, effective, efficient)		
44. ___ ACCEPTING MY POSITION IN LIFE (submitting to circumstances)		
45. ___ HONEST (genuine, sincere) B		
46. ___ PRESERVING MY PUBLIC IMAGE (protecting my 'face')		
47. ___ OBEDIENT (dutiful, meeting obligations)		
48. ___ INTELLIGENT (logical, thinking)		
49. ___ HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others) B		
50. ___ ENJOYING LIFE (enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc.)		
51. ___ DEVOUT (holding to religious faith and belief)		
52. ___ RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable) B		
53. ___ CURIOUS (interested in everything, exploring)		
54. ___ FORGIVING (willing to pardon others) B		
55. ___ SUCCESSFUL (achieving goals)		
56. ___ CLEAN (neat, tidy)		

(Note: **U**=Universalist values, and **B**=Benevolence values).

Self-Report Altruism Scale (Rushton, Chrisjohn & Fekken, 1981)

Circle the response that best describes how often you have carried out the following acts:

1 Never	2 Once	3 More than Once	4 Often	5 Very Often
1. I have helped push a stranger's car out of the snow			1 2 3 4 5	
2. I have given directions to a stranger			1 2 3 4 5	
3. I have made change for a stranger			1 2 3 4 5	
4. I have given money to a charity			1 2 3 4 5	
5. I have given money to a stranger who needed it (or asked for it)			1 2 3 4 5	
6. I have donated goods or clothes to a charity			1 2 3 4 5	
7. I have done volunteer work for a charity			1 2 3 4 5	
8. I have donated blood			1 2 3 4 5	
9. I have helped carry a stranger's belongings			1 2 3 4 5	
10. I have delayed an elevator and held the door open for a stranger			1 2 3 4 5	
11. I have allowed someone to go ahead of me in a lineup (at photocopy machine, in grocery store)			1 2 3 4 5	
12. I have pointed out a clerk's error (in a bank or store) in undercharging me for an item			1 2 3 4 5	
13. I have let a neighbour whom I didn't know too well borrow an item of value to me			1 2 3 4 5	

1 Never	2 Once	3 More than Once	4 Often	5 Very Often
14. I have bought 'charity' greeting cards deliberately because I knew it was a good cause				
			1 2 3 4 5	
15. I have helped a classmate who I did not know well with a homework assignment when my knowledge was greater than his or hers				
			1 2 3 4 5	
16. I have voluntarily, before being asked, looked after a neighbour's pets or children without being paid for it				
			1 2 3 4 5	
17. I have offered to help an elderly person or someone with a physical disability across a street				
			1 2 3 4 5	
18. I have offered my seat on a bus or train to a stranger who was standing				
			1 2 3 4 5	

Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1994)

Emotional concern and Perspective-Taking Subscales

(Note: EC = Emotional concern items, and PT = Perspective-taking items).

The statements below ask about your thoughts and feelings in various situations. For each statement, use the following scale and pick the number between 0 and 4 which best represents how well the statement describes you.

DOES NOT DESCRIBE ME WELL AT ALL 0 1 2 3 4 DESCRIBES ME VERY WELL

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

Marlowe-Crowne Scale of Social Desirability (1960)

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you.

T	F	1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
T	F	2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
T	F	3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
T	F	4. I have never intensely disliked someone.
T	F	5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
T	F	6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
T	F	7. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.
T	F	8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
T	F	9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.
T	F	10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
T	F	11. I like to gossip at times.
T	F	12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
T	F	13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
T	F	14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
T	F	15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
T	F	16. I'm always willing to make a mistake.
T	F	17. I always try to practice what I preach.
T	F	18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed, obnoxious people.
T	F	19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.
T	F	20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.
T	F	21. I am always polite, even to people who are unpleasant.
T	F	22. At times I have really insisted on getting my own way.
T	F	23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
T	F	24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.
T	F	25. I never resent being asked to return a favour.
T	F	26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
T	F	27. I sometimes think when people are unlucky they only got what they deserved.
T	F	28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of someone's good luck.
T	F	29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
T	F	30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favours of me.
T	F	31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.

Participant Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions. All information will be kept confidential and anonymous.

1. Your age: _____
2. Your sex: _____
3. Your religion, if any: _____
4. Your ethnic/racial background: _____
5. Your place of birth: _____
6. Your marital/relationship status: _____
7. Do you have children? _____
8. Where did you grow up? _____
9. Family's social class while you were growing up: _____
10. Your present social class: _____
11. Your sexual orientation: _____
12. Your employment status: _____
13. Which class were you in when you signed up for this study? _____

Appendix D

Criterion Measures, Study A

Outgroup Activism

The purpose of this questionnaire is to inform you of events occurring right now to women in Afghanistan, and to gauge support for a local Action Group. First, we will give you some background information about the women in Afghanistan, and about a group that was recently formed at Carleton University. Next we will present commitments you may make to participate with this group on behalf of the Afghan women. **Please answer the questions honestly**, as this information is important for determining how best to engage in recruitment campaigns on behalf of Afghan women.

Women in Afghanistan are currently facing severe repression and denial of their basic human rights from the Taliban leaders of their nation. For example, women who were formerly employed are no longer allowed to go to work, and girls are not able to take part in education. Women cannot leave their homes, even to go to the market, unless they are accompanied by their husband or a close male relative. All women must remain covered from head to toe in public at all times. Women are also being denied medical treatment, as male doctors are prohibited from treating them, and most female doctors are not allowed to work.

Ever since a Canadian journalist alerted her readers to the plight of the Afghan women in a magazine article, Canadians have been sending letters and faxes to both Lloyd Axworthy, Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Mary Robinson, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. Many Canadians, including an Ottawa group called the Action Group for Afghan Women, have been attempting to put pressure on our nation and the international community to act on behalf of the Afghan women. The Action Group, which meets regularly, has organized a postcard campaign, rallies, and other lobbying activities. The group is looking for more support and help from local people.

Please circle Y (yes) or N (no) to indicate whether you support the Action Group, and whether you would like to be involved in any of the following efforts on the behalf of Afghan women.

I feel supportive of the Action Group for Afghan Women's efforts.	Y	N
I will tell other people about the plight of the Afghan women.	Y	N
I will sign a petition against these human rights abuses.	Y	N
I will write a letter to the newspaper to educate my community about the plight of Afghan women.	Y	N

I will donate money to the Action Group. Y N

Amount: _____

I will attend the next meeting of the Action Group
for Afghan Women (held every Monday morning, 9 a.m.,
in room 2107 Dunton Tower) Y N

I will write a letter to Lloyd Axworthy, the Canadian Minister
of Foreign Affairs, asking for international effort to put pressure
on the Afghanistan regime. Y N

I will put my support for Afghan women in writing as part
of the Action Group's postcard campaign to lobby Mary Robinson,
UN High Commission for Human Rights. Y N

I will attend a Demonstration to support Afghan women
organized by the Action Group in front of the Canadian Department
of Foreign Affairs (125 Sussex Dr.). Y N

I will sign up to help organize the rally. Y N

I am willing to volunteer with administrative
tasks (e.g., typing, photocopying, mailing) Y N

Number of hours/week I can help: _____

I will make purchases at the next fundraising bake sale
co-ordinated by the Action Group, whether I want
the baked goods or not. Y N

Resource Allocation Measure of Solidarity with Outgroups

In this time of budget cutbacks and changes to the University, funding to various groups on campus has been threatened. As researchers, we are interested in knowing how much support there is for different clubs, societies, and groups at Carleton University. As a result, we would like to get your opinions about which groups on campus should be supported. Although these groups and clubs are not all 'social activist' groups, some of them do, at times, engage in social action projects.

For this questionnaire, imagine that you have \$500 to give to different groups at Carleton, and can give it out in portions of \$100.

Put an X beside the groups you feel should receive \$100 allotments. If you think a particular group should receive more than \$100, mark as many X's as you want next to their name. Since there is only \$500 to be apportioned, do not mark more than 5 X's altogether.

Pakistani Students' Association _____
 Jewish Students' Union _____
 Latin American Students' Association _____
 Muslim Students' Association _____
 Chinese Students' Association _____
 Womyn's Centre _____
 Nation of Islam Students' Association _____
 Chess Club _____
 Inter-varsity Christian Fellowship _____
 German Society _____
 First Nations Club _____
 Hellenic Students' Association _____
 Somali Students' Association _____
 Aboriginal Students' Association _____
 Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered Centre _____
 Scottish Club _____

Why did you choose the Club(s) or Group(s) that you did?

Are you a member of any of the above Clubs? Y ____ N ____

If yes, which one(s)? _____

Prior Activism Checklist

Please place a checkmark next to any of the listed activities that you have EVER participated in, whether once, or more than once:

1. _____ been active in a trade union or the labour movement
2. _____ participated in a feminist organization
3. _____ participated in a protest march or demonstration
4. _____ been involved with an environmentalist group
5. _____ worked on behalf of Native Rights
6. _____ carried a picket or protest sign
7. _____ participated in a pro-choice rally on abortion rights
8. _____ been involved in an AIDS prevention/cure campaign
9. _____ signed a petition
10. _____ participated in an anti-racism group or workshop
11. _____ provided volunteer services to women (e.g., Rape Crisis Hotline)
12. _____ helped to organize a march or demonstration
13. _____ been involved in the Peace Movement (e.g., anti-nuclear groups)
14. _____ attended Earth Day activities
15. _____ provided aid to refugees or new immigrants
16. _____ participated in activities on behalf of minority rights
17. _____ publicly showed solidarity to oppressed groups in other countries
18. _____ donated money to a social activist organization (e.g., Amnesty International)
19. _____ written a letter to a politician regarding a social issue
20. _____ given a speech supporting the rights of minorities
21. _____ been arrested at a political demonstration
22. _____ volunteered to work with people who have HIV/AIDS
23. _____ attended a conference or event on human rights
24. _____ been involved in animal rights campaigns
25. _____ participated in civil disobedience on behalf of social change

Appendix E

Factor Loadings for the Intergroup Orientation Scales

Factor Loadings for the Individual Ingroup Orientation Scale

Question	Component	
	1	2
*It is difficult to truly know another person.	.665	.330
We have a responsibility to look after ourselves.	.459	.455
It is not possible to categorize myself.	-.306	.324
*People should for the most part 'go it alone, depending only on themselves.	.800	.121
It's not possible to generalize from one person's experience to everyone else's.	.493	.313
*People would be better off if they could live far away from one another and never have to do anything for them.	.521	-.335
Canadian tax dollars should not be spent on social programs; people should learn to take care of themselves.	.337	.103
<u>All people are unique individuals.</u>	-.173	.724
* Retained items.		

Factor Loadings for the Multiple Groups Ingroup Orientation

Question	Component	
	1	2
*It is a natural inclination to focus on a person's gender or race.	.758	.117
*I tend to see the world as divided into many social categories such as rich and poor, men and women, Black and White.	.589	-.112
*People from different parts of the world are fundamentally different.	.736	9.604E-02
People are 'social animals' who need to identify with groups.	-.115	-.129
I tend to spend most of my time with people from the same racial background as myself.	-.118	.531
Canadian tax dollars should be spent on solving problems in our own country, not on other countries.	.100	.716
I feel most comfortable with people who are similar to me.	.433	.447
We have a responsibility to care for our own.	.102	.722
* Retained items.		

Factor Loadings for the Transcendent Ingroup Orientation Scale

Question	Component	
	1	2
I don't see many differences between myself and other people.	-.122	.718
*We have a responsibility to every person on the planet.	.678	-.222
Despite differences, everyone is the same under the skin.	.406	.652
*Each person is an important member of the human community.	.611	-7.06E-02
*Sometimes I feel a "oneness" with all humanity.	.565	8.29E-03
All humans share a fundamental similarity.	-.104	.681
*There are many 'universals' that hold for all human beings.	.589	.244
A good portion of Canadian tax dollars should be spent on aid for other countries.	.139	.360
* Retained items.		

Appendix F
Themes, Research Questions and Sample Interview Questions

Themes/Research Questions	Interview Questions
<p>I. Background</p> <p>1. What organizations has the participant worked with, and in what capacity?</p> <p>II. Motivations</p> <p>1. What triggered earliest involvement?</p> <p>2. Role of personal history</p> <p>3. Religious/spiritual beliefs</p> <p>4. Altruism or egotism</p> <p>III. Social Roles</p> <p>1. Self-definition</p> <p>2. Social support</p> <p>3. Integration of activist role with sense of self</p> <p>4. Costs/benefits</p>	<p>I Background</p> <p>1. Length of involvement? Present involvement? Role in organizations?</p> <p>II. Motivations</p> <p>1. Why are involved with this effort? What made you originally decide to get involved? Why have/haven't you continued with the effort?</p> <p>2. Was your family of origin involved in social activism? Do you think the way you were raised accounts for your involvement in any way?</p> <p>3. Is your activism related to religious beliefs? Is there a spiritual basis for your involvement?</p> <p>4. Some people argue that there's a self-serving basis for everything we do; others say it's possible to be really selfless and act purely for someone else. Where does your activism lie on this continuum - from doing it for you, to doing it for someone else?</p> <p>III. Social Roles</p> <p>1. Do you consider yourself 'an activist'? Would you use that label, or some other label?</p> <p>2. Do you have a circle of friends who are involved in the same type of activism? Is your family involved also?</p> <p>3. Is being an (activist, volunteer..) a small part of your life, a good part of your life, or a large component of your life?</p> <p>4. Are there personal benefits of being involved in this cause? Are there personal costs? Can you list the benefits of your involvement? Can you list the costs?</p>

Themes/Research Questions	Interview Questions
<p>IV. Outgroup/Confronting the 'other'</p> <p>1. Helping outgroup members</p> <p>2. Intergroup similarity and difference</p> <p>3. View of the 'other'</p> <p>V. Personal Experience/Sense of Self</p> <p>1. Role of emotions</p> <p>2. Empathy</p> <p>3. Personal experiences; marginalization</p>	<p>IV. Outgroup</p> <p>1. Who, besides yourself, benefits from what you do?</p> <p>2. Do you have anything in common with (them)? Do you see yourself as part of (their) group, or as part of a different group in society? Do you understand how people in (their) situation feel? What has brought you to work on (their) behalf?</p> <p>3. If you were giving a talk about (this group), how would you describe them? What have your interactions with (them) been like? Why is it that it's (this) group that you've gotten involved with?</p> <p>V. Personal Experience</p> <p>1. Is there an emotional component for what you do? Either as a possible cause for being involved, or as an outcome of being involved?</p> <p>2. Do you think activists have more empathy than people who don't become activists? Do you?</p> <p>3. Is there anything in your earlier life that could help me to understand why it is that you devote your efforts to trying to improve things for (them)? We know that only a small minority of people get actively involved in social justice causes. Why do you?</p>

Appendix G

Demographic Questionnaire, Study B

The purpose of asking you for “demographic” information is to give me a better idea of who people involved in social justice causes are. Neither your name, your interview, nor any organization you are involved with will be connected in any way to the demographic information contained on this form. In fact, this form will be kept separate from your signed informed consent so that you may not be identified. Recognizing that some of the questions contained on this form are sensitive, I’d like to make clear that you don’t have to respond to any or all questions if you choose not to. I’ve purposely kept the questions open-ended so you may describe yourself in any manner you like.

1. Your age: _____
2. Your sex: _____
3. Your religion, if any: _____
4. Your ethno-cultural background: _____
5. Your place of origin: _____
6. Your marital/relationship status: _____
7. Parenthood status: _____
8. Where did you grow up? _____
9. Family’s social class while you were growing up: _____
10. Your present social class: _____
11. Your sexual orientation: _____
12. Your employment status: _____
13. What is your highest level of education? _____

Appendix H

Informed Consent, Study B

The purpose of informed consent is to ensure you understand the purpose of the study and the nature of your involvement. The informed consent provides sufficient information for you to decide whether you wish to participate in this study.

Purpose of the study/Duration and Locale

This interview about your experiences and involvement in social change movements is part of the principle investigator's dissertation research on people's motivations for community activism. Interviews will be held at a place and time convenient for you, and will last 1-2 hours. You will also be asked to fill out a confidential demographic sheet.

Research Personnel

The following are members of the psychology department at Carleton University involved in this research study, and may be contacted at any time with questions/concerns about the research:

Principle Investigator: Catherine Borshuk 520-2655 ex. 2655
(cborshuk@ccs.carleton.ca)

Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Fran Cherry 520-2655 ext. 2702

For ethical concerns or questions, please contact at 520-2600:

Chair of Psychology Department: Dr. Kim Matheson ext. 2648

Chair of Psychology Ethics Committee: Dr. Mary Gick ext. 2644

Potential Risk/Discomfort

There are no potential physical or psychological risks to this study. This study involves no deception or experimentation beyond the information asked about in the interview.

Anonymity/Confidentiality

The information collected in the interview will be tape recorded without your name identifying your responses. Your full name will not be used on the tape or on the transcribed copy. Analyses and write-up of the study will be completed so that neither your name nor any organization you are involved with will be associated with your responses. Information from the interview and from the demographic sheet will be kept confidential, and only researchers associated with this project will have access to the interview tapes or transcriptions.

Right to Withdraw

You have the right to withdraw from or end the interview at any time without consequences.

Signatures

I have read the above information and understand the conditions of my participation in the study. My signature indicates that I willingly agree to participate.

Name:

Signature:

Date:

Researcher's signature:

Appendix I

Written Debriefing, Study B

First, I'd like to thank you for participating in this research. The interview we have completed is one of approximately a dozen I am doing that explore the reasons why people become involved in social activism.

While there have been a number of research projects done with social activists, they are usually focused on just one type of social movement, for example the environmental movement. There is little, if any, general information about the type of person who becomes involved in social change efforts, their motivations for becoming involved, or the costs/rewards associated with activism. This type of information is the first thing I am exploring in my dissertation, partly in the hopes that it will prove useful to social movement organizations in their recruiting efforts.

Another main goal of my research is to understand social activism in terms of identities. Although many social movements are focused around a single "identity" (e.g., race, gender, or sexual orientation), it is clear that identities have become less rigid, and people are becoming more willing to work with or on behalf of others and other movements. I call this phenomenon "cross-identity social activism", and direct your attention toward instances of men in the feminist movement, Canadians protesting for human rights in East Timor, or White/Euro Canadians who take part in Native blockades. One of my research questions regarding this phenomenon is, What does it take to interest people in social justice movements beyond their own 'back yards'? I have engaged in some preliminary theorizing, speculating it may be due to a person's personal experiences or feelings, or perhaps due to a type of consciousness whereby they see all people as being connected in some way, or possibly, a psychological mind-set allowing them to put themselves in someone else's position more easily. These are ideas I am testing in interviews with social activists, and will be following up with a survey study.

If you know any other activists who may be interested in participating in this study, or if you would like more information about this research, please feel free to call me at any time: 520-2600 ext. 2655, or email cborshuk@ccs.carleton.ca, or to pass along my number or email address to interested others. You may also contact Dr. Fran Cherry, faculty sponsor of this research, at 520-2600 ext. 2702 for more information.

Thank you once again for taking the time to participate in this pilot study. If you have any ethical concerns about this research, please contact Dr. M. Gick (Chair of Ethics Committee) at 520-2600 ext. 2664 or Dr. K. Matheson (Chair of Psychology) at 520-2600 ext. 2648.