The Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory: A Validation Study

Alex L. Pieterse
Boston College
Katherine Kirkinis
Private Practice, CDMX, México
Lynsay Paiko
VA Palo Alto Health Care System
The University at Albany, SUNY
Matthew J. Miller
Loyola University - Chicago

Abstract

The current study extends the initial creation and validation of the Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory (ARBI; Pieterse, Utsey & Miller, 2016), a measure designed to assess anti-racism awareness and behavior among Whites Americans. Given that the original measure was developed with a sample of graduate students in counseling psychology, the current study extends validation to a sample of White individuals who identify as anti-racism activists (N=153). Findings support the original bifactor factor model of the Anti-Racism Behavioral inventory (one general anti-racism behavior factor and three domain-specific factors: individual advocacy, awareness of racism, and institutional advocacy). Additional evidence for validity was supported through negative associations with measures of the color-blind racial attitudes, as well as positive associations with scores on the White Privilege Awareness Inventory. Implications of the findings for training and future research are discussed.

Keywords: anti-racism, advocacy, measurement, social justice

© 2022 Pieterse, Kirkinis, Paiko, & Miller. Journal for Social Action in Counseling & Psychology, 14(2), 48-63.
doi: 10.33043/JSACP.14.2.48-63. Shared with CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 License.

The Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory: A Validation Study

Racism, the system of racial hierarchy that privileges and oppresses groups based on racial group membership, is rooted in unequal allocation of power (Kivel, 2017) and can be understood as a race-based system of hierarchy that privileges Whites and disadvantages people of Color within the United States of America (US) (Feagin & Doucey, 2018). The system of racial oppression in the US results in the unequal distribution of resources and opportunities that benefits Whites and marginalizes people of Color (Marger, 2014) and is noted to be an enduring phenomenon with American society (Roberts & Rizzo, 2021). Racism, although often only thought of as occurring at the individual level, is a multi-level system that exists at individual, institutional, and cultural levels: On an individual level, racism is reflected in racial prejudice and discrimination toward people of Color (e.g., racial microaggressions and racially motivated violence; Jones, 1997; Miller & Garran, 2017); on an institutional level, racism consists of racial bias within agencies (e.g., the overrepresentation of Whites in positions of power); and on a cultural level, it is the practice of treating the cultures of persons of Color as inferior by both individuals and institutions (e.g., standards of beauty favoring White phenotypes and the United States' history of colonization; Jones, 1997; Bailey et al., 2017;). This system of racial oppression in the United States is deeply rooted in the country's history of White domination that characterizes the country's current practices (i.e., Native American genocide, kidnapping and enslavement of Africans, European standards of beauty, White domination of the media, etc., Feagin & Doucey, 2017).

The harmful impact of racism on its targets is well-documented: Experiences of racism are associated with poorer physical and general health (Paradies et al., 2015; Carter et al., 2019) and negative self-evaluation (Gale et al., 2020). Experiences of racism are also associated with negative mental health outcomes such as depression and anxiety (Nadal, et al., 2014), psychological distress (Pieterse et al., 2012), and trauma-like symptomology (Kirkinis et al., 2021).

Anti-Racism Identity & Behavior

In recent years, the COVID-19 pandemic and high-profile incidents of race-related police brutality such as the 2020 killing of George Floyd, has brought increasing attention to the social impact of racist structures, and has led to renewed calls for all sectors of US society to respond to the phenomenon of systemic or institutionalized racism (Milner et et., 2020; Krieger, 2020). However, in order to effectively address and confront racial oppression, a stance of anti-racism is necessary (Basham, 2004). *Anti-racism* refers to a value that seeks to "counter racism as a system of privilege, inequality, and oppression based on perceived categorical differences" (Basham, 2004, p. 292). Additionally, anti-racism is thought to reflect "forms of thought and/or practice that seek to confront, eradicate, and/or ameliorate racism" (Bonnett, 2000, p. 4). Tatum (2017) compares anti-racist behavior to running in the opposite direction on a conveyor belt which means that those walking in the direction of belt flow, or standing still are complicit in the system of racism. That is, deliberate, active anti-racism action (i.e., moving in the opposite direction of the belt) requires effort and energy necessary to challenge the status quo that maintains racism. At present the literature provides some conceptual models for understanding anti-racism activism which informed the theoretical frame of the Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory (Pieterse et al, 2016).

Anti-racism identity development

Derman-Sparks and Phillips in 1997 introduced a model of anti-racism identity development that included four phases: (1) an informational introduction to racism and initial exploration of the "social meaning of one's personal experiences" in the context of racism; (2) realization of the contradiction between American values and unequal treatment based on race; (3) the provocation of "cognitive and emotional disequilibrium"; and (4) development of belief in the efficacy of anti-racist action and implement strategies for activism (Derman-Sparks & Phillips, 1997, p. 40-66). Shortly thereafter, D'Andrea and Daniels (1999) provided a model to understand the development of anti-racism development specific to Whites characterized by five phases: (1) simplistic, stereotyped, and "illogical" thinking patterns about race; (2) dichotomous thinking on race relations and conflict;

(3) complexity in understanding human rights that can still create disproportional valuation of White values; (4) historically situated understanding of racism; and (5) excitement and cynicism about dismantling racism. Together, these models provide a foundation for understanding the mechanisms by which anti-racism identity development may work. More recently Ray & Fuentes (2020) have presented a racial equity frame in which they suggest a racially inclusive society can be created and sustained. Their conceptual frame includes three phases including "racial equity learners" in which individuals learn and educate themselves about racial inequality; "racial equity advocates" in which individuals challenge and confront forms of racial inequality, holding themselves and others accountable; "racial equity brokers" in which individuals advocate for and engage policy development for racial equity built on accountability and transparency. Contemporary approaches to anti-racism are noted to consistently include an anti-racism knowledge component and an accompanying set of behaviors directed at dismantling racist attitudes and racist structures (Ben et al., 2020).

Anti-racism behavior

Anti-racism behavior refers to behaviors that aim to dismantle racist attitudes or institutions (Ben et al., 2020; Pieterse et al., 2016). That is, "anti-racism behaviors are designed to challenge prejudicial attitudes and institutional aspects of racism" (Pieterse et al., p. 358). As such, these behaviors can occur at institutional as well as interpersonal levels. Examples of such behaviors include involvement in organizations focused on racial justice (Pedersen et al., 2005), interrupting racist jokes or confronting negative racial stereotypes (cf. Pollock, 2008). Further, it stands to reason that in order to continue to engage in such behavior, it is important to continuously work internally on one's own racial identity, awareness and knowledge. In connection with aforementioned theory, scholars have theorized that in order to enact anti-racism behaviors, one must both accept that racism exists and have a knowledge and understanding of the history of racism and how it operates in present day society (Derman-Sparks, & Phillips, 1997; Kivel, 2017).

Anti-Racism Among Whites

In terms of research and scholarship in the area of anti-racism behavior for White individuals, qualitative research has identified "understanding one's Whiteness and White privilege" as a key piece of anti-oppressive work for Whites (Mallot et al., 2014; Smith & Reddington, 2010). Similarly, Kiselica's (1999) argues that anti-racism advocacy consists of behavioral domains in addition to awareness/knowledge domains. Along the same lines, Smith and Redington (2010) qualitatively examined the qualities of anti-racist allies finding that action was often precipitated by racial awareness and integrated into participants' work and daily lives. This notion was echoed by White women involved in anti-racism who explained that the activism went beyond traditional understanding of activism (e.g., boycotts, marches) to speaking up against racial injustice throughout their personal lives (Case, 2012). Other anti-racist activists described anti-racism action as integral in their development of a positive White identity (Mallott et al., 2014). Bolstering these qualitative findings with a measure of anti-racism behaviors could add to the field's understanding of anti-racism in practice.

Measurement of White Anti-Racism Behavior

The recent focus on Whiteness as a construct that informs racism has resulted in literature focused on both conceptual and measurement aspects of Whiteness (Grzanka et al.,2019; Schooley et al., 2019). The current focus on Whiteness and racism builds on the multicultural literature in counseling and education and attempts by these fields to incorporate multicultural competency and social justice into their training programs (Bemak, et al., 2011). In view of a dearth of measurement instruments designed to assess antiracism practice, Pieterse et al., (2016) developed the Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory (ARBI), as an attempt to measure anti-racism awareness and behavior and to determine the efficacy of anti-racism training among White counseling psychology students. This work was informed by the recognition that that anti-racism development and training needs for White students may be unique (Boatright-Horowitz, 2005; Pieterse, 2009). Through a series of studies that include

item construction and examining the factor structure of the ARBI employing both exploratory and confirmatory procedures, the ARBI provided evidence for internal consistency, temporal stability, and construct validity.

Current Study

The current study sought to extend findings of the initial validation of the Anti-Racism Behavior Inventory (ARBI; Pieterse et al., 2016) by re-examining the factor structure of a sample of White individuals who self-identified as anti-racist activists and who were involved with racial justice organizations (e.g., the Anti-Racist Alliance). The goal was to establish validity on a new population thereby extending the utility of the ARBI beyond counseling students and other mental health professional trainees. We expected that the findings would replicate the Bifactor model of the initial scale construction indicating one overall anti-racism factor and three second order domains, namely anti-racism awareness, individual advocacy, and institutional advocacy.

Upon adequately replicating the factor structure, we planned to assess criterion validity with measures of related constructs including colorblindness via the Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; Neville et al., 2000), and awareness of white privilege via the White Privilege Awareness subscale of the Privilege and Oppression Inventory (WPAI; Hays et al., 2007). We also decided to include a measure of social desirability using the Marlowe-Crowne Short Form Social Desirability Scale (MC-10; Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972) to account for the possible influence of impression management. We expected the ARBI to be negatively related to the CoBRAS as it stands to reason that being unaware of racism (e.g., colorblindness) would not cause one to engage in behaviors to end racism (e.g., anti-racism). Other studies have found a connection between colorblindness and oppressive system justification (Yogeeswaran et al., 2018) as well as anti-affirmative action beliefs (Oh, et al., 2010). We expected the ARBI to be positively related to the WPAI because previous research has shown that awareness of White privilege is related to similar constructs like racial prejudice and antidiscrimination behavior (Stewart et al., 2010).

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited by individually contacting chapter leaders of anti-racism groups (e.g., Anti-Racism Alliance; Showing up for Racial Justice, SURJ) and asking leaders to forward the survey to chapter members. See *Procedures* for additional information. A total of 153 adults comprised the participant group. Of the participants who completed the survey, 131 identified as racial justice/anti-racist advocates, however analyses were conducted on all 153 participants because depending on participants' level of development (e.g., racial identity) not all individuals engaging in anti-racism will self-identify an anti-racist (Pieterse et al., 2016).

All 153 participants self-reported their racial group memberships as White (100%; n = 153). In terms of gender, the sample was primarily female (85.6%; n = 131), followed by male (11.8%; n = 18), transgender (<1%, n =1) and other (2%; n = 3). Participant ages ranged from 21-79 years old (M = 42.31, SD = 15.94). Most participants were highly educated having attained graduate-level educations (45.8%; n = 70) followed by undergraduate degrees (39.9%; n = 61). Smaller percentages of participants had attained professional degrees (9.2%; n =14), only high school diplomas (3.3%; n = 5), or less than high school (1.3%; n = 2). One participant did not report their highest level of education.

Participants reported their sexual orientation as heterosexual (67.32%; n = 103), followed by bisexual (7.84%; n = 12), other (6.54%; n = 10), gay or lesbian (5.23%; n = 8), queer (4.58%; n = 7) and pansexual (3.27%; n = 5). Eight participants did not disclose their sexual orientation. Participant annual income ranges were as follows: less than $40,000 ($n$ = 65), $41,000-$55,000 (n = 14), $56,000-$70,000 (n = 23) $71,000-100,000 ($n$ = 26), $101,000-$115,000 (n = 2), $116,000-130,000 ($n$ = 3), greater than $131,000 ($n$ = 17). Three participants did not report their annual income.

Measures

Demographics. Participants self-reported their race, ethnicity, religion, income, age, gender, sexual orientation, and whether they identify as a racial justice or anti-racism advocate/activist.

Anti-Racism-Behavior Inventory. The Anti-Racism-Behavioral Inventory (ARBI; Pieterse et al., 2016) is a 21-item self-report measure designed to assess knowledge and behavior associated with anti-racism, was used for this study which employed a 5-point Likert- type response (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree). Examples of items include: "I interrupt racist jokes when I hear my friends talking that way". The original validation study yielded three subscales: Institutional Advocacy, Individual Advocacy, and Awareness, in addition to a Total ARBI score, with higher scores representing more engagement in anti-racism advocacy. In the original sample, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were as follows: individual advocacy α = .83; awareness of racism α = .83; institutional advocacy α = .79, and total score α =.83. Reliability coefficients for current sample were as follows: α =.84 (individual advocacy); α = .81 (awareness of racism); α =.79 (institutional advocacy), and α = .89 (total score).

White Privilege. The Privilege and Oppression Inventory (Hays et al., 2007) includes a 13-item subscale, White Privilege Awareness (WPA) that assesses a cognitive awareness of racial advantage. Each item is rated on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). Example items include: "Whites have the power to exclude other groups" and "There are benefits to being White in this society". The authors obtained Cronbach alpha coefficients α = .92. Reliability coefficients for the current sample was α = .95. Hays et al., provided evidence of construct validity through expected relationship with other measures of discrimination.

Social Desirability. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale Short Form (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972) is a 10 item scale in true/false format aimed to measure social desirability, defined as "the need to obtain approval by responding in a culturally appropriate and acceptable manner" (Crowne & Marlowe, 1961, p. 353). Example items include: "I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble" and "I have never intensely disliked anyone". The original authors obtained Cronbach alpha coefficients ranging from .49 to .75 (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972). Reliability coefficients for current sample was α = .67.

Color Blind Racial Attitudes. The Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; Neville et al., 2000) is a 20-item self-report measure designed to assess color-blind racial attitudes which measures implicit racism-related attitudes as reflected in unawareness of racial privilege, unawareness of institutional discrimination, and unawareness of blatant racism. This scale employs a Likert-type response format. Scores are obtained by summing all items for a total score, and summing relevant items for the three subscales. The total score can range from 20 to 120 with higher scores reflective of greater levels of color-blind racial attitudes. The authors obtained Cronbach alpha coefficients ranging from .70 to .86. Evidence for construct validity includes positive associations between scores on the CoBRAS and a measure of racial intolerance. Further evidence of construct validity has been noted by an inverse relationship between scores on the CoBRAS and scores on the White Privilege Attitudes Scale, a measure of awareness of racial privilege (Pinterits et al., 2009). Reliability estimates for the current sample was as follows: α = .84 (racial privilege), α = .86 (institutional discrimination), α = .58 (blatant racism), and α = .91 (total score). These reliabilities are in the same range as other studies that have utilized the CoBRAS (Gamst et al., 2011).

Mental Health. The Mental Health Inventory-5 (MHI-5. Berwick et al., 1991) is a brief, five-item mental health screening tool to assess general mental health and to screen for depressive and anxiety related symptoms. Example items include: "During the past month, how much of the time were you a happy person?" and "How much of the time, during the past month, have you felt so down in the dumps that nothing could cheer you up?" For each question, participants are asked to choose one of the following responses: 1 = all of the time, 2 = most of the time, 3 = a good bit of the time, 4 = some of the time, 5 = a little of the time, and 6 = none of the time. Because two items ask about positive feelings, their scoring was reversed. The score for the MHI-5 is computed by summing the scores of each question item and then transforming the raw scores to a 0–100-point

scale. Higher scores reflect greater mental health and lower scores reflect increased psychological distress. The reliability coefficient for current sample was α = .78.

Procedure

After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board, an online data collection procedure was utilized. To assist with the data collection process, a list of anti-racist groups was generated by Google search. Chapters leaders were contacted via e-mail and asked if they and/or their chapter would be interested in participating in the study. Chapter leaders who expressed interest were provided with a URL link to the survey, along with a message of introduction to the survey. E-mails requesting participation were sent by chapter leaders, directing members to a URL where they could review informed consent and access the online survey. Prior to data collection, each participant was presented with informed consent. Upon completion, participants received a debriefing form. Participants were not compensated for their participation in the study. All data collection was undertaken online.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Descriptive statistics indicated a normal distribution of the ARBI total scores as evidenced by the frequency distribution and measures of central tendency (M = 82.09, SD = 11.66.4, range = 43-102; skewness = -.80 and kurtosis = .27). Given that these findings suggested adequate variability of participant responses to the initial item pool, we proceeded to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis to examine if the original factor structure could be supported in a new sample of White individuals who identified as anti-racism activists.

Missing Data

In order to determine the percentage of each variable that was missing, a missing values analysis was conducted in the open-source statistical program R (R Development Core, 2014) using the *mice* package (van Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2010). Overall, missing data for specific variables ranged from 0% to 3.27%. Missing data on the ARBI ranged from 0% to 2.61%; missing CoBRAS data ranged from 0% to 1.31%; missing MHI-5 data ranged from 0% to .65%; missing WPAI data ranged from 0% to 3.27%; and missing SDS data ranged was 0%. Based on further analysis of the distribution of missing data across variables, it appears that WPAI items 2, 10, and 12 had the highest percentages of missing data (56.21%), followed by ARBI 3.3 (1.96%) and CoBRAS 2.12, CoBRAS 1.1, CoBRAS 3.18, CoBRAS 3.15 (1.31%). While there is no firm consensus regarding the percentage of missing data that becomes problematic, scholars have suggested that between 5% and 20% of missing data will yield biased results. Since we found that data were missing completely at random (MCAR, Schlomer et al., 2010), we addressed missing data by using the nearest point procedure within the *VIM* package (Shopfhauser et al., 2016). To impute the data using the KNN Nearest Neighbor Imputation, an algorithm that matches a point with its closest neighbor, assuming that a point can be approximated by the values of the points that are closest to it, based on other variables.

Analysis of Variance

We also tested for differences on the ARBI scores across gender and education via a two-way MANOVA. Results were insignificant for interaction effects [Wilks' λ = 1.27, F (21, 112) = .81, p = .21] and main effects for education [Wilks' λ = .79, F (21, 112) = 1.42, p = .12] and gender [Wilks' λ = .80, F (21, 112) = 1.31, p = .18] suggesting that education and gender groups did not differ significantly on ARBI scores.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The purpose of this study was to further examine the factor structure with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with a new sample of White adults. Typical approaches to scale validation and development include

the replication of the initial factor structure with new samples as well as the examination of validity through correlation-based procedures (DeVellis, 2016).

To validate the factor structure and examine construct validity, a maximum-likelihood estimation model CFA utilizing LISREL8.54 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2006) was conducted and was guided by the confirmatory procedure utilized in the initial development study (Pieterse et al., 2016). Model fit threshold was guided by general guidelines of model fit including RMSEA equal to or less than .06 and CFI equal to or greater than .95. (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2010).

The 21-item first order oblique three-factor ARB model (Model 1) exhibited mixed results regarding model fit, SB $\chi^2(186, N = 153) = 349.992$, $p < .05$, RMSEA = .077 (.064; .088), SRMR = .087, CFI = .941. All of the factor loadings and uniqueness terms were significant and the standardized factor loadings ranged from .24 (item 4) to .88 (item 13) (See Table 3). Factor correlations ranged from .45 (AWA and INST) to .70 (IND and INST). In addition, we tested a bifactor model (Reise, Moore, & Haviland, 2010), which assumed one general factor that accounted for variance in all ARBI items and three domain-specific factors which accounted for variance (above and beyond the variance accounted for the by general factor) in three separate subsets of ARBI items (Model 2). We tested a bifactor model given the conceptual plausibility of a general anti-racism factor which accounted for common variance among all items. In addition, we assumed that a bifactor model might be most appropriate given the moderate factor correlations identified in Model 1 (Reise, Morizot, & Hays, 2007).

The 21-item bifactor ARBI model exhibited good model fit, SB $\chi^2(168, N = 153) = 210.450$, $p < .05$, RMSEA = .041 (.019; .057), SRMR = .061, CFI = .976. All but two factor loadings for the general factor (items 4 and 6) were significant. Five domain-specific factor loadings (Individual specific factor items 3, 5, 12, and 15; AWA specific factor item 4) were significant. Standardized general factor loadings ranged from .10 to .81 and domain specific factor loadings ranged from .02 to .74. (See table 2). Likelihood ratio testing with the scaled chi-square difference test (T_d; Satorra & Bentler, 2001) indicated that the bifactor model exhibited a statistically significant improvement in model fit compared to the first-order three-factor model, $T_d(18) = 83.59$, $p < .0001$.

Correlational Analysis

Bivariate correlations were examined to assess for evidence of validity. Evidence of criterion validity was assessed by examining correlations between scores on the ARBI and Scores on the CoBRAS. Finding indicated that individuals who endorsed racism-related attitudes (i.e., CoBRAS) were less likely to endorse anti-racism knowledge and behaviors as measured by the ARBI (r = -.75, p <.000). When examining the association between anti-racism awareness and behaviors and White privilege attitudes, finding indicate that awareness of White privilege was significantly and positively associated with scores on the ARBI (r = .64, p = <.000). Examine the subscales an interesting pattern was observed in that the strongest relationship was observed for WPA and ARBI-Awareness (r = .81, p = <.000) while the weakest relationship was observed for WPA and ARBI-Institutional (r = .27, p = .001). (see Table one). Finally, findings reveal that social desirability had a modest inverse association with scores on the ARBI (r = -.24, p = .003), and scores in the mental health inventory were inversely associated with scores on the ARBI (r = -.19, p = .018)

Discussion

Findings of this study support the original bi-factor structure of the Anti-Racism Behavioral inventory (ARBI). Given that the factor structure has been replicated with the current sample of predominantly White, female, self-identified anti-racism activists, this finding suggest that the validity of the ARBI extends beyond the initial sample of White college students, and holds the promise for application with White antiracism activists. Furthermore, the mean ARBI score evidenced by the current sample (M= 82.03) in comparison to the mean scores from the original sample (M=66.03) (Pieterse et al., 2016) suggest that the ARBI is also sensitive to anti-racism activities as evidenced by higher means scores among anti-racism activists. Therefore, given the current

findings we believe that the ARBI represents an important addition to measures focused on awareness of racism, white privilege, and antiracism activity (Schooley et al., 2019).

The pattern of relationships gleaned from the correlational analysis presents some interesting findings worth further discussion. For the current sample antiracism knowledge and behavior is not associated with positive mental health as assessed by the MHI-5. Although this finding might be disappointing at first glance, it should not be surprising that individuals engaged in social justice activism might also experience lowered levels of wellbeing as evidenced by studies that document the experience of burnout among social justice advocates (Cheng & Gorski, 2015; Gorki, 2019). Although qualitive examinations of the experience of antiracism advocacy among White individuals indicate that these individuals describe the work as meaningful, they are also document significant challenges which is a reminder of the need for support and self-care when engaging activism that challenges entrenched system of oppression and structural racism (Smith & Redding, 2010). This finding also serves as a reminder that White people who have an awareness and commitment to anti-racism (i.e., actively fighting and thinking about it), could experience ongoing racial injustice as distressing and discouraging (Smith & Redding).

When examining evidence of criterion validity, we note that individuals who endorse higher awareness of White Privilege are more likely to endorse and engage antiracism activism. This finding is consistent with the developmental frame for antiracism activism outlined by Derman-Sparks and Phillips (1997) who suggest that knowledge of racism and Whiteness is a prerequisite for individual and institutional antiracism activities. Furthermore, a closer examination of this relationship indicates that White Privilege Awareness, while positively associated with antiracism has weaker associations with antiracism behavior as assessed by the ARBI individual (r = .43) and ARBI Institutional (r = .27) subscales. This finding provides preliminary evidence that awareness of White privilege does not necessarily translate to engaging in anti-racism activism. It appears that there might be other variables that either mediate or moderate the White privilege awareness and antiracism activism relationship.

Limitations

Although the findings do lend strong support for the psychometric strength of the ARBI, it is important to consider limitations that might preclude generalizability. This validation of the ARBI was on a highly educated, White American sample who were predominantly members of anti-racist groups. Given the rather narrow sample represented in this current research, it is clear that the findings cannot be generalized beyond individuals that share characteristics of the current sample. Future research might examine the validity of the ARBI on a multiracial sample. There is some evidence to suggest that people of Color and Whites have a different process in regard to exploring racial awareness and engaging anti-racism activism (Pieterse et al., 2016; Gorki, 2019). Additionally, the current sample was highly educated, suggesting that educational attainment may influence anti-racist attitudes and behavior. Given mixed findings regarding the relationship between level of education and anti-racist attitudes and behavior (e.g., Hagendoorn & Nekuee, 2018; Norrlof, 2019) future research should examine the interaction between education, racial group and gender, and its influence on the endorsement of anti-racism knowledge and behaviors.

Implications

The ARBI could be a useful tool when seeking to assess the efficacy of anti-racism instruction and training for racial awareness for Whites. Applications could include using the ARBI in a pre-test post-test format to assess the effectiveness of anti-racism training. For individuals who are less familiar with anti-racism behaviors, the ARBI also provides examples of the type of knowledge and the specific behaviors associated with anti-racism activism. Ongoing racial bias and systemic racial oppression within the US (Abramowitz & McCoy, 2019; Clayton et al., 2019) highlights the need to more aggressively pursue anti-racism instruction. The findings also highlight the type of training needed for anti-racism activism, specifically the need to examine and understand White privilege, as well as the need to disrupt Colorblind racial attitudes.

Future Research

The ARBI was developed on a sample of White students in various mental health training programs, and in the current study, further validation has been provided with a sample of White adults engaged in various activism associated with anti-racist activism. Given the focus on anti-racism in other fields such as education (Escayg, 2019), nursing (Coleman, 2020), medicine (Monroe et al., 2021) and public health (Breny, 2020), further development of the ARBI should draw on individuals from these disciplines to extend utility of the ARBI beyond counseling and anti-racism activists. In keeping with further populations for validation – it would be important to extend the ARBI beyond White identified individuals and included other racial groups as part of future validation samples. Additionally, the utility of the ARBI might be enhanced by the development of a normative sample of anti-racist advocates that could serve as a reference point when applying the ARBI to anti-racism training. Finally, the factor loadings suggest that some or the current items could benefit from revision. Additionally, the utility of the ARBI could be further extended with the addition of items that speak to engaging anti-racism in the world of. social media.

Author Correspondence

For correspondence regarding this article please contact Alex L. Pieterse, Boston College, Lynch School of Education and Human Development, 140 Commonwealth Ave, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467. Email: pietersa@bc.edu.

References

Abramowitz, A., & McCoy, J. (2019). United States: Racial resentment, negative partisanship, and polarization in Trump's America. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *681*(1), 137-156. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716218811309

Basham, K. (2004). Weaving a tapestry: Anti-racism and the pedagogy of clinical social work practice. *Smith College Studies in Social Work, 74*, 289–314. DOI: 10.1080/00377310409517717

Bailey, Z. D., Krieger, N., Agénor, M., Graves, J., Linos, N., & Bassett, M. T. (2017). Structural racism and health inequities in the USA: evidence and interventions. *The Lancet*, *389* (10077), 1453-1463. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30569-X

Bemak, F., Chi-Yung Chung, R., Talleyrand, R. M., Jones, H., & Daquin, J. (2011). Implementing multicultural social justice strategies in counselor education training programs. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling & Psychology, 3*(1), 29-43. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33043/JSACP.3.1.29-43

Ben, J., Kelly, D., & Paradies, Y. (2020). Contemporary anti-racism: a review of effective practice. In Solomos, J. (Ed.). (2020). *Routledge International Handbook of Contemporary Racisms (pp. 205-215)*. New York, NY: Routledge

Berwick, D. M., Murphy, J. M., Goldman, P. A., Ware Jr, J. E., Barsky, A. J., & Weinstein, M. C. (1991). Performance of a five-item mental health screening test. *Medical care*, 169-176.

Boatright-Horowitz, S. L. (2005). Teaching antiracism in a large introductory psychology class: A course module and its evaluation. *Journal of Black Studies, 36,* 34–51. DOI: 10.1177/0021934704266508

Bonnett, A. (2000). *Anti-racism*. London: Routledge.

Breny, J. M. (2020). Continuing the journey toward health equity: Becoming antiracist in health promotion research and practice. *Health Education & Behavior*, *47*(5), 665-670.DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198120954393

Carter, R. T., Johnson, V. E., Kirkinis, K., Roberson, K., Muchow, C., & Galgay, C. (2019). A meta-analytic review of racial discrimination: Relationships to health and culture. *Race and Social Problems*, *11*(1), 15-32. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-018-9256-y

Case, K. A. (2012). Discovering the privilege of whiteness: White women's reflections on anti-racist identity and ally behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(1), 78-96.

Chen, C. W., & Gorski, P. C. (2015). Burnout in social justice and human rights activists: Symptoms, causes and implications. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, *7*(3), 366-390.

Clayton, D. M., Moore, S. E., & Jones-Eversley, S. D. (2019). The Impact of Donald Trump's Presidency on the Well-Being of African Americans. *Journal of Black Studies*, *50*(8), 707-730. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934719885627

Coleman, T. (2020). Anti-racism in nursing education: Recommendations for racial justice praxis. *Journal of Nursing Education*, *59*(11), 642-645. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20201020-08

D'Andrea, M. D., & Daniels, J. (1999). Exploring the psychology of White racism through naturalistic inquiry. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*, 93–101. DOI: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1999.tb02426.

Derman-Sparks, L., & Phillips, C. B. (1997). *Teaching/learning anti-racism: A developmental approach*. New York: Teachers College Press.

DeVellis, R. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (Fourth edition.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Escayg, K. A. (2020). Anti-racism in US early childhood education: Foundational principles. *Sociology Compass*, *14*(4), e12764. DOI: 10.1111/soc4.12764

Feagin, J. R., & Ducey, K. (2018). *Racist America: Roots, current realities, and future reparations*. Routledge.

Gale, M. M., Pieterse, A. L., Lee, D. L., Huynh, K., Powell, S., & Kirkinis, K. (2020). A meta-analysis of the relationship between internalized racial oppression and health-related outcomes. *The Counseling*

Psychologist, *48*(4), 498-525. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000020904454

Gamst, G., Liang, C. & Der-Kerabetian, A. (2011). *Handbook of Multicultural Measures.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Gorski, P. C. (2019). Racial battle fatigue and activist burnout in racial justice activists of color at predominately white colleges and universities. *Race ethnicity and education*, *22*, 1-20. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2018.1497966

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

Hagendoorn, L., & Nekuee, S. (2018). *Education and racism: A cross national inventory of positive effects of education on ethnic tolerance*. Routledge.

Hays, D. G., Chang, C. Y., & Decker, S. L. (2007). Initial development and psychometric data for the Privilege and Oppression Inventory. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 40*, 66–79. DOI: 10.1080/07481756.2007.11909806

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Structural Equation Modeling, 6, 1-55. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. A. (2006). LISREL 8.54 and PRELIS 2.54. Chicago, IL: Scientific Software.

Kirkinis, K., Pieterse, A. L., Martin, C., Agiliga, A., & Brownell, A. (2021). Racism, racial discrimination, and trauma: A systematic review of the social science literature. *Ethnicity & health*, *26*, 392-412. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13557858.2018.1514453

Kiselica, M. S. (1999). Confronting my own ethnocentrism and racism: A process of pain and growth. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*, 14–17. DOI: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1999.tb02405.x

Kivel, P. (2017). *Uprooting racism-: How white people can work for racial justice*. New Society Publishers.

Kline, R. (2010). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Krieger, J. (2020). ENOUGH: COVID-19, structural racism, police brutality, plutocracy, climate change – and the time for health justice, democratic governance, and an equitable, sustainable future. American Journal of Public Health, 110, 1620-163. Doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.202.305886

Mallott, K. M., Paone, T. R., Schaefle, S., Cates, J., & Haizlip, B. (2014). Expanding White racial identity theory: A qualitative investigation of Whites engaged in antiracist action. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 93*, 333-343. DOI: 10.1002/jcad.12031

Marger, M. N. (2014). *Race and ethnic relations: American and global perspectives* (10th ed.). Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.

Marlow, D., & Crowne, D. P. (1961). Social desirability and response to perceived situational demands. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 25*(2), 109-115. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/h0041627

Milner, A., Franz, B., & Henry Braddock, J. (2020). We need to talk about racism—in all of its forms—to understand COVID-19 disparities. *Health equity*, *4*(1), 397-402. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1089/heq.2020.0069

Miller, J., & Garran, A. (2017). *Racism in the United States: Implications for the helping professions*. Belmont, CA: Thomson & Brooks/Cole.

Monroe, A. D., Sturgis, L. C., & Adashi, E. Y. (2020, December). Antiracism Training in Medicine. In *JAMA Health Forum* (Vol. 1, No. 12, pp. e201477-e201477). American Medical Association. DOI:10.1001/jamahealthforum.2020.1477

Nadal, K., Griffin, K., Wong, Y., Hamit, S., & Rasmus, M. (2014). The impact of racial microaggressions on

mental health: Counseling implications for clients of color. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 92,* 57-66. DOI: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.2014.00130.x

Neville, H., Lilly, R., Duran, G., Lee, M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the color-blind racial attitudes scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*(1), 59-70. DOI: 10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59

Norrlof, C. (2019). Educate to Liberate: Open Societies Need Open Minds. *Foreign Aff.*, *98*, 132.

Oh, E., Choi, C.-C., Neville, H., Anderson, C. & Landrum-Brown, J. (2010). Beliefs about affirmative action: A test of the group self-interest and racism beliefs models. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3,* 163-176. DOI:10.1037/a0019799

Paradies, Y., Ben, J., Denson, N., Elias, A., Priest, N., Pieterse, A., ... & Gee, G. (2015). Racism as a determinant of health: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one*, *10*(9), e0138511. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138511

Pedersen, A., Walker, I., & Wise, M. (2005). " Talk does not cook rice": Beyond anti-racism rhetoric to strategies for social action. *Australian Psychologist*, *40*(1), 20-31. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00050060512331317 29

Pieterse, A. L. (2009). Teaching antiracism in counselor training: Reflections on a course. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 37,* 141-152. DOI: 10.1002/j.2161-1912.2009.tb00098.x

Pieterse, A. L., Todd, N. R., Neville, H. A., & Carter, R. T. (2012). Perceived racism and mental health among Black American adults: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59*(1), 1-9. DOI: 10.1037/a0026208

Pieterse, A. L., Utsey, S., O., & Miller, M. (2016). Development and initial validation of the anti-racism behavioral inventory (ARBI), *Counseling Psychology Quarterly, 29*(4), 356-381. DOI: 10.1080/09515070.2015.1101534

Pinterits, E. J., Poteat, V. P., & Spanierman, L. B. (2009). The White Privilege Attitudes Scale: Development and initial validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *56*(3), 417-429. DOI: 10.1037/a0016274

Pollock, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Everyday antiracism: Getting real about race in school*. The New Press.

R Core Team (2014). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from: http://www.R-project.org/

Ray, R., & Fuentes, G (2020). Formulating a theory in anti-racism activism. In Solomos, J. (Ed.). (2020). *Routledge International Handbook of Contemporary Racisms (pp. 230-239)*. New York, NY: Routledge

Reise, S. P., Moore, T. M., & Haviland, M. G. (2010). Bifactor models and rotations: Exploring the extent to which multidimensional data yield univocal scores. *Journal of Personality assessment, 92*, 544-559. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2010.496477

Reise, S. P., Morizot, J., & Hays, R. D. (2007). The role of the bifactor model in resolving dimensionality issues in health outcomes measures. *Quality of Life Research, 16,* 19-31. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-007-9183-7

Roberts, S. O., & Rizzo, M. T. (2021). The psychology of American racism. *American Psychologist, 76*(3), 475–487. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000642

Schooley, R. C., Lee, D. L., & Spanierman, L. B. (2019). Measuring Whiteness: A Systematic Review of Instruments and Call to Action. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *47*(4), 530-565. doi.org/10.1177/0011000019883261

Satorra A., & Bentler, P. (2001). A scaled difference chi-square test statistic for moment structure analysis. *Psychometrika. 66,* 507–514. DOI: 10.1007/BF02296192

Schlomer, G. L., Bauman, S., & Card, N. A. (2010). Best practices for missing data management in counseling psychology. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57(1), 1-10. DOI: 10.1037/a0018082

Schooley, R. C., Lee, D. L., & Spanierman, L. B. (2019). Measuring Whiteness: A Systematic Review

of Instruments and Call to Action. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *47*(4), 530-565. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000019883261

Schopfhauser, D., Templ, M., Alfons, A., Kowarik, A., & Prantner, B. (2016) Package 'VIMGUI'. *https://rdrr.io/cran/VIMGUI/*

Smith, L., & Reddington, R. M. (2010). Lessons from the experiences of White antiracist activists. *Professional Psychology, Research and Practice, 41*, 541–549. DOI: 10.1037/a0021793

Strahan, R., & Gerbasi, K. C. (1972). Short, homogeneous versions of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of clinical psychology*, 28 (2), 191-193. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679

Stewart, T., Latu, I., Branscombe, N. & Denney, H. (2010). Yes we can!: Prejudice reduction through seeing (inequality) and believing (in social change). *Psychological Science, 21,* 1557–1562. DOI: 10.1177/0956797610385354

Tatum, B. D. (2017). *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?: And other conversations about race*. Basic Books.

van Buuren, S., & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K. (2011). mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R. *Journal of Statistical Software, 45*, 1 - 67. DOI: 10.18637/jss.v045.i03

Yogeeswaran, K., Verkuyten, M., Osborne, D. & Sibley,C. (2018). "I Have a Dream" of a colorblind nation? Examining the relationship between racial colorblindness, system justification, and support for policies that redress inequalities. *Journal of Social Issues, 74*, 282-298. DOI: 10.1111/josi.12269

Table 1

Correlation Matrix (n = 153)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. CoBRAS Blatant	1										
2. CoBRAS Institutional	0.55**	1									
3. CoBRAS Racial Privilege	0.60**	0.76**	1								
4. CoBRAS Total	0.75**	0.92**	0.92**	1							
5. Social Desirability	0.28**	0.30**	0.41**	0.38**	1						
6. Mental Health	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.14	1					
7. White Privilege	-0.60**	-0.8**	-0.85**	-0.88**	-0.33**	-0.04	1				
8. ARBI Institutional Advocacy	-0.34**	-0.39**	-0.31**	-0.39**	-0.11	-0.19*	0.27**	1			
9. ARBI Individual Advocacy	-0.46**	-0.50**	-0.45**	-0.53**	-0.12	-0.19*	0.43**	0.55**	1		
10. ARBI Awareness	-0.62**	-0.76**	-0.78**	-0.84**	-0.33**	-0.08	0.81**	0.34**	0.50**	1	
11. ARBI Total	-0.60**	-0.70**	-0.65**	-0.74**	-0.24**	-0.19*	0.64**	0.75**	0.87**	0.78**	1
Cronbach's Alpha	0.57	0.86	0.84	0.90	0.66	0.78	0.94	0.78	0.85	0.87	0.90
M(SD)	11.56	13.99	17.77	43.33	4.37	21.06	67.65	14.95	37.29	29.86	82.10
	(2.62)	(5.23)	(5.23)	(11.37)	(2.18)	(4.13)	(10.26)	(4.12)	(5.29)	(5.09)	(11.66)

*Notes. ** indicates correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, * indicates correlation is significant at the 0.05 level, 2-tailed test*

Table 2

Factor Loadings for Bifactor ARBI Model with loadings <.03 in bold

Item		ARBI Total	*Factor 1* Individual Advocacy	*Factor 2* Awareness of Racism	*Factor 3* Institutional Advocacy
1.	When I hear people telling racist jokes and using negative racial stereotypes, I usually confront them	.274	**.618**		
3.	I actively seek to understand how I participate in both intentional and unintentional racism	**.699**	.055		
5.	I actively seek to educate myself about the experience of racism	**.752**	.035		
7.	I interrupt racist conversations and jokes when I head my friends talking that way	**.465**	**.712**		
10.	I have challenged acts of racism that I have witnessed in my workplace or at school	**.479**	.275		
12.	I make it a point to educate myself about the experience of historically oppressed groups in the US (e.g. slavery, internment of Japanese, American Indians and the trail of tears etc.)	**.617**	.124		
15.	I often speak to my friends about the problem of racism in the US, and what we can do about it.	**.672**	-.090		
18.	I do not like to talk about racism in public	**-.455**	-.250		
20.	I interrupt racist conversations and jokes when I hear them in my family	**.420**	**.623**		
4.	I feel guilty and ashamed when I think of the history of racism and slavery in the US	.135		.211	
9.	It bothers me that my country has yet to acknowledge the impact of slavery	.568		**.669**	
11.	The US should offer some type of payment to the descendants of slaves	**.627**		**.428**	
13.	The US has not acknowledged the impact of slavery.	**.566**		**.692**	
14.	Because of racism in the US, Blacks do not have the same educational opportunities as compared to Whites.	**.660**		**.445**	
16.	Within the US, racism is largely perpetuated by the White racial majority	**.513**		**.505**	
21.	The police unfairly target Black men and Latinos.	**.565**		**.528**	
2.	I give money to organizations working against racism and discrimination	**.536**			**.381**
6.	When I read articles in newspapers or magazines that are perpetuating racist ideas, I generally write a letter to the editor	.116			**.547**
8.	I am actively involved in exposing companies that uphold exclusionary and racist practices	**.408**			**.648**
17.	I write letters to local and state politicians to voice my concerns about racism	.295			**.618**
19.	I volunteer with anti-racist or racial justice organizations	**.638**			**.392**

Model	$\chi 2$	df	$\chi 2$/df	CFI	RMSEA
BiFactor	250.442	168	1.48	.976	.056

Table 3

Factor Loadings and Fit Indices for 3 factor ARBI Model

Item		*Factor 1* Individual Advocacy	*Factor 2* Awareness of Racism	*Factor 3* Institutional Advocacy
1.	When I hear people telling racist jokes and using negative racial stereotypes, I usually confront them	**.450**		
3.	I actively seek to understand how I participate in both intentional and unintentional racism	.671		
5.	I actively seek to educate myself about the experience of racism	.715		
7.	I interrupt racist conversations and jokes when I head my friends talking that way	.650		
10.	I have challenged acts of racism that I have witnessed in my workplace or at school	.548		
12.	I make it a point to educate myself about the experience of historically oppressed groups in the US (e.g. slavery, internment of Japanese, American Indians and the trail of tears etc.)	.634		
15.	I often speak to my friends about the problem of racism in the US, and what we can do about it.	.596		
18.	I do not like to talk about racism in public	-.532		
20.	I interrupt racist conversations and jokes when I hear them in my family	.592		
4.	I feel guilty and ashamed when I think of the history of racism and slavery in the US		.239	
9.	It bothers me that my country has yet to acknowledge the impact of slavery		**.836**	
11.	The US should offer some type of payment to the descendants of slaves		**.754**	
13.	The US has not acknowledged the impact of slavery.		**.877**	
14.	Because of racism in the US, Blacks do not have the same educational opportunities as compared to Whites.		**.791**	
16.	Within the US, racism is largely perpetuated by the White racial majority		**.727**	
21.	The police unfairly target Black men and Latinos.		**.782**	
2.	I give money to organizations working against racism and discrimination			**.698**
6.	When I read articles in newspapers or magazines that are perpetuating racist ideas, I generally write a letter to the editor			**.397**
8.	I am actively involved in exposing companies that uphold exclusionary and racist practices			**.680**
17.	I write letters to local and state politicians to voice my concerns about racism			**.589**
19.	I volunteer with anti-racist or racial justice organizations			**.798**

Model	$\chi 2$	df	$\chi 2$/df	CFI	RMSEA
3-Factor	389.558	186	2.09	.941	.077