

LANGUAGE FRAMING INFLUENCES INTEREST IN SOCIAL-ISSUE-BASED PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR

DOI 10.21697/sp.2024.24.2.02

OLAJUWON OLAGBEGI¹, DONALD F. SACCO¹, MITCH BROWN²

¹University of Southern Mississippi

²University of Arkansas

ABSTRACT

Social activism has become an increasingly ubiquitous route to address perceived inequalities, with racial issues oftentimes being a salient example. Those looking to recruit activists for their cause are oftentimes interested in strategies to elicit participation. Two studies examined how linguistic framings of activism influence interest in such displays. Participants viewed generic low-cost and high-cost prosocial behaviors, described as being in the service of social justice, social activism, or volunteering on a between participants basis. Prosocial interest was highest for behaviors described as serving social justice purposes (Study 1). When the same prosocial behaviors were tied to specific social issues, interest in low-cost prosocial behaviors were higher when they were described as serving social activism (Study 2). Black participants reported more activism interest than White participants in both studies, regardless of framing. Findings could inform best practices for garnering support for various social causes.

KEYWORDS

social language, activism, framing, prosocial behavior

INTRODUCTION

Various contemporary social and cultural events have increased interest in social activism. This surge in involvement can at least be partly attributed to mounting dissatisfaction with perceived social inequalities, particularly those ostensibly affecting historically marginalized communities. Though engagement may occur in pursuit of social change, participants may ascribe their engagement through various labels and reasons, highlighting the significance of social language in shaping collective efforts. The spirit of volunteerism drives the actions of some (Chambré & Einolf, 2008). Others might align themselves with the principles of social justice, viewing their participation as rectification for perceived imbalances (e.g., Jost & Kay, 2010; Rothschild & Keefer, 2018). There are also individuals who fully embrace the *social activist* identity, with their engagement oftentimes being confrontational to demand immediate change (Fox & Quinn, 2012).

Despite such motives sharing an interest in tangible social change, variations in the language used within these communities can foster differing perceptions of what a given motive for social change could mean. Stereotypes and biases linked to such terminology may influence self-identification with one label and dissociation from another (Bernburg, 2019; Breakwell, 2014). This research sought to examine the influence of social language on diverse individuals. More specifically, we explored the potential impact of social language on individuals' interest in activism by understanding the epistemic basis for this interest. It could be that specific language use (i.e., volunteerism, social justice, social activism) promotes higher engagement in these activities due to the preference of specific language use or labels (Bashir et al., 2013; Breakwell, 2014; Cermak et al., 2011; Zlobina et al., 2021). Such understandings of the language employed by individuals involved in social movements could inform what measures could elicit great engagement in their causes.

IMPACT OF BIASED LANGUAGE ON ACTIVISM

The nuanced interplay of language assumes a pivotal role by influencing the trajectory and efficacy of social change efforts. Biased language and strategic language framing are critically linked to the success or impediment of social change activities. While resonating with those who see collective action as necessary for social change (Seyranian, 2014), certain linguistic framings have the potential to isolate and estrange individuals who may view the drastic actions of others as counterproductive. However, presentation is not merely a communicative act but a strategic endeavor. The specific articulation and word choice inform the reception and support garnered (Tarlau, 2014). Language framing emerges as pivotal to shaping reactions that drive social outcomes (Snow & Benford, 2005). Linguistic choices have historically wielded significant influence over public opinion, shaping perceptions and responses to social issues (Crotty et al., 2023). Extending beyond individual communication, recent studies emphasize the broader impact of language framing on political narratives, ideologies, distribution of resources within societies and global movements (Aalberg et al., 2012; Capraro & Vanzo, 2019; Dai et al., 2022; Mayer et al., 2019).

Specific labels have influenced individuals' interest in activism. Labels associated with social change carry various stereotypes that exhibit positive and negative connotations (Ashford et al., 2019; Vaes et al., 2019). One's identification with activism based on its specific label has had a shift in its connotations, often from positive to negative (Handayani et al., 2022). Negative connotations could discourage participation in activism (Bashir et al., 2013; Bobel, 2007). Additionally, the increasing prevalence of especially confrontational, almost dogmatic, approaches to social change has led to a derision of activism in light of the perceived rigidity, or even destructiveness, from these approaches (Burrows et al., 2023). This acknowledgment could lead to a conflation between earnest attempts at positive change with radical stances that become authoritarian (Costello et al., 2022). A conflation between these two could lead to a homogenization of what constitutes justice and

preclude appropriate corrections for societal problems (for discussions, see Honeycutt & Jussim, 2020; O'Donohue et al., in press).

Perceptions of one's own prosocial behavior could reflect their interest in social change beyond labels. When categorizing one's behavior as either activism or volunteering, the former is closely linked to an interest in social change and the latter with charity (Zlobina et al., 2021). This discrepancy may be increasingly apparent for individuals who face criticism for supporting activities perceived as charitable but not specifically aimed at affecting perceived societal transformations. Moreover, individuals who pursue social justice are often ascribed the label of a "social justice warrior," which has also shifted from positive to negative connotations (Handayani et al., 2022). Consequently, individuals participating in social change activities may resist embracing labels consistent with social activism to avoid negative stereotypes (Stuart, 2013). Moreover, the competing labels on self-presentation could impede one's association and engagement in activism (Conlin & Heesacker, 2018).

COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH ACTIVISM BEHAVIORS

Human evolutionary history has favored individuals with prosocial tendencies. Cooperation and mutual aid have been crucial for survival as they facilitated the overall well-being of groups and the propagation of shared genes (Darwin, 1859; Hamilton, 1964; Simpson & Beckes, 2010). As societies evolved, this predisposition to cooperate persisted and became engrained into human social structures. Membership in cohesive, cooperative groups enhanced inclusive fitness (Lenzi et al., 2012, Vogt et al., 2020). In contemporary times, challenges facing humanity have become increasingly complex (e.g., poverty, climate change). As a response, prosocial behavior has expanded to encompass a broader spectrum of activities, which may include activism.

Like with other ostensibly prosocial behaviors, activism presents unique costs and benefits that an actor must consider prior to engaging (Lehmann & Keller, 2006). Although the net benefit of prosociality would improve one's inclusive fitness, such actions present immediate costs to the actor that may preclude one from contributing to superordinate group goals. The magnitude of sacrifice in activism can be classified as high-cost or low-cost behaviors. High-cost behaviors benefit others but require personal sacrifice or significant effort (Wilson & Kahn, 1975). Examples include putting oneself in harm's way or extending valuable resources to achieve broader goals of helping. In contrast, low-cost behaviors can afford more immediate benefits to the recipient with little cost to the donor. Examples of low-cost include signing a petition, opening a door, or donating a dollar. Typically, low-cost situations garner increased participation from individuals, even in the presence of available high-cost opportunities as a strategy to conserve personal resources (Boyd, 2014; Halbesleben et al., 2014).

Both high-cost and low-cost behaviors have positive effects on the recipient and the performer. However, the costs associated with these behaviors may constrain the willingness or ability of an individual to engage in helping altogether. Thus, empirical evidence suggests that a potential helper may be further enticed by the specific framing of the prosocial act. Recent studies have suggested that framing altruistic acts in a "not to harm" versus "to help" tone elicits different outcomes wherein individuals are more motivated to prevent harm than to apply help. Thus, the phrase "not to harm" elicited more impactful framing outcomes versus "to help" (Böhm et al., 2018). This trend of framing effects is more pronounced when such framing cues are presented in the recipient's native language. In light of this evidence, the principal objective of the current study sought to investigate the impact of language framing on high-cost and low-cost helping behaviors to explore if specific framing elicits different outcomes.

RACE AND ACTIVISM

Racial factors in social activism efforts are multifaceted while significantly shaping the priorities, strategies, and overarching themes within Black and White communities. The motivations and challenges faced by individuals from historically underrepresented backgrounds play a pivotal role in shaping their involvement. Black individuals often find inspiration in historic contexts marked by the struggles that preceded, and were part of, the Civil Rights Movement (Chong, 2014). Current movements approach these issues as more multifaceted, focusing on community issues and oftentimes invoking concerns of so-called intersectionality (Bailey et al., 2013; Bell, 2013; Mustaffa, 2017). However, barriers such as burnout, historical distrust in institutions, and resource constraints may impede sustained participation (Gorski & Erakat, 2019; Peña et al., 2023).

In White communities, activism can also be prevalent. However, the issues and motivations may differ from those in Black communities, given a different history of how civil rights issues would have affected them. Moreover, White people may be motivated by allyship as means to engage other groups and address perceived inequalities faced by historically marginalized communities (Case, 2012; Smith & Crowley, 2018). Nevertheless, various barriers could emerge for some White individuals that may prevent them from being willing to engage in activism (e.g., fears of missteps; Simi & Futrell, 2009).

CURRENT RESEARCH

The central theme of the findings above is that prosocial behavior has evolved to include complex displays of cooperation, notably seen in activism. Despite a shared goal of advancing social change, the costs associated with these behaviors may constrain the willingness of such participation. Additionally, the language used within these communities plays a crucial role in shaping perceptions. The presence of stereotypes and biases associated with different labels can influence self-identification with certain terms and the avoidance of others (Bernburg, 2019; Breakwell, 2014).

Assessing the labels that foster the embracement of activism could identify potential barriers that may impede prosociality. This research sought to identify the linguistic and behavioral economic barriers. We considered how the designation of prosocial behavior as activism fosters a willingness to engage in behaviors that could promote positive social change while also considering whether controversial labels can be more enticing for action based on whether the actions are costly. These studies addressed both a general approach to activism (Study 1) and for specific causes (Study 2). Data and materials for these studies are provided: https://osf.io/47f5g/?view_only=764f069efe344375a8411b58b8780dd0

STUDY 1

The purpose of this study was to identify potential racial differences in an interest in activism based on whether such activism was described as low-cost or high-cost, in addition to the label ascribed to it. We predicted that individuals would be most interested in low-cost prosocial behaviors overall due to a preference of conserving personal resources (Ferreira, 2022). Additionally, we hypothesized that participants would be most enticed by the label “volunteer” over “social justice” or “social activism,” because it presents less loaded language that may minimize social costs for the actor (Snow & Benford, 2005; Tarlau, 2014; Crotty et al., 2023). Last, we predicted that Black participants would be more prone to activist behaviors at a higher rate than White participants

due to the salience of activism within this community (Jee-Lyn Garcia & Sharif, 2015; Clayton, 2018; Leitch et al., 2021).

METHODS

PARTICIPANTS

We recruited 300 participants through Prolific who identified as either Black or White for \$0.50 (USD). A power analysis using G*Power indicated that such a sample would adequately detect small effects at 80% power (Cohen's $f = .25$; Faul et al., 2007). One participant was excluded for failing to disclose race ($n=299$; 149 men, 145 women, 6 undisclosed; 148 Black, 151 White; $M_{Age} = 36.92$ years, $SD = 12.30$ years).

Materials and Procedure

Participants viewed a set of instructions describing prosocial behavior in one of three ways, wherein they indicated the extent to which that they would engage in each behavior. These instructions described the behaviors as social activism, social justice, or volunteer behaviors. Participants were randomly assigned to read instructions for one of these conditions on a between-subjects basis.

After reviewing these instructions, participants viewed a series of 6 low-cost and 6 high-cost prosocial behaviors. These behaviors were manually and congruently constructed based on time, effort and money. More specifically, the low-cost items (i.e., donating \$5 to a social cause) were very similar to the high-cost items (i.e. donating \$100 to a social cause) with clear variations in the costliness of each behavior. Participants viewed these behaviors in a randomized order and indicated their interest in participating in each (1=*Not at All*; 9=*Very Much*). We aggregated these items into separate composites for high-cost and low-cost behaviors ($\alpha > .93$).

RESULTS

We conducted a 2 (Participant Race: Black vs White) \times 3 (Language: Social Justice vs. Social Activism vs. Volunteerism) \times 2 (Activism Type: Low vs. High) mixed model ANOVA with the latter factor as a repeated factor. An Activism Type main effect indicated that participants preferred low-cost activism ($M=6.22$, $SD=1.78$) over high-cost activism ($M=4.06$, $SD=1.85$), $F(1, 293)=650.15$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .689$. A Race main effect indicated that Black participants expressed greater interest in participating overall ($M=5.38$, $SD=1.74$) than White participants ($M=4.90$, $SD=1.56$) $F(1, 293)=7.15$, $p = .008$, $\eta^2 = .024$.

A Condition main effect also emerged, $F(2, 293) = 4.63$, $p = .010$, $\eta^2 = .031$. LSD post hoc comparisons indicated that participants were more interested in participating in prosocial behaviors framed in terms of social justice ($M=5.54$, $SD=1.58$) compared to volunteerism language framing ($M=5.04$, $SD=1.78$), $p = .042$, $d = .30$, and social activism language framing ($M=4.87$, $SD=1.59$), $p = .004$, $d = .42$. Interest in prosocial behavior did not differ between social activism and volunteering language framings, $p = .459$, $d = .10$. No interactions emerged.

DISCUSSION

As with previous research (e.g., Ferreira, 2022), participants preferred low-cost prosocial behavior. One possible explanation for this observed preference lies in the notion that low-cost prosocial

behaviors typically demand fewer individual resources which may be perceived as naturally appealing to individuals (Boyd, 2014; Halbesleben et al., 2014). The simplicity associated with low-cost behaviors might further render them more accessible and easier to implement, fostering spontaneous engagement without extensive planning.

Second, Black participants expressed greater interest in social change-based prosocial behaviors overall. This difference could be rooted in an awareness of disproportionately higher rates of social inequalities in Black communities, which could contribute to a heightened sense of urgency and commitment to activism endeavors (Button & Rienzo, 2003; Chaney & Robertson, 2015; Hall et al., 2017). Moreover, the overall salience of civil rights within the Black community specifically could bolster a strong sense of duty and responsibility to advocate for change (Diani, 2011; Walton, 1998). Both historical and contemporary concerns may motivate an inclination towards activism among Black individuals allowing them to invest in costly behaviors (Carbado, 2017; Cheung, 2020; Fieldstein, 2005; Haines, 1984; Kelley, 2018).

Additionally, the impact of language on individuals' interest in participating in social causes underscores the importance of framing activism messages that resonate with target audiences. Social justice-oriented language unexpectedly elicited the strongest interest. One potential reason for this unexpected effect is that the issues presented to participants reflected a generic set of ideas without requiring participants to commit to specific issues for which the implications of support could be more apparent. In other words, without a specific cause to support, it could be possible that participants may not have been thinking about actual social costs (e.g., being labeled as a radical for a contentious issue). Study 2 addressed this limitation by tasking participants to indicate their interest in activism toward specific issues. Namely, we focused on affirmative action and defunding the police, two topics that were relevant issues during the study's conductance (Avery, 2023; Pereira et al., 2023; Mesic et al., 2018; Jackson et al., 2023).

STUDY 2

Research repeatedly demonstrates that the consistency between attitudes and behaviors is notably influenced by the specificity of the behavior in question (Ajzen, 2014; Ajzen et al., 2018). When examining prosocial behaviors, supporting a broad concept, such as social justice, may not translate into equivalent support for specific causes. To this end, we selected specific social issues for our second study to determine whether variability in support for specific causes based on the language used to describe them exists. In this study, we sought to utilize contemporarily relevant issues that have transitioned into recent social movements in the United States and generally evoke similar ideas regarding social inequality. Utilizing this criterion, we intentionally selected two causes: affirmative action and defunding the police. These issues have long fueled the ongoing discussion concerning equity and inclusion. In July 2023, the Supreme Court overturned affirmative action, dismantling decades of precedence (Avery, 2023; Pereira et al., 2023). This ruling posited that colleges can no longer consider race as a factor when evaluating applications for admission. Though this seemingly communicates anti-discriminatory measures, affirmative action emerged during the Civil Rights movement to remedy systemic discrimination and ensure students of color receive fair consideration for employment and educational opportunities (Sottile et al., 2024; Mujtaba 2023; Nuckols & Gregory, 2023)

Moreover, several fatal events – within marginalized communities - have led to the suggestion of defunding the police reallocation of funding from the police department to various community resources such as housing, education, and healthcare (Mesic et al., 2018; Jackson et al., 2023). Given the recency of events and the overlap in mission, we were inclined to include these issues. In Study 1, participants expressed increased interest in social justice language in the absence of tangible social issues. Thus, the purpose of the current study was to determine whether the previously

identified interest in social justice would extend when the ostensibly prosocial behaviors were associated with two specific social causes: affirmative action and defunding the police.

METHODS

PARTICIPANTS

We recruited 335 participants through Prolific who identified as either Black or White for \$0.50 (USD). A power analysis using G*Power indicated that such a sample would adequately detect small effects at 80% power (Cohen's $d = .25$ Faul, Erdfelder, & Lang, 2007). The final sample consisted of 163 Black participants, and 172 White participants garnered by a specialized feature in Prolific. Due to a programming error, no additional demographic information was collected. However, this study was exclusively interested in how race might impact prosocial engagement, so the lack of demographic information in study did not pose critical concerns. We utilized a feature in Prolific to acquire Black and White participants specifically, allowing for effective examination of data based on predictions. This study was pretested to ensure that it could be completed in an average time of 3 minutes.

Materials and Procedure. Participants responded to a similar procedure from Study 1, albeit with an additional between-subjects factor. Specifically, they were told that their behaviors would be in support of either affirmative action or defunding the police, two social issues that are oftentimes framed as relevant to social justice causes.

RESULTS

We conducted a 2 (Participant Race: Black vs. White) \times 3 (Language: Social Justice, Social Activism, Volunteerism) \times 2 (Issue: Defund the Police vs. Affirmative Action) \times 2 (Activism Type: Low Cost vs. High Cost) mixed model ANOVA, with repeated measures over the last factor. Similar to Study 1, an Activism Type main effect indicated that participants were more interested in low-cost behaviors ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 2.70$) relative to high-cost behaviors ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 2.37$), $F(1, 323) = 117.06$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .226$. An Issue main effect emerged indicating that participants were more interested in prosocial activities in support of affirmative action ($M = 4.49$, $SD = 2.61$) relative to defunding the police ($M = 2.93$, $SD = 2.17$), $F(1, 323) = 31.704$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .089$. A Participant Race main effect indicated that Black Participants were more interested in activism ($M = 4.77$, $SD = 2.63$) than White Participants ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 2.04$), $F(1, 323) = 55.453$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .147$, which is consistent with Study 1.

The most superordinate interaction was an Activism Type \times Language \times Issue interaction, $F(2, 323) = 3.68$, $p = .026$, $\eta^2 = .022$. Participant race did not qualify this superordinate interaction ($p = .78$) suggesting a lack of racial differences. To investigate this superordinate interaction, we conducted two subordinate Language \times Activism Type analyses, separately for each issue. For affirmative action, the subordinate interaction was not significant, prompting no further consideration in this analysis, $F(2, 178) = 1.60$, $p = .205$, $\eta^2 = .018$. A marginal two-way interaction emerged for defunding the police, $F(2, 151) = 2.86$, $p = .061$, $\eta^2 = .036$. Given the significant omnibus three-way, we found it prudent to decompose this interaction because of how close it was to conventional significance.

We conducted subsequent paired-samples t -tests to compare high-cost versus low-cost behaviors for each language condition. In each of these comparisons, low-cost behaviors were preferred with social activism, social justice, and volunteer language, $t_s > 2.85$, $p_s < .007$. The effect was largest

for social activism ($d=1.31$), followed by social justice ($d=.83$), and finally volunteer language ($d=.82$). Table 1 provides relevant descriptive statistics.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Defunding The Police Condition

Defund Police	Low-Cost		High-Cost	
	M	SD	M	SD
Social Justice Language	3.19	2.50	2.90	2.28
Social Activism Language	3.57	2.50	2.83	2.05
Volunteerism Language	2.82	2.14	2.44	1.60
Total	3.17	2.37	2.70	1.97

DISCUSSION

Several unexpected findings emerged in this study in addition to those that were expected. As expected, participants continued to prefer low-cost prosocial, aligning with Study 1 and previous research suggesting an interest in prosocial behavior when direct costs to the actor are minimal (e.g., Bode et al., 2015; Hobfoll, 1989; Rubaltelli & Agnoli, 2012; Simpson, 2009; Warneken & Tomasello, 2009). Second, participants were more supportive of affirmative action than defunding the police. A potential explanation for this observation may be that affirmative action might have been viewed as a more prevalent and pressing issue as the Supreme Court recently overturned decades of precedence in July 2023 (Avery, 2023; Pereira et al., 2023). This could have resulted in heightened advocacy for this issue. Moreover, the issue of “defunding the police” may have quieted down due to the minimization of “national headline events” since 2020 and participants may have become more sensitive to the nuance of this issue through the passage of time (Jackson et al., 2023; Mesic et al., 2018).

No interactive effects emerged for Black and White participants across the framing and issue conditions. The lack of difference could suggest that factors outside of race may have played a more significant role in shaping responses. Participants may have done cost-benefit analyses by weighing potential advantages and disadvantages before committing to specific social activities (Fireman & Gamson, 1977; McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Simon et al., 1998; Almanzar & Herring, 2004). This approach could be strategically employed by individuals from both ethnicities to assess perceived benefits (e.g., personal fulfillment, sense of purpose or social impact) against the perceived costs (e.g., time commitments, emotional strain) before committing to advocacy or engagement (Thomas & Dockter, 2019; Crosby 2006, Rubenfield, 1997). Moreover, the absence of differentiation by race implies that the decision-making process transcends racial boundaries and participants may be further influenced by other aspects, such as the framing of the behaviors or the language used to describe them. This insight guides our exploration beyond racial distinctions, suggesting that varying linguistic nuances or contextual cues may shape individuals’ considerations of the costs and benefits associated with these issues.

Last, the discerned language effects were more specific to concerns surrounding Defunding the Police. This effect may reflect the importance of activist language on policing issues, especially if one’s investment is low-cost helping. The magnitudinal effect for activism language could reflect interest in seeing oneself as a positive agent of change for a specific issue with minimal cost to oneself. This effect presents a degree of heterogeneity with Study 1 (where social justice framing was preferred). This finding could reflect that there may be varying interpretations of what defunding police means in language conditions compared to social justice framing lacking a specific issue for the perceiver (e.g., Vaez et al., 2019).

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Results from both studies provide continued evidence for the importance of language in shaping one's decisions to engage in ostensibly prosocial behavior tied to social issues generically (Study 1) and specifically (Study 2) as a function of that behavior's cost, albeit with greater nuance than predicted. Social justice was an influential motivator to engage in ostensibly prosocial behavior in Study 1, an effect that could have emerged based on the social desirability of the label, especially with lower costs associated with the behavior. Nonetheless, activism language was more desirable when an issue was specific for perceivers, as evidenced by Study 2. Considering specific issues as activism could be related to an interest in minimizing involvement with specific social justice initiatives that could implicate one as more disagreeable with broader society (Costello et al., 2022).

Additionally, In Study 1, Black Participants expressed greater interest in both low and high-cost activism behaviors compared to White Participants. The discrepancy in levels of interest suggests potential variations in how individuals from different racial background engage with and prioritize activism, reflecting the diverse ways in which marginalized communities may perceive and respond to social issues. Interestingly, in Study 2, Black and White perceivers did not respond to the framing conditions differently from each other. Crucially, the divergence in results between these two studies became evident only when specific social issues, namely affirmative action and defunding the police, were introduced in Study 2. This suggests that the interplay between framing techniques and the inclusion of particular social issues may significantly influence how individuals perceive and respond to these issues.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

These preliminary findings offer a glimpse into the interplay between language and activism behaviors. Nonetheless, several limitations emerge that warrant future research. First, results could be tied to a social desirability bias based on intentions to participate versus real-life actions (Randall & Fernandes, 1991; Van de Mortel, 2008). Future research endeavors could benefit from employing behavioral measures that monitor actual engagement in real-world activism. Second, there was no additional demographic information (outside of race) collected in Study 2. This omission of basic demographics such as social class, gender, etc. poses limitations because these factors could have aided in interpreting the findings of Study 2.

Moreover, it should be noted that the observed effects in this research may be contingent upon political orientation specifically. Given the nature of the issues addressed, particularly within the realm of contemporarily relevant social issues, it is plausible that these effects may be more pronounced amongst individuals with left-leaning, liberal orientations (Baranauskas, 2022; Goldberg, 2022). Liberal individuals, who often endorse progressive values and social change, may demonstrate a heightened sensitivity to the language framing manipulations thus impacting the behavioral responses. Though political orientation was not explored exclusively in this study, future research may consider exploring this dynamic to ascertain the generalizability of the findings and discern potential variations in the observed effects regarding political orientation.

Last, this study focused exclusively on the effects of language framing related to more race-specific issues. Future investigations could explore these effects more broadly (e.g., environment, health). Additionally, this research was limited to concerns of Black and White participants, which may limit the generalizability of findings. Future research could address comparisons with other groups.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our research sheds light on the crucial role of language preferences in shaping activism interest and engagement in prosocial activities. The observed surge in interest and involvement in social activism reflects a growing awareness of social inequality and the need for positive societal change. As individuals from diverse backgrounds come together with a shared goal of addressing these issues, the language used to frame activism behaviors becomes increasingly significant in garnering support and aid.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I., Fishbein, M., Lohmann, S., & Albarracín, D. (2018). The influence of attitudes on behavior. *The Handbook of Attitudes, Volume 1: Basic principles*, 197-255.
- Avery, D.R. (2023). How outlawing collegiate affirmative action will impact corporate America. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 64(4), 1-5.
- Almanzar, N.A. P., & Herring, C. (2004). Sacrificing for the cause: Another look at high-risk/cost activism. *Race and society*, 7(2), 113-129.
- Ashford, R.D., Brown, A.M., McDaniel, J., & Curtis, B. (2019). Biased labels: An experimental study of language and stigma among individuals in recovery and health professionals. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 54(8), 1376-1384.
- Bailey, T.K.M., Williams, W.S., & Favors, B. (2013). Individual and systemic racial oppression faced by African Americans. *Internalized oppression: The Psychology of Marginalized Groups*, 137-162.
- Baranasukas, A.J. (2022). Racial resentment, crime concerns, and public attitudes toward defunding the police. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 20(1), 48-72.
- Bashir, N.Y., Lockwood, P., Chasteen, A.L., Nadolny, D., & Noyes, I. (2013). The ironic impact of activists: Negative stereotypes reduce social change influence. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(7), 614-626.
- Bell, J. (2013). The four "I"s of oppression. *Somerville, NJ: YouthBuild USA*.
- Bernburg, J.G. (2019). Labeling theory. *Handbook on Crime and Deviance*, 179-196.
- Böhm, R., Theelen, M.M., Rusch, H., & Van Lange, P.A. (2018). Costs, needs, and integrating efforts shape helping behavior toward refugees. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115, 7284-7289.
- Breakwell, G.M. (2014). Identity and social representations. *Identity process theory: Identity, social action and social change*, 118-134.
- Burrows, B., Selvanathan, H.P., & Lickel, B. (2023). My fight or yours: Stereotypes of activists from advantaged and disadvantaged groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 49(1), 110-124.
- Button, J.W., & Rienzo, B.A. (2003). The impact of affirmative action: Black employment in six southern cities. *Social Science Quarterly*, 84(1), 1-14.
- Carbado, D.W. (2017). Black rights, gay rights, civil rights. In *Sexuality and Equality Law* (pp. 305-328). Routledge.
- Cermak, M.J., Christiansen, J.A., Finnegan, A.C., Gleeson, A.P., White, S.K., & Leach, D.K. (2011). Displacing activism? The impact of international service trips on understandings of social change. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 6(1), 5-19.
- Chambré, S.M., & Einolf, C.J. (2008). Is volunteering work, prosocial behavior, or leisure? An empirical study. *Centre for Nonprofit Strategy and Management*.
- Chaney, C., & Robertson, R.V. (2015). Armed and dangerous? An examination of fatal shootings of unarmed black people by police. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 8(4), 45-78.
- Chong, D. (2014). Collective action and the civil rights movement. *University of Chicago Press*.
- Clawson, R.A., & Waltenburg, E.N. (2003). Support for a Supreme Court affirmative action decision: a story in black and white. *American Politics Research*, 31(3), 251-279.
- Conlin, S.E., & Heesacker, M. (2018). The association between feminist self-labeling and gender equality activism: Exploring the effects of scale language and identity priming. *Current Psychology*, 37, 334-342.
- Costello, T.H., Bowes, S.M., Stevens, S.T., Waldman, I.D., Tasimi, A., & Lilienfeld, S.O. (2022). Clarifying the structure and nature of left-wing authoritarianism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 122, 135-170.
- Crosby, F.J., Iyer, A., & Sincharoen, S. (2006). Understanding affirmative action. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 57, 585-611.
- Darwin, C. (1859). *On the origins of species*. London: John Murray.
- Diani, M. (2011). Social movements and collective action. *The SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis*, 223-235.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G* Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175-191.
- Feldstein, R. (2005). "I Don't Trust You Anymore": Nina Simone, Culture, and Black Activism in the 1960s. *The Journal of American History*, 91(4), 1349-1379.
- Ferreira, A.I. (2022). 7 Hiding behind a mask: A multilevel perspective of burnout shame. *Burnout While Working: Lessons from Pandemic and Beyond*.
- Fox, J., & Quinn, S. (2012). The meaning of social activism to older adults in Ireland. *Journal of Occupational Science*, 19(4), 358-370.
- Goldberg, Z. (2022). Is defunding the police a "luxury belief"? Analyzing White vs. non-White democrats' attitudes on depolicing.
- Haines, H.H. (1984). Black radicalization and the funding of civil rights: 1957-1970. *Social Problems*, 32(1), 31-43.
- Halbesleben, J.R., Neveu, J.P., Paustian-Underdahl, S.C., & Westman, M. (2014). Getting to the "COR" understanding the role of resources in conservation of resources theory. *Journal of management*, 40(5), 1334-1364.
- Hall, A.V., Hall, E.V., & Perry, J.L. (2016). Black and blue: Exploring racial bias and law enforcement in the killings of unarmed black male civilians. *American Psychologist*, 71(3), 175.
- Hamilton, W.D. (1964). The genetical evolution of social behavior. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 7, 1-52.
- Handayani, T., Rohmah, T.Y., Lestari, R.D., & Azzahra, F. (2022). Identity Construction of the New Face of Social Justice Warrior on Indonesian Twitter Users. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*, 7(2), 422-433.
- Honeycutt, N., & Jussim, L. (2020). A model of political bias in social science research. *Psychological Inquiry*, 31(1), 73-85.
- Jackson, J., Fine, A., Bradford, B., & Trinkner, R. (2023). Social identity and support for defunding the police in the aftermath of George Floyd's murder. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 26(4), 833-858.
- Jost, J., & Kay, A.C. (2010). Social justice: History, theory, and research. In *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 1122-1165). Wiley.
- Kelley, R.D. (2018). Black study, Black struggle. *Ufahamu: A Journal of African Studies*, 40(2).
- Leitch, S., Corbin, J.H., Boston-Fisher, N., Ayele, C., Delobelle, P., Gwanzura Ottemöller, F., & Wicker, J. (2021). Black Lives Matter in health promotion: moving from unspoken to outspoken. *Health Promotion International*, 36(4), 1160-1169.
- Mesic, A., Franklin, L., Cansever, A., Potter, F., Sharma, A., Knopov, A., & Siegel, M. (2018). The relationship between structural racism and black-white disparities

- in fatal police shootings at the state level. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 110(2), 106-116.
- Mujtaba, B.G. (2023). Affirmative action initiatives in education and employment: Its necessity then, now and in the future. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, 24(1), 46-54.
- Mustaffa, J.B. (2017). Mapping violence, naming life: A history of anti-Black oppression in the higher education system. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 30(8), 711-727.
- Nuckols, W.L., & Gregory, D.E. (2023). Affirmative Action in Higher Education: The Perspectives of Randall Kennedy. In *The Future of American Higher Education* (pp. 214-226). Routledge.
- O'Donohue, W., Silander, N.C., Frisby, C.L., & Fisher, J.E. (2023). A Challenge to Orthodoxy in Psychology: Thomas Sowell and Social Justice. *Perspectives on Psychological Science: a Journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, 17456916231203204-17456916231203204.
- Pan, J., Wang, Z., Qi, W., Lyu, H., & Luo, J. (2023). Understanding Divergent Framing of the Supreme Court Controversies: Social Media vs. News Outlets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.09508*.
- Peña, A.M., Meier, L., & Nah, A.M. (2023). Exhaustion, Adversity, and Repression: Emotional Attrition in High-Risk Activism. *Perspectives on Politics*, 21(1), 27-42.
- Pereira, R.I., Diaz-Thomas, A., Hinton Jr, A., & Myers, A.K. A call to action following the US Supreme Court affirmative action ruling. *Lancet (London, England)*, S0140-6736.
- Randall, D.M., & Fernandes, M.F. (1991). The social desirability response bias in ethics research. *Journal of business ethics*, 10, 805-817.
- Rubinfeld, J. (1997). Affirmative Action. *The Yale Law Journal*, 107(2), 427-472.
- Seyranian, V. (2014). Social identity framing communication strategies for mobilizing social change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(3), 468-486.
- Simi, P., & Futrell, R. (2009). Negotiating White power activist stigma. *Social Problems*, 56(1), 89-110.
- Simon, B., Loewy, M., Stürmer, S., Weber, U., Freytag, P., Habig, C., ... & Spahlinger, P. (1998). Collective identification and social movement participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3), 646-658.
- Simpson, J.A., & Beckes, L. (2010). Evolutionary perspectives on prosocial behavior.
- Smith, W.L., & Crowley, R.M. (2018). Social studies needs (new) White people: The case for including allies in the curriculum. *The Social Studies*, 109(4), 202-214.
- Snow, D.A., & Benford, R.D. (2005). Clarifying the relationship between framing and ideology. *Frames of protest: Social movements and the Framing Perspective*, 205, 209.
- Sottile, E., Pasha, A.S., Ufomata, E., Nikiforova, T., Donovan, A.K., Khan, A., & Bonnema, R. (2024). Affirmative action ends and the imperative to diversify medicine must intensify. *Journal of general internal medicine*, 39(5), 863-866.
- Stuart, A. (2013). Being active, but not an activist: Managing problematic aspects of activist identity by expressing individuality or taking alternative forms of collective action (Doctoral dissertation, Murdoch University).
- Thomas, B.R., & Dockter, N. (2019). Affirmative action and holistic review in medical school admissions: Where we have been and where we are going. *Academic Medicine*, 94(4), 473-476.
- Vaes, J., Latrofa, M., Suitner, C., & Arcuri, L. (2019). They are all armed and dangerous! Biased language use in crime news with ingroup and outgroup perpetrators. *Journal of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications*, 31(1), 12.
- Van de Mortel, T.F. (2008). Faking it: social desirability response bias in self-report research. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25(4), 40-48.
- Vogt, T., Kluge, F., & Lee, R. (2020). Intergenerational resource sharing and mortality in a global perspective. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(37), 22793-22799.
- Walton, J. (1998). Urban conflict and social movements in poor countries: Theory and evidence of collective action. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 22(3), 460-481.
- Zlobina, A., Dávila, M.C., & Mitina, O.V. (2021). Am I an activist, a volunteer, both, or neither? A study of role identity profiles and their correlates among citizens engaged with equality and social justice issues. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 31(2), 155-170.