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As the importance of social justice advocacy is increasingly emphasized in counseling psychology, it is imperative for researchers to explore the development of individuals' social justice interest and commitment. With a diverse sample of 298 undergraduate students, this study sought to replicate findings from Miller et al. (2009) which supported the use of Social Cognitive Career Theory in predicting social justice advocacy interest and commitment from social justice advocacy self-efficacy and outcome expectations. Additionally, individuals’ preferences for an equality or hierarchy-based social structure were examined as additional predictors. Using structural equation modeling, the original Miller et al. (2009) model was tested and compared to three alternative models which included the preference for equality, the preference for hierarchy, or both. Results demonstrated replicability of the Miller et al. (2009) model. In addition, equality-based and hierarchy-based social structure preferences were found to be significant predictors of social justice self-efficacy and outcome expectations.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Since the early work of Frank Parsons, counseling psychology has been rooted in promoting social justice and ameliorating injustices (Hartung & Blustein, 2002). Although this emphasis on social justice has waxed and waned over the last century, the field is presently undergoing a revival of social justice theory and research (Fouad, Gerstein, & Toporek, 2006). Increasingly, scholars are focusing their efforts on matters of human rights, putting marginalized and underrepresented groups at the forefront. In addition to examining psychological correlates of individuals who face injustice (i.e., Fischer & Holtz, 2007; Lin & Israel, 2012; Szymanski & Stewart, 2010; Wang, Heppner, & Du, 2012), scholars have begun to emphasize underlying psychological mechanisms of social justice advocacy behavior (see Goodman, 2000; Moeschberger, Ordonez, Shankar, & Raney, 2006; Sachweh, 2011).

Though there has long been research on justice attitudes in several different fields, models of advocacy behavior are fewer and more recent, and have yet to attain solid empirical support. However, the recent work of Miller and colleagues (Miller, Sendrowitz, Connacher, Blanco, de la Pena, et al., 2009; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011) has attempted to apply a well-supported theory of career development, Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994), to social justice advocacy and have found the model to be useful in predicting interest and commitment in this domain. Building off these two initial studies, the aim of the current study is twofold. First I seek to replicate previous findings (Miller et al., 2009; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011) that support the use of SCCT in explaining the development of interest and commitment in social justice advocacy with a new, and diverse, sample of undergraduate students. Given
numerous recent calls in the psychological literature for replication (i.e., Koole & Lakens, 2012; Schmidt & Landers, 2013), I to provide further support to the validity of this model. Second, I seek to extend the model by examining the role of attitudes towards hierarchy and equality as additional predictor variables. It may be that an individual’s larger view of how society should function has meaningful effects on social justice attitudes.

**Social Justice Within SCCT**

Over the last three decades, SCCT (Brown & Lent, 1996; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) has dominated the career development literature. Rooted in Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory, SCCT examines cognitive variables and how they interact with an individual’s environment to facilitate or hinder one’s ability to make career-related decisions as well as achieve success within those domains. Specifically, SCCT focuses on the relations between self-efficacy, interests, outcome expectations, and commitment as well as supports and barriers in career decision-making (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). The foundational concept of SCCT is that individuals will develop interests in domains in which they feel a sense of self-efficacy and can expect positive outcomes. Thus, individuals will gravitate towards, and develop a liking for, activities in which they feel they will do well and will lead to positive outcomes such as social recognition, prestige, or financial reward. Developed interests in activities in which individuals feel efficacious and expect positive outcomes in turn lead to goals related to these activities. Goals often manifest in career decision-making, such as choosing a college major related to the domain of interest (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994).
Although empirical studies applying SCCT principles to social justice advocacy are few, the existing research does point to utility of the model in this area. For example, Feather, Woodyatt, and McKee (2012) found that willingness to support an organization aimed at empowering marginalized Indigenous Australians was predicted by positive outcome expectations of doing so. Likewise, Chung and Probert (2011) found that in a sample of African American young adults, positive outcome expectations for the community was related to greater likelihood of volunteering and positive outcome expectations for the individual was related to greater likelihood of intention to engage in political activism.

Miller et al. (2009) were the first to develop a questionnaire with variables from SCCT specific to social justice advocacy. They defined social justice self-efficacy as an individual’s perceived ability to perform tasks related to social justice advocacy across four domains: intrapersonal, interpersonal, community, and political/institutional. Social justice outcome expectations were defined as the perceived positive outcomes of a given advocacy-related activity. Miller et al. (2009) divided outcomes into three categories: social, material, and self-evaluative. Social justice interest referred to the extent to which an individual likes or dislikes a particular social justice-related activity. Social justice commitment referred to an individual’s intention to engage in social justice advocacy in the future.

Miller et al. (2009) tested a model with these variables with a sample of 274 undergraduate students. Results showed that, consistent with previous findings, (Lent, Brown, Brenner, Chopra, & Talleyrand, & Suthakaran, 2001; Lent, Brown, Schmidt, Brenner, Lyons, & Treistman, 2003; Lent, Lopez, Lopez, & Sheu, 2008), social justice
self-efficacy and outcome expectations each had a direct effect on social justice interest. Social justice self-efficacy also had an indirect effect on social justice interest as mediated by outcome expectations. Additionally, social justice self-efficacy and interest directly predicted commitment to social justice advocacy. In other words, the more individuals believed that they are able to perform social justice advocacy tasks, and the more they believed that advocacy work would lead to positive change, the more committed they to doing such work. Findings also showed that self-efficacy had a more robust impact on interest and commitment than outcome expectations; the authors suggest that self-efficacy may be especially important for development of social justice interest and commitment in college students. The final model accounted for 56% of the variance in social justice interest and 70% of the variance in commitment to social justice advocacy, demonstrating the utility of SCCT in this domain. Miller and Sendrowitz (2011) found further support for the theory as it applies to social justice in a sample of counseling psychology doctoral trainees.

Based on these findings, I hypothesize that in a sample of undergraduate students, social justice self-efficacy (path 4 in Figure 1-1) and outcome expectations (path 5 in Figure 1-1) will have a direct, positive effect on social justice interest (hypothesis 1), social justice self-efficacy will have a direct, positive effect on social justice commitment (hypothesis 2; path 6 in Figure 1-1), outcome expectations will mediate the relation between social justice self-efficacy and social justice interest (hypothesis 3 paths 3-5), and social justice interest will have a direct, positive effect on social justice commitment (hypothesis 4; path 8 in Figure 1-1). Additionally, based on previous findings that outcome expectations directly relate to commitment (Lent et al.,
I hypothesize that these will be directly, positively related within the social justice domain (hypothesis 5; path 7 in Figure 1-1).

Social Structure Preferences

The Miller et al. (2009) model captures several key predictors of social justice interest and commitment. In the present study, however, I assert that an individual’s cultural orientation may be an additional, important predictor variable. Specifically, I propose that an individual’s preferences regarding how society should be structured may impact their self-efficacy and expectations for positive outcomes related to engaging in social justice-related activities.

A common implied goal in social justice advocacy is a fair distribution of resources and opportunity across society (Miller, 1999). Past studies have shown that cultural differences may moderate people’s perceptions of what qualifies as “fair.” (Berman, Murphy-Berman, & Singh, 1985; Deutsch, 1975; Otto, Baumert, & Bobocel, 2011). One of the most commonly presented differences in how justice is conceptualized is the tendency for societies to have a preference for either equality or hierarchy within a society. Whereas many paradigms of social justice posit equality as the most just principal, others present hierarchy-based principals as the most just way of distribution power and resources (Vera & Speight, 2003). Though there are many philosophical conflicting paradigms of social justice, no known study has examined the extent to which an equality-based orientation versus a hierarchy-base orientation would lead to social justice advocacy. In the current study, I aim to test the extent to which preferences for social structure (equality and hierarchy) predicts social justice advocacy variables.
Preference For Equality

In the past several decades, researchers have examined cultural patterns of equality, identifying nations that most favor equality and specific characteristics of equality-based cultures. The most basic feature of equality-based societies is that individuals see themselves as similar to others (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). When individuals in an equality-based society face a hierarchical structure, they see it as a “necessary evil,” and do not feel comfortable with large power and status differentials (Hofstede, 2001, p. 97). Likewise, in equality-based societies, power-holders try to minimize the appearance of having power, and there is generally harmony between those with much power and people with less power. Additionally, people in equality-based societies are more likely to prefer a collaborative leadership style in which subordinates are involved in decision-making processes (Hofstede, 2001; Sharma, 2010; Yoo & Donthu, 2005).

Preference For Hierarchy

In contrast to equality-based societies, people in hierarchy-based societies do not see themselves as similar to others. Rather, they identify as either higher or lower than others on a hierarchy (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Whereas equality-based societies strive to avoid large differences in power and status, hierarchy-based societies view hierarchy as crucial to maintaining social order. The distinctive acceptance of hierarchy or equality is perhaps best illustrated when considering the value of power and status in a society. Theoretical descriptions of hierarchy orientations posit that individuals in these societies tend towards seeking power, prestige, and status as well as valuing competition and achievement (Singelis et al., 1995; Singelis & Triandis, 1998; Triandis, Chen & Chan,
and power holders in hierarchy-based societies try to emphasize their status (e.g., through dress or public display of possessions; Sharma, 2010; Yoo & Donthu, 2005). Finally, people in hierarchy-based societies are more likely to prefer an authoritarian leadership style in which they are told what to do (Hofstede, 2001).

Research Findings

Previous research examining cultural patterns in reactions to injustice has indicated that orientation to equality is an important predictive factor. For example, Shao et al. (2013) found that reactions towards injustice were stronger for those from equality-based nations. Another study by Lee, Pilluta, and Law (2000) showed that the relation between procedural justice and trust in supervisors was stronger for those who exhibited high equality values, possibly because justice is more expected in societies with stronger equality-based values.

Singelis et al. (1995) created a scale designed to measure the extent to which equality or hierarchy is endorsed at the individual level. The authors refer to equality-oriented societies and individuals as horizontal and hierarchy-oriented societies and individuals as vertical. This theory of vertical and horizontal orientations has generated a wealth of research, and has been supported in dozens of studies across several cultures (i.e., Chiou, 2001; Gouveia, Clemente, & Espinosa, 2003; Gyoerkoes, Becker, Massoudi, et al., 2013). Using the Singelis (1995) measure, previous research has supported the theoretical distinctions between people in hierarchy and equality-based cultures. For example, consumer research has shown that individuals in hierarchical societies respond more positively to advertisements that display power differences between people than do individuals in equality-based societies, suggesting that
individuals in vertical societies are both more comfortable with and approving of inequality (Shavitt, Lalawanie, Zhang, & Torelli, 2006).

Shavitt et al. (2006) noted the potential relatedness of Social Dominance Theory, which has shown individuals that are more accepting of inequalities at the societal level are more likely to seek hierarchy-enhancing professional roles and to demonstrate ideologies that endorse group-based hierarchy (e.g., racism, meritocracy; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Furthermore, Triandis and Singelis (1998) posit individuals in equality-based societies, such as Australia and Sweden, are more likely to support redistribution and social welfare policies. In contrast, the authors highlight Americans’ tolerance of a 15% poverty rate, and marginalization of the poor as a way of buttressing their own status. Given the emphasis of distribution of power in the social justice literature (Miller, 1999), it is possible that having an equality or hierarchy-based orientation could result in differing attitudes towards social justice advocacy.

It is important to note that, although equality and hierarchy values are related, they are conceptually distinct, as opposed to two poles of a unidimensional spectrum. In the Singelis et al. (1995) measure of verticality and horizontalness, the two constructs are measured separately, allowing researchers to understand vertical and horizontal values independent of each other. Thus, it is possible for an individual to endorse high equality values and hierarchy values simultaneously. As such, in the current study I will measure these variables separately and test them independently in three different models: one testing only equality values, one testing only hierarchy values, and one testing both variables at the same time. This will allow results to speak to how equality
and hierarchy values might operate in predicting social justice advocacy both together and independently.

Present Study

In the present study, I seek to replicate findings from Miller et al. (2009; 2011) and examine the extent to which one’s preference in societal structure influences social justice advocacy self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and commitment. Because of the perceived inevitability of inequality and perceived necessity of hierarchy in vertical orientations, I predict that those who exhibit high equality values and low hierarchy values may be more likely to feel efficacious and expect positive outcomes of social justice advocacy.

Based on previous findings regarding equality values as well as theoretical assumptions of equality and hierarchy-based cultures, I will examine how valuing hierarchy and equality function within the Miller et al. (2009) social just commitment model. Specifically, I will use structural equation modeling to examine four models: 1) the Miller et al. (2009) model with the four core SCCT variables, 2) a model where valuing equality is hypothesized to positively predict self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and commitment, 3) a model where valuing hierarchy is hypothesized to negatively predict self-efficacy, outcome expectations and commitment, and 4) a model where valuing equality and hierarchy are both included as predictor variables. The models will be compared in terms of fit, parsimony, and variance accounted for. Indirect effects will be computed using bootstrapping techniques based on the best fitting and most parsimonious model.
Figure 1-1. Hypothesized model based on Miller et al. (2009)
CHAPTER 2
METHOD

Participants

The sample was comprised of 337 undergraduate students recruited from general psychology courses at a large southeastern university. Of these, 39 participant data points were discarded due to incomplete data, leaving 298 participants included in analyses. Of the remaining sample, 101 (34%) identified as male, 194 (63.7%) identified as female, and 3 (1%) did not specify a gender identity. The sample was predominately White ($n = 197, 66.3\%$), followed by Hispanic ($n = 47, 15.8\%$), Asian/Asian American ($n = 30, 10.1\%$), African American ($n = 26, 8.8\%$), Asian Indian ($n = 9, 3.0\%$), Middle Eastern/Arab American ($n = 4, 1.3\%$), Pacific Islander ($n = 1, 9.0\%$), and Native American ($n = 2, >1.0\%$), and multiethnic ($n = 8, 2.4\%$). Participants identified with the following social classes: lower class ($n = 11, 3.7\%$), working class ($n = 36, 12.1\%$) middle, class $n = 135, 45.5\%$) upper middle class ($n = 99, 33.4\%$) and upper class ($n = 15, 5.1\%$). The mean age was 20 years. A diversity of majors was represented, ranging from Biology to Family, Youth, and Community Sciences.

Procedure

After receiving approval from a university institutional review board, a questionnaire constructed on Qualtrics, an online survey generator, was administrated. Participants accessed the survey and were compensated with class credit through SONA, an undergraduate research participant database. Students were granted course credit for participating in the study.
Instruments

Social justice variables were measured with a set of scales developed by Miller et al. (2009). These scales included items that targeted social justice self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interest, and commitment. In previous studies, positive relations between social justice self-efficacy and interests, outcome expectations and commitment demonstrated criterion validity as these relations are present in established research on SCCT (Miller et al., 2009; Miller & Sendrowitz 2011). Moreover, the authors performed a confirmatory factor analysis, which resulted in a four-factor model consistent with the existing theory.

Social Justice Self-Efficacy

The Social Justice Self-Efficacy scale consists of 20 items that ask participants to rate, on a scale of 0 (no confidence at all) to 9 (complete confidence), their confidence in their ability to engage in social justice advocacy at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, community, and institutional/political levels. Higher scores reflect higher levels of confidence in these areas. Example items include “How confident are you in your ability to examine your own worldview, biases, and prejudicial attitudes after witnessing or hearing about social injustice” and “How confident are you in your ability to address structural inequalities and barriers facing racial and ethnic minorities by becoming politically active (e.g., helping to create government policy)”. Previous research has estimated an internal consistency reliability of .94-.95 (Miller et al., 2009; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011) for the total scale, and a range of .79 to .92 for the subscales (Miller et al., 2009; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011). The internal consistency reliability estimate for the present study was .96
Social Justice Outcome Expectations

The Miller et al. (2009) Social Justice Outcome Expectations scale measures the extent to which participants perceive likely positive outcomes as a result of engagement in social justice advocacy behavior. The scale consists of 10 items, representing 3 different domains: social, material, and self-evaluative outcome expectations. Participants are asked, on a scale of 0 (Strongly Disagree) to 9 (Strongly Agree) the extent to which they agree with statements indicating likelihood of specific outcomes of social justice advocacy. Examples of items include “Engaging in social justice activities would likely allow me to fulfill a sense of personal obligation” and “Engaging in social justice activities would allow me to reduce the oppression of certain groups.” Higher scores reflect higher levels of positive outcomes associated with social justice advocacy. Previous research has estimated an internal consistency reliability ranging from .81 to .88 (Miller et al., 2009; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011). The internal consistency reliability estimate for the present study was .96.

Social Justice Interests.

The Miller et al. (2009) Social Justice Interests scale evaluates the extent to which an individual exhibits a liking for social justice advocacy activities. The measure consists of 9 statements and participants are asked to rate, on a scale of 0 (low interest) to 9 (high interest) how interested they are in activities related to social justice. Higher scores indicate higher levels of interest in the given activities. Examples of items include “How much interest do you have in reading about social issues” and “How much interest do you have in watching television programs that cover social issues.” Previous estimates for internal consistency reliability range from .90-.93 (Miller et al., 2009; Miller
& Sendrowitz, 2011). The internal consistency reliability estimate for the present study was .88.

**Social Justice Commitment.**

The Social Justice Commitment scale measures intention to engage in social justice advocacy in the future. The scale consists of four items, each of which present statements in which participants are asked to rate on a scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree). Example items include “In the future, I intend to engage in social justice activities” and “I have a plan of action for ways I will remain or become involved in social justice activities over the next year.” Higher scores indicate higher levels of social justice commitment. In previous studies, the estimated internal consistency reliability ranged from .90-.93 (Miller et al., 2009; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011). The internal consistency reliability estimate for the present study was .94.

**Social Structure Preferences.**

The extent to which individuals endorsed inequality or hierarchy was measured using a scale developed by Singelis et al. (1995). The scale is comprised of 32 items and four subscales: Horizontal Collectivism (HC), Vertical Collectivism (VC), Horizontal Individualism (HI), and Vertical Individualism (VI). For the purposes of the current study, only the vertical-horizontal dimensions were be examined; thus, the horizontal dimension (representing equality values) consisted of the summation of HC and HI, and the vertical dimension (representing hierarchy values) consisted of the summation of VC and VI. Items include statements which respondents are asked to rate on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree) how much they agree. In the development of the scale, internal consistency reliabilities for subscales ranged from .61 to .76 for each of the subscales, and initial validation demonstrated convergent and divergent validity of
the scales with horizontal and vertical orientations consistently correlating with characteristics predicted by theory (e.g., Singelis et al., 2005; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Additionally, factor analyses in studies across several nations have consistently supported the four-factor model (e.g., Chiou, 2001; Gouveia, Clemente, & Espinosa, 2003; Gyoerkoes, Becker, Massoudi, et al., 2013) Internal consistency reliability estimates for the current study subscales ranged from .80 to .90.
CHAPTER 3  
RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Prior to examining the primary hypotheses, several preliminary analyses were conducted. First, normality was assessed using skew and kurtosis values for each of the observed variables. All values for skew and kurtosis were between -1.0 and 1.0, indicating normality. As such, no transformations to data were made. Second, correlations between all variables in the model were calculated (See Table 1). Additionally, I examined the data for any demographic characteristics that might impact the amount power and privilege that individuals might hold in society. Previous scholarly work has indicated that an individual’s place in the hierarchical structure might impact their orientation to equality values (Levin, Federico, Sidanius, & Rabinowitz, 2002). In order to control for the effect of the amount of power an individual may hold in the societal hierarchy, I assessed for moderating effects of variables that might indicate privilege: ethnicity, social class, and gender. No moderating effects in the relation of social structure values and social justice variables were found.

Structural Equation Modeling

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to assess the fit of the hypothesized models to the data. Following Anderson and Gerbing’s (1988) two-step procedure for structural equation modeling (SEM), I first assessed measurement models using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Using observed indicators for each latent variable, measurement models were constructed using AMOS 22.0. Model fit was assessed using chi-square, comparative fit index (CFI), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). Although good fit is indicated by an insignificant $\chi^2$, this index
is unreliable, since it is almost always significant in large samples (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). As CFA and RMSEA were the primary fit indices. CFI compares the proposed model to a null model in which study variables are unrelated. Values of the CFI close to or greater than .95 indicate good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The RMSEA assesses how well the proposed model would fit the population covariance matrices if the best parameter estimates were available and is sensitive to model complexity. Values equal to or less than .06 indicate good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999), values from .06-.08 are considered fair fit, and values greater than .10 are considered poor-fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). Bootstrapping techniques with 1,000 bootstrapped samples of the data at a 95% confidence interval were used to determine all indirect effects (Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007). According to Shrout and Boulger (2002), if the confidence intervals for the mediation models do not include zero, the mediations are statistically significant at $p < .05$.

**Miller et al. (2009) Model**

Before testing models including equality and hierarchy values, I tested for the replicability of the Miller et al. (2009) model in the current sample. For the measurement model, items were parceled as follows: the 20 items representing social justice self-efficacy were divided into 4-item parcels based on domain; social justice outcome expectations items were divided into 3 parcels based on domain: two containing 2 items and one containing 6 items; social justice interest items were divided into 3 parcels, each containing 3 items; social justice commitment was not parceled, as it only contained four items (see Figure 3-1). Factors were loaded onto their respective observed indicators to determine the dimensionality of the latent constructs. The measurement model was found to be an adequate fit to the data: $\chi^2(71) = 256.18, p <$
.001; CFI = .95; and RMSEA = .09, \( p < .001 \), and all items/parcels loaded on their hypothesized factor at values of .80 or higher. In the structural model, direct paths from self-efficacy to outcome expectations, interest, and commitment and direct paths from outcome expectations to interest and commitment were hypothesized (see Figure 3-2). All hypothesized paths except for the path from outcome expectations to commitment were confirmed. Contrary to my hypothesized positive path from outcome expectations to career commitment, this path was found to be significantly negative. The structural model was found to be an acceptable fit to the data: \( \chi^2(71) = 256.18, p < .001; \) CFI = .95; and RMSEA = .09, \( p < .001 \), and the model accounted for 64.6\% of the variance in social justice interest and 72.7\% of the variance in social justice commitment.

**Equality Model**

Next, I added equality values to the original model predicting social justice interest and commitment. For the measurement model, the same parcels for social justice variables in the Miller et al. (2009) model were used (see Figure 3-3). For the added variable of equality, four parcels with four items each were created based on subscales. Initial results indicated that the hypothesized measurement model did not demonstrate good fit to the data: \( \chi^2(127) = 567.8, p < .001; \) CFI = .91; and RMSEA = .10, \( p < .001 \). After examining the model for potential modifications, it was noted that parcels that loaded onto equality values were very highly correlated, and modifications were made to reflect this in the model. With these adjustments, indexes demonstrated that the measurement model was an adequate fit to the data: \( \chi^2(66) = 349.04, p < .001; \) CFI = .95; and RMSEA = .08, \( p < .001 \), and all items/parcels loaded on their hypothesized factor at values of .60 or higher. The structural model consisted of the same hypothesized paths as the Miller et al. (2009) model, with equality values added.
as a direct predictor of social justice self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and commitment (see Figure 3-4). This model was an adequate fit to the data: $\chi^2(124) = 349.28, p < .001$; CFI = .95; and RMSEA = .08, $p < .001$, and accounted for 64.5% of the variance in interest and 73.2% of the variance in commitment.

**Hierarchy Model**

Next, I tested a model that only included hierarchy values as predicting social justice interest and commitment. For the measurement model, the same parcels for social justice variables in the Miller et al. (2009) model were used (see Figure 3-5). For the added variable of hierarchy, four parcels with four items each were created based on subscales. After adjusting for highly correlated parcels, the measurement model was found to be an adequate fit to the data: $\chi^2(124) = 365.00, p < .001$; CFI = .95; and RMSEA = .08, $p < .001$. With the exception of parcels 1 and 2 for hierarchy values, all items/parcels loaded onto their hypothesized factor at .80 or higher. Parcels 1 and 2 for hierarchy values loaded onto their factor at .34 and .35, respectively. The structural model consisted of the same hypothesized paths as the Miller et al. (2009) model, with hierarchy values added as a direct predictor of social justice self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and commitment (see Figure 3-6). This model was found to be an adequate fit to the data: $\chi^2(125) = 365.12, p < .001$; CFI = .95; and RMSEA = .08, $p < .001$, and accounted for 64.5% of the variance in social justice interest and 73.3% of the variance in social justice commitment.

**Model Including Equality And Hierarchy**

Finally, I tested the model including both hierarchy and equality values together (see Figure 3-7). The fit of this model to the data was inadequate: $\chi^2(191) = 707.82, p < .001$; CFI = .91; and RMSEA = .10, $p < .001$, although all items/parcels loaded on their
hypothesized factor at values of .60 or higher. The structural model consisted of the same hypothesized paths as the models including equality and hierarchy values individually. The structural model was also inadequate: $\chi^2(193) = 732.90$, $p < .001$; CFI = .91; and RMSEA = .10, $p < .001$, and accounted for 64.5% of the variance in social justice interest and 73.2% of the variance in social justice commitment.

**Indirect Effects**

In order to determine which model to use to assess indirect effects, I compared all four models for parsimony, fit, variance accounted for, and significant paths. The model including both equality and hierarchy values was deemed to be unacceptable given its lack of parsimony and inadequate fit statistics. In comparing the equality and hierarchy models, the equality model was deemed more acceptable given its slightly improved fit, likely due to the factor loadings on each of the social structure variables. In comparing the equality model to the Miller et al. (2009) original model, the equality model offers slightly better fit, slightly more variance accounted for in terms of commitment, but is less parsimonious. I ultimately chose to use the equality model to explore indirect effects because even though the variance accounted for is very similar, the equality model offers added information on predictors of social just interest and commitment that are not included in the original Miller et al. (2009) model.

I first tested the hypothesized indirect effects of the core Miller et al. (2009) model variables. and found the following to be significant: self-efficacy to interest as mediated by outcome expectations ($CI [.05, .12], SE = .02$), self-efficacy to commitment as mediated by interest ($CI [.08, .13], SE = .01$) and outcome expectations ($CI [-.04, -.01], SE = .01$), and outcome expectations to commitment as mediated by interest ($CI [.23, .33], SE = .03$).In terms of equality, the following indirect effects were significant:
equality values to outcome expectations as mediated by self-efficacy (CI [.14, .29], SE = .04), equality values to interest as mediated by self-efficacy (CI [.08, .20], SE = .03) and outcome expectations (CI [.33, .63], SE = .08), and equality values to commitment as mediated by self-efficacy (CI [.06, .14], SE = .02) and interest (CI [.07, .17], SE = .02). Outcome expectations was not a significant mediator in the link from equality values to social justice commitment.

Table 1-1. Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Equality Values</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hierarchy Values</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outcome Expectations</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interest</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Commitment</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>109.63</td>
<td>95.93</td>
<td>134.9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>47.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>33.85</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3-1. Measurement model based on Miller et al. (2009)
Figure 3-2. Structural model based on Miller et al. (2009)
Figure 3-3. Measurement model including Equality Values
Figure 3-4. Structural model including Equality Values as a predictor
Figure 3-5. Structural model including Hierarchy Values
Figure 3-6. Structural model including Hierarchy Values as a predictor
Figure 3-7. Structural model including Hierarchy and Equality Values as predictors
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

The current study had two major aims: (1) to replicate findings of Miller et al. (2009) that validated the use of a social cognitive model to predict social justice interest and commitment in college students and (2) to extend their model by including attitudes toward societal structure as an additional predicting variable. With a diverse sample of undergraduate students, four models were tested: the original Miller et al. (2009) model, a model with equality values predicting social justice variables, a model with hierarchy values predicting social justice variables, and a model with both equality and hierarchy values predicting social justice variables.

Results indicated that the Miller et al. (2009) model was, indeed, a good fit to the data from this sample. This supports previous studies that have found the social cognitive model to be an appropriate model for predicting interest in and commitment to social justice advocacy. These results also support the notion that SCCT is useful for predicting interest and commitment in a variety of different domains (Lent et al., 1994). Furthermore, as the population from the current study was comprised of undergraduate students, these along with previous results (Miller et al., 2009; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011), suggest that this model is appropriate in predicting advocacy interest and commitment in college students.

In addition to replicating previous research, I proposed a new model with the added explanatory variable of social structure preferences. After testing and comparing three potential models, results demonstrated that a model including equality values as a direct predictor of social justice self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and commitment best fulfilled criteria for model fit, significant paths, variance accounted for, and model
parsimony. When explaining interest in and commitment to social justice, it may be important to consider one’s overall view of society and preference for how it is structured. This model is consistent with previous research showing that contextual variables play an important role in the relations between the core SCCT variables (Lent et al., 2001; Miller et al., 2009; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011). Thus, this addition to the model may be important to future work in the prediction and explanation of social justice development, as it gives greater understanding of how people develop an inclination to be involved in advocacy work.

Hypotheses regarding direct paths within the larger model were partially supported. As predicted, there was a direct, moderate positive relation from equality values to social justice self-efficacy. Thus, results seem to suggest that the more one values a societal structure where power is evenly distributed and status is downplayed (Hofstede, 2001; Shavitt et al., 2006; Singelis et al., 1995; Singelis & Triandis, 1998; Triandis, Chen & Chan, 1998; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), the more one will feel able to engage in social justice advocacy and the more positive one’s outcome expectations will be. This model is consistent with previous work suggesting that individuals in equality-based societies are more likely to support redistributive procedures aimed at helping those living in poverty and research demonstrating individuals in equality-based societies tend to experience greater discomfort with power differences (Shavitt et al., 2011; Triandis & Singelis, 1998).

Two unexpected findings regarding direct effects were the direct links from equality values and outcome expectations to commitment. Although I predicted a direct linkage for both of these paths, I predicted that the relation would be positive.
Interestingly, there was a significant negative relation between outcome expectations and commitment. That is, the higher one’s outcome expectations and the more they value social equality, the less likely they are to be committed to social justice advocacy. This is inconsistent with previous theoretical and empirical work done within SCCT in non-social justice domains showing positive relations (Lent et al., 2001). Within the social justice domain, Miller and colleagues (Miller et al., 2009; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011) found no significant relation between these variables. One possibility for these mixed findings is that the negative relation may be due to suppressor effects from other variables in the social justice model. That is, if an individual is high in equality values or outcome expectations but low in self-efficacy or interest, they may be less likely to be committed to social justice work. This interpretation is consistent with current findings of indirect effects of equality values on commitment through self-efficacy and interest and indirect effects of outcome expectations on interest. Moreover, simple correlations between these variables were significantly positive. This finding underscores the importance of each of the multiple predictors in relation to each other in accounting for the total variance in commitment. Additionally, although findings were inconsistent with previous research in terms of direct link from outcome expectations to commitment, they were supportive of findings that show self-efficacy to be the more robust of the two predictor variables in these relations (Miller et al., 2009; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011).

Hypotheses regarding indirect effects were partially supported. Self-efficacy mediated the link between equality values and interest and commitment. Additionally, self-efficacy was mediated by outcome expectations to interest, and interest mediated the link from outcome expectations and self-efficacy to commitment. Consistent with the
extant work on SCCT (Lent et al., 1994; 2001; 2008; Miller et al., 2009; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011), this finding indicates that cultivating self-efficacy and outcome expectations might be an essential part in developing interest in and commitment to social justice. Furthermore, results suggest that broader views on society might play an important distal role in this process of development.

**Practical Implications**

Results from this study may have implications for those working to promote social justice and increase advocacy on college campuses. Results suggest that social justice advocacy, self-efficacy and outcome expectations and, in turn, interest and commitment are predicted by the role of equality values. Understanding this might help professionals seeking to increase social justice advocacy among undergraduates to better evaluate barriers to students’ engagement in advocacy. For example, outreaches regarding social issues might be adjusted to better target increasing self-efficacy and highlighting potential positive outcomes of engaging in advocacy. Although hierarchical orientations intuitively seems to be inconsistent with social justice values, results from the study suggest that they may be positively related. Thus, it may be important to explore the potential for a conceptualization of social justice that is culturally palatable to individuals who value hierarchy and see it as beneficial to society. Though the results of this study may not speak to the question of how social justice commitment would manifest in someone who values hierarchy, they do provide a preliminary foundation on which to build.

This notion may bring about an interesting ethical question of how counseling professionals should respond when the issue of multiculturalism conflicts with a social justice agenda. The culture of counseling psychology is largely committed to promoting
equality and eliminating social inequities (CCPTP, 2005; Mintz, Jackson, Neville, Illfelder-Kaye, & Winterowd, 2009). As such, it may be important to consider that the profession is value-laden, and brings with it a culture of its own. It will be important for future research in this area to be accompanied by the ethical discussion of this potential clash between two of the field’s most prominent professional values. Although it remains to be seen if a social justice agenda can be reconciled to the seemingly contrary values of hierarchical orientation, the results from the current study have the potential to increase cultural sensitivity in the encouragement of social justice advocacy, specifically in interventions targeted at self-efficacy and outcome expectations.

Limitations And Future Directions

Results of the current study need to be considered in light of several limitations. First, the data collected for this study were cross-sectional, limiting the extent to which conclusions can be drawn regarding causality and development over time. In the future, longitudinal research might be employed to examine how interest in and commitment to social justice advocacy change over time as well as to confirm the causal paths in the confirmed model.

Second, this study did not account for potential differences that might arise from variation in the amount of power, privilege, and status an individual may have. Previous research has indicated that people who are more privileged within a society are more likely to endorse attitudes of social dominance (Levin, Federico, Sidanius & Rabinowitz; 2002). Although I tested for moderation effects of power on equality endorsement, the sample was mostly white, middle to upper-middle class, and highly educated. Since this sample was highly privileged, effects of power and privilege may not have been detectable. Thus, results from this study may not be generalizable to non-white, non-
college student populations. Future research might further examine how one’s privilege and status in society can moderate the relations found in the current study. This should include diversifying the sample to include a greater number of individuals with minority identities.

Third, in the current study, I was interested in valuing either equality or hierarchy, which were reflected by the horizontal and vertical subscales of the Singelis et al. (2005) measure. However, the literature presents varying orientations within equality and hierarchy values. Namely, though previously studied constructs reflecting hierarchy (e.g., verticality, power distance; Hofstead, 2001; Singelis et al., 1995) are conceptually very similar, some are indicative of how much inequality is accepted, whereas others reflect how much inequality is desired. The current study did not allow to test for these differences. It would be interesting to examine whether effects are different in these two different types of hierarchical orientation in terms of how they predict social justice advocacy interest and commitment. In the future, researchers might be intentional about exploring this nuance.

Finally, it is important to note that individualism/collectivism and vertical/horizontal orientation are conflated on the Singelis et al. (2005) scale. That is, individualism and collectivism are measured with the same items as equality values and hierarchical values. Thus, it is difficult to identify unique variance contributed by each construct. As such, future researchers might focus on developing new measures that allow the constructs to be analyzed independently of each other.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

In summary, the aim of the current study was to extend previous literature suggesting a predictive link between social justice advocacy self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interest and commitment. In addition, a new predictive variable, social structure preferences, was added to create a five-factor model explaining interest and commitment in social justice advocacy. Confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling were used to test direct and indirect effects and compare three models including social structure preferences. Results indicated replicability of the original social justice commitment model. In addition, both preferences for social equality and social hierarchy were found to be direct, positive predictors of social justice advocacy self-efficacy and outcome expectations, and indirectly related to social justice advocacy interest and commitment. Findings may be used to inform counseling professionals seeking to promote a more culturally sensitive approach to encouraging advocacy in social issues, as well as guide future research in this area.
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