



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Journal of Experimental Social Psychology

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/jesp](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jesp)

## Case Report

## A (costly) penny for your thoughts? Allies cause harm by seeking marginalized group members' help when confronting prejudice

Merrick R. Osborne<sup>a,\*</sup>, Eric M. Anicich<sup>b</sup>, Cydney H. Dupree<sup>c</sup><sup>a</sup> Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Organizational Behavior, 309 Ives Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA<sup>b</sup> University of Southern California, Marshall School of Business, Department of Management & Organization, 701 Exposition Blvd., Hoffman Hall 411, Los Angeles, CA 90089-1424, USA<sup>c</sup> University College London, School of Management, Organizations and Innovation, One Canada Square, Canary Wharf, London E14 5AA, UK

## ARTICLE INFO

## Keywords:

Prejudice confrontations

Help-seeking

Status conferral

Emotional burden

## ABSTRACT

When confronting acts of prejudice in the workplace, allies may seek help from marginalized group members, thereby involving them (potentially against their will) in the confrontation. Across three pre-registered studies ( $N = 1447$ ) and three supplemental studies—using multiple prejudice confrontation and help-seeking situations and different marginalized groups (i.e., women and racially marginalized individuals)—we find that allies' help-seeking has negative affective consequences for the marginalized group member and negative evaluative consequences for the ally. Specifically, members of marginalized groups whose help is directly solicited (versus not directly solicited) by an ally during a prejudice confrontation experience more emotional burden; in turn, they view the ally as less deserving of status and seek to minimize their future exposure to the ally. These findings highlight the theoretical value and practical importance of examining prejudice confrontations from the marginalized group member's perspective.

Scholars have recently called for advantaged group members (hereafter referred to as allies<sup>1</sup>) to “step up” and confront prejudice against marginalized group members (e.g., Johnson & Smith, 2020; Kaur, 2020; theSkimm Staff, 2023). Indeed, research documents benefits for both allies and marginalized group members when allies call out prejudiced attitudes and discriminatory behaviors (Chu & Ashburn-Nardo, 2022; Collins, Zhang, & Sisco, 2021; Knowlton, Carton, & Grant, 2022). However, allies may be uncertain about how to confront prejudice effectively; either because they feel ill-equipped to confront (Good, Moss-Racusin, & Sanchez, 2012; Sherf, Tangirala, & Weber, 2017; Van Zomeren, 2013) or have concerns regarding their psychological standing to confront (De Souza & Schmader, 2022). When that is the case, they are likely to seek guidance from marginalized group members.

Allies may seek help from marginalized group members during prejudice confrontations for several reasons: they may feel unqualified to act (Good et al., 2012; Sherf et al., 2017; Van Zomeren, 2013), fear that they lack the psychological standing to confront (De Souza &

Schmader, 2022) or view marginalized individuals as more knowledgeable about discrimination (Nelson, Adams, & Salter, 2013). Indeed, compared to advantaged allies, marginalized group members are seen as more likely to confront prejudice (Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, & Bylsma, 2003) and better equipped to explain why a behavior is discriminatory (Allen, 1995; Duguid, 2011; Ely, 1994; Ibarra, 1995; Loyd & Amoroso, 2018; Saguy, Fernández, Branscombe, & Shany, 2020; Torrez, Dupree, & Kraus, 2024; Wilton, Rattan, Abrams, & Genao-Perez, 2022). Research on targeted social referencing similarly finds that advantaged group members often look to marginalized individuals for cues on how to respond to prejudice (Cose, 1997; Crosby, 2015; Crosby & Monin, 2013; Crosby, Monin, & Richardson, 2008), based on the belief that they are more informed about oppression (Bonam, Nair Das, Coleman, & Salter, 2019) and more committed to justice (Saguy et al., 2020). Broader societal norms reinforce this pattern by positioning marginalized individuals as “moral experts” expected to educate others about bias (e.g., Hodgson, 2019; Tita-Reid, 2020; Vorauer & Sakamoto, 2008; Vorauer & Petsnik, 2023; Wilson, 2020). Together, these

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [mro38@cornell.edu](mailto:mro38@cornell.edu) (M.R. Osborne), [anicich@marshall.usc.edu](mailto:anicich@marshall.usc.edu) (E.M. Anicich), [c.dupree@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:c.dupree@ucl.ac.uk) (C.H. Dupree).<sup>1</sup> In line with other allyship research (Birnbaum, Wilson, & Waytz, 2024; Chu & Ashburn-Nardo, 2022; Park, Vani, Saint-Hilaire, & Kraus, 2022), we conceptualize allies as advantaged group members. However, alternative conceptualizations exist, some of which include marginalized group members as allies (Vani, Alzahawi, Dannels, & Halevy, 2023). We briefly discuss the implications of ally identity in the general discussion.

dynamics help explain why allies often defer to marginalized group members—but how does this affect marginalized group members who are being asked to help?

Such requests may seem beneficial, as assisting in confronting prejudice may offer psychological benefits similar to initiating the confrontation oneself—such as increased self-esteem, competence, empowerment (Gervais & Hillard, 2014), and feelings of control (Swim & Thomas, 2006). Being invited into the confrontation may also signal ally support and reduce fear of backlash. As a result, marginalized individuals may feel affirmed and empowered when asked to help.

However, we anticipate that allies' help-seeking while confronting prejudice will emotionally burden marginalized group members. This burden may stem from uncertainty about how to respond or concern that participating in the confrontation could jeopardize their social capital (Eliezer & Major, 2012; Sherf et al., 2017). Such concerns are not unfounded—marginalized group members, particularly women, often face backlash for assertive behavior (Amanatullah & Tinsley, 2013a, 2013b; Dupree, 2024). Furthermore, being solicited for help in these moments may heighten the salience of their marginalized identity, which can increase negative affect (Crosby, King, & Savitsky, 2014) and reduce their sense of power (Vorauer & Petsnik, 2023). Scholars have pointed to the harmful effects of this dynamic, noting that calling on Black people to address racism serves to “only augment exhaustion as Black colleagues are relied upon to provide resources, education, guided discovery, and emotional support to their non-black peers” (Boykin et al., 2020; p. 777; see also: Richeson, Trawalter, & Shelton, 2005).

More broadly, help-seeking research suggests that being the target of such requests can heighten feelings of exhaustion (Baer et al., 2015). Building on this work, we propose that marginalized group members will feel greater emotional burden—i.e. the negative affective states (e.g., stress, discomfort, or anxiety) that arise from providing support to others (Kayaalp, Page, & Rospenda, 2021)—when allies request their help in confronting prejudice, compared to when no such request is made (Hypothesis 1).

We also examine how allies' help-seeking during prejudice confrontations might shape marginalized group members' perceptions of the ally. When allies confront prejudice independently (i.e., without requesting help), they can enhance their standing in the marginalized group member's eyes by signaling openness to the target's perspective, thus promoting the marginalized group member's feelings of safety. From this perspective, help-seeking may elevate the ally's perceived status in the eyes of the marginalized group member. *Status*—defined as one's perceived instrumental social value based on displaying group-benefiting behavior (Leary, Jongman-Sereno, & Diebels, 2014)—is an important resource that is associated with numerous intrapersonal (e.g., Adler, Epel, Castellazzo, & Ickovics, 2000; Anderson, Brion, Moore, & Kennedy, 2012) and interpersonal (e.g., Djurdjevic et al., 2017; Judge & Cable, 2004; Merton, 1968) benefits, including higher compensation (Chen, Hambrick, & Pollock, 2008) and increased promotion opportunities (DiPrete & Soule, 1988).

However, soliciting help from marginalized group members may inadvertently place marginalized individuals in a difficult position, particularly given their aforementioned concerns about potential backlash. These concerns about backlash may then lead them to feel compromised or burdened by the request. Therefore, we predict that marginalized group members will confer less status on allies who seek their help compared to those who confront prejudice without doing so (Hypothesis 2).

Extending this logic, we further propose that help-seeking during a prejudice confrontation may diminish marginalized group members' willingness to engage with the ally more broadly. Specifically, we predict that marginalized group members whose help is solicited—compared to those whose help is not—will report less interest in working with the ally (Hypothesis 3), less interest in socializing with the ally (Hypothesis 4), and more negative perceptions of the ally's suitability for leading diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives

(Hypothesis 5). Furthermore, we predict that emotional burden will partially mediate the effects of allies' help-seeking (versus not help-seeking) on status conferral (Hypothesis 6a), interest in working with the ally (Hypothesis 6b), interest in socializing with the ally (Hypothesis 6c), and perceived DEI leadership suitability (Hypothesis 6d).

Finally, we propose that the presence (versus absence) of the perpetrator moderates the effects of help-seeking on both emotional burden and status conferral. Confronting prejudice can provoke the perpetrator's ire (Rattan, Kroeper, Arnett, Brown, & Murphy, 2023; Stone, Whitehead, Schmader, & Focella, 2011). Therefore, when the perpetrator is present and the ally seeks help from the marginalized group member, the risk of backlash spreads to both the confronter and the help-seeking target. Building on stress research (Jamieson, Crum, Goyer, Marotta, & Akinola, 2018) and practitioner recommendations to remove stressors from the target's environment (e.g., Cleveland Clinic, 2020; Conway, 2021; Paulise, 2023), we predict that help-seeking when the perpetrator is absent will reduce emotional burden (H7) and increase status conferred on the ally (H8), compared to when the perpetrator remains present. In turn, we expect that lower emotional burden will lead to greater status conferral (H9). Still, we anticipate that both forms of help-seeking—regardless of perpetrator presence—will elicit more emotional burden (H1) and less status conferral (H2) than confrontations where the ally does not seek help, as help-seeking inherently spotlights the marginalized individual and heightens the salience of their identity.

## 1. The current work

We tested our predictions across three pre-registered studies with participants from historically marginalized groups—specifically, women and people of color. In Study 1, participants described a realistic act of workplace prejudice and evaluated a real coworker (the ally) who either hypothetically sought or did not seek their help while confronting it. Study 2 used a stimulus sampling design to test the effects of ally help-seeking across varied contexts. Study 3 examined how women responded to ally help-seeking when the perpetrator was either present or absent. For each study, we report how we determined sample size, all exclusions (if any), manipulations, and measures. Sample sizes were calculated using the “pwr” package in R to detect a small effect size with 85 % power and  $\alpha = 0.05$  using two-tailed tests (v. 1.3.0; Champely et al., 2018). All materials, data, and pre-registrations are available on OSF: [https://osf.io/dphyb/?view\\_only=0e69749d48044a3b99d2bf030c02e4dc](https://osf.io/dphyb/?view_only=0e69749d48044a3b99d2bf030c02e4dc). In Study 1, we pre-registered the emotional burden variable as exploratory; in all other studies, it was confirmatory. Table 1 provides sampling information for each study, including minimum detectable effect sizes.<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, items were presented on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

## 2. Study 1

Study 1 examined the emotional burden experienced by women (in response to sexism) and people of color (in response to racism) when an ally sought their help during a prejudice confrontation, and whether this

<sup>2</sup> The online supplement contains additional analyses with pre-registered control variables and exploratory outcomes, and reports three supplementary studies: 1) a qualitative pilot study of marginalized group members' experiences being the targets of help-seeking during prejudice confrontations, 2) an experimental vignette study building on the pilot, and 3) a conceptual replication of Study 1.

**Table 1.**  
Sampling information for each study.

| Study | Platform       | Initial<br><i>N</i> | # failed<br>exclusion<br>criteria | Final<br><i>N</i> | Sensitivity analyses<br>(Minimum detectable<br>effect) | <i>M</i><br>age | SD<br>age | %<br>White<br>women | % Women<br>of color | %<br>Men<br>of<br>color | %<br>Non-<br>binary | Recruitment strategy                              |
|-------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 1     | Prolific       | 467                 | 42                                | 425               | $d = 0.29$                                             | 34.27           | 13.56     | 47                  | 38                  | 14                      | 1                   | People of color (any gender) and women (any race) |
| 2     | Cloud-Research | 709                 | 130                               | 579               | $\eta^2 = 0.03$                                        | 40.99           | 13.02     | 78                  | 22                  | 0                       | 0                   | Exclusively women                                 |
| 3     | Prolific       | 472                 | 29                                | 443               | $\eta^2 = 0.02$                                        | 38.61           | 13.14     | 79                  | 19                  | 0                       | 2                   | Exclusively women                                 |

*Note.* Additional information about our sampling strategy and participant demographics is reported in the supplement. All reported minimum detectable effects are based on 85 % power, two-tailed tests,  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

burden affected the status they conferred on the ally. After collecting demographic data, we categorized participants as women of color, White women, or men of color. Participants were then asked to name an advantaged-group coworker.<sup>3</sup> Participants then recalled a moderately prejudiced comment that could plausibly be directed at them (or someone who shares their marginalized identity), described it, indicated whether they had personally experienced it, and rated its offensiveness (1 = *Not offensive at all*, 10 = *Very offensive*).

Next, participants read a scenario involving a White male perpetrator and the identified coworker as the ally. In a casual conversation, the perpetrator made the prejudiced comment that the participant had described. In the *no help-seeking condition*, the ally simply confronted the perpetrator (“...telling him that what he said was wrong and offensive”). In the *help-seeking condition*, the ally confronted the perpetrator, then turned to the participant to ask them to help explain how the situation should be resolved so that all parties involved can move forward.

2.1. Measures

2.1.1. Emotional burden

Participants reported their emotional burden using four items adapted from the emotional burden subscale of the Caregiver Burden Inventory (Novak & Guest, 1989): “{confronter}’s behavior made me uncomfortable,” “{confronter}’s behavior embarrassed me,” “I resent {confronter}’s actions,” and “{confronter}’s actions made me feel angry.” ( $\alpha = 0.94$ ).

2.1.2. Status conferral

Status conferral was measured using four items adapted from Jachimowicz, To, Agasi, Côté, and Galinsky (2019): “I would admire {confronter} more,” “I would hold {confronter} in higher esteem,” “{confronter} would have higher status in my eyes,” and “I would respect {confronter} more.” ( $\alpha = 0.97$ )

2.2. Results and discussion

See Table 2 for means, standard deviations, and test statistics. Supporting Hypotheses 1–2, marginalized group members in the *help-seeking condition* reported greater emotional burden and conferred less status on the ally than those in the *no help-seeking condition* (H1: emotional burden,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 0.45$ , 95 % C.I. [0.25, 0.64]; H2: status conferral,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = -0.36$ , 95 % C.I. [-0.55, -0.17]). Emotional burden partially mediated the effect of help-seeking (versus no help-seeking) on status conferral (indirect effect =  $-0.39$ ,  $SE = 0.09$ , 95 % C.I. [-0.56,

<sup>3</sup> We asked White women participants to name a male coworker; men of color participants to name a White coworker; and women of color participants to name either a male or White coworker (randomly assigned). We asked participants of color who imagined a White coworker to also indicate the coworker’s gender.

**Table 2.**  
Means, standard deviations, correlations, and test statistics (Study 1).

| Measure             | No help-seeking<br>condition<br><i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> ) | Help-seeking<br>condition<br><i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> ) | <i>t</i> -test<br>information   | Correlation<br>between<br>measures |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Emotional burden | 1.98 (1.18)                                            | 2.53 (1.28)                                         | $t(423) = 4.62$ ,<br>$p < .001$ | –                                  |
| 2. Status conferral | 5.66 (1.25)                                            | 5.21 (1.27)                                         | $t(423) = -3.68$ , $p < .001$   | $-0.70^{***}$                      |

*Note.*  $***p < .001$ . Help-seeking = “1”, no help-seeking = “0”.

–0.22]), supporting Hypothesis 6a.

3. Study 2

In Study 2, we added two conditions: in the *only invoke target condition*, the ally invoked—but did not explicitly seek help from—the marginalized participant, allowing us to rule out effects due to merely being singled out. In the *general help-seeking condition*, the ally sought input from the group, helping us rule out effects of general (versus direct) help-seeking. Additionally, we employed a stimulus sampling approach, which involves using multiple stimuli within a category to represent a condition (Simohnson et al., 2025; Wells & Windschitl, 1999). Specifically, we varied the prejudiced comment and help-seeking phrasing to enhance generalizability and reduce stimulus-specific bias.

In this study, we recruited participants who identified as women. Participants imagined working as analysts at a company called Design-Tech and read a series of emails exchanged among six project team members: Paul (perpetrator), Jeff (ally), the participant (the only woman copied), and three uninvolved male coworkers (Brian, Justin, John). The email chain began with Brian asking the team how many applications they expected for a new job posting. Paul “replied all” to the group with one of three sexist comments: “No idea, but it’s a leadership [highly quantitative] [highly stressful] position so I doubt very many women will apply. And the women who do apply probably won’t be very strong.” We varied the text of the statement to ensure results were not driven by a specific prejudiced statement.<sup>4</sup> Paul then followed up: “Please disregard my previous email...I didn’t realize that I copied the whole team.”

Participants were then randomly assigned to one of four conditions in which Jeff (the ally) replied to Paul (the perpetrator), copying the full team. In all conditions, Jeff began: “Your comment about women is pretty messed up.” In the *no help-seeking condition*, Jeff did not write anything further. In the *only invoke target condition*, Jeff added: “... [Participant’s name] probably doesn’t appreciate it either.” In the

<sup>4</sup> A one-way ANOVA showed no significant effect of comment type on perceived offensiveness,  $F(2, 576) = 1.08$ ,  $p = .342$ ,  $\eta^2 < 0.0005$ .

general help-seeking condition, Jeff added: "...What did others think of Paul's comment?" Finally, in the *direct help-seeking condition*, we again followed a stimulus sampling approach, randomly displaying one of three help-seeking messages: a) "[Participant name] what do you think of Paul's comment?", b) "[Participant name] will you describe how Paul's comment made you feel?", and c) "[Participant name] will you explain why Paul's comment was discriminatory?".<sup>5</sup>

### 3.1. Measures

After reviewing the full exchange, participants completed the same emotional burden ( $\alpha = 0.95$ ) and status conferral ( $\alpha = 0.98$ ) measures used in Study 1 and then rated their willingness to: (a) work with the ally ("How willing would you be to continue to work with Jeff in the future?"), (b) socialize with the ally ("How willing would you be to spend time with Jeff outside of work in the future?") (1 = *Not willing at all*, 7 = *Very willing*), and (c) support the ally in leading DEI efforts ("To what extent would you want Jeff to lead Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) efforts at your organization?"; 1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *Very much*).

### 3.2. Results and discussion

Table 3 reports descriptive statistics and correlations, Table 4 presents test statistics and effect sizes, and Table 5 presents *p*-values from Tukey HSD post hoc comparisons. Supporting Hypotheses 1 and 2, women in the *direct help-seeking condition* anticipated significantly greater emotional burden and indicated they would confer less status on the ally than women in the other three conditions (all *p*'s < 0.001). They also anticipated being less willing to work with the ally, spend time with him outside of work, and support him in a DEI leadership role (*p*'s < 0.042), supporting Hypotheses 3–5. Emotional burden partially mediated the effects of the direct help-seeking condition (versus each of the other conditions) on all anticipated outcomes, supporting Hypotheses 6a–6d (see Table 6 for mediation results).

## 4. Study 3

Study 3 tested whether the perpetrator's presence moderates the effects of help-seeking on emotional burden and status conferral. Drawing on prior research showing that confronting perpetrators' prejudice can provoke backlash (Rattan et al., 2023; Stone et al., 2011) and that removing stressors reduces strain (Jamieson et al., 2018), we predicted that burden would be greatest—and status conferral lowest—when help was sought in the perpetrator's presence (versus absence; H7 and H8). Finally, we tested whether emotional burden mediated the effects of condition on status conferral (H6a and H9).

Participants (all women) began by reporting their age, gender, and race. Then, they imagined working as a marketing manager at Xantippe, a frozen fast-food company. In a scenario adapted from Isaakyan, Sherf, Tangirala, and Guenter (2021), they entered an open office as a conversation ended, during which a male coworker (Paul) made a moderately sexist comment while looking at them. Another male coworker (Sam) confronted Paul, saying the comment was wrong and offensive. Participants were then randomly assigned to one of three conditions: (1) *help-seeking with the perpetrator present*, (2) *help-seeking with the perpetrator absent*, or (3) *no help-seeking*.

In the *perpetrator present condition*, Sam turned to the participant during the confrontation and asked, "As a woman, can you explain to us how Paul's comment was wrong or offensive?" In the *perpetrator absent condition*, Sam asked the same question after the room had cleared, leaving only the participant. Language in both help-seeking conditions was adapted from Sherf et al.'s (2017) psychological standing measure.

<sup>5</sup> A one-way ANOVA showed no significant effects of help-seeking message on any outcomes (*p*'s = 0.202–0.878).

In the *no help-seeking condition*, Sam confronted Paul but did not involve the participant further. Finally, participants completed the same measures of emotional burden ( $\alpha = 0.96$ ) and status conferral ( $\alpha = 0.99$ ) used in Studies 1–2.

### 4.1. Results and discussion

We first tested whether help-seeking (versus no help-seeking) increased emotional burden and reduced status conferral. Collapsing across both help-seeking conditions, participants reported significantly greater emotional burden ( $M = 3.35$ ,  $SD = 1.64$ ) and conferred less status ( $M = 4.34$ ,  $SD = 1.60$ ) than participants in the no help-seeking condition (burden:  $M = 1.95$ ,  $SD = 1.13$ ;  $t(441) = 9.20$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 0.94$ ; 95 % C.I.: [0.73, 1.15]; status conferral:  $M = 5.75$ ,  $SD = 1.10$ ;  $t(441) = -9.42$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = -0.96$ , 95 % C.I.: [-1.17, -0.75]), supporting H1 and H2. Then, coding the combined help-seeking conditions as "1" and the no help-seeking condition as "0", we tested if the effect of help-seeking on status conferral was mediated by emotional burden. The confidence interval for the indirect effect did not cross zero (indirect effect = -1.05,  $SE = 0.11$ , 95 % C.I. [-1.27, -0.83], 10,000 bootstraps), supporting H6a.<sup>6</sup>

Next, we compared all three conditions to each other. One-way ANOVAs showed significant effects of condition on both emotional burden,  $F(2, 440) = 49.14$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.18$ , 95 % C.I. [0.13, 1.00]), and status conferral:  $F(2, 440) = 44.76$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.17$ , 95 % C.I. [0.12, 1.00]). See Table 7 for means and standard deviations, and Table 8 for effect size comparisons across the three conditions. Perpetrator presence (versus absence) increased emotional burden (supporting H7) but did not significantly affect status conferral (failing to support H8). Overall, help-seeking—regardless of perpetrator presence—increased burden and reduced status conferral, further supporting H1 and H2. These results suggest that soliciting help from marginalized group members during a confrontation may be burdensome even when the immediate social threat is lower.

## 5. General discussion

Although confronting prejudice can be beneficial, allies may not always feel comfortable or equipped to do so alone. In these moments, they may solicit help from marginalized group members. However, across three pre-registered studies—featuring different confrontation scenarios, and identity groups—we consistently found that when allies directly asked a marginalized person for help during a prejudice confrontation, marginalized group members (in these studies, women and/or people of color) reported more emotional burden than when no help was sought. This heightened burden, in turn, partially reduced the extent to which marginalized group members conferred status on the ally or wanted to work with them, socialize with them, and support them in future leadership roles.

Moreover, the effects were robust across multiple types of help-seeking (Study 2) and social contexts (Study 3); indeed, in a supplemental study (Supplemental Study 3), we found that the language that allies used to seek the marginalized group members' help did not qualitatively shape our results. Additionally, Study 3 demonstrated that help-seeking increased emotional burden regardless of the perpetrator's presence—though the burden was greater when the request occurred in front of the perpetrator. This finding reveals that while the presence of an immediate threat exacerbates the cost of being asked to participate,

<sup>6</sup> To validate these results using an orthogonal contrast, we re-ran the analysis using Helmert coding to compare the no help-seeking (coded as 0) condition to the average of the two help-seeking conditions (both coded as -0.5). The contrast remained statistically significant for both emotional burden ( $b = -1.68$ ,  $SE = 0.17$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and status conferral ( $b = 1.48$ ,  $SE = 0.29$ ,  $p < .001$ ).



**Table 3.**  
Descriptive statistics and correlations (Study 2).

| Measure          | No Help-Seeking Condition<br>M (SD) | Only Invoke Target Condition<br>M (SD) | General Help-Seeking Condition<br>M (SD) | Direct Help-Seeking Condition<br>M (SD) | Emotional burden | Status conferral | Work w/ ally | Time w/ ally |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Emotional burden | 2.05 (1.42)                         | 2.42 (1.61)                            | 2.27 (1.57)                              | 3.55 (1.85)                             |                  |                  |              |              |
| Status conferral | 5.77 (1.18)                         | 5.37 (1.50)                            | 5.59 (1.28)                              | 4.78 (1.80)                             | −0.49***         |                  |              |              |
| Work with ally   | 6.20 (1.17)                         | 6.12 (1.23)                            | 6.25 (1.17)                              | 5.48 (1.54)                             | −0.52***         | 0.72***          |              |              |
| Time with ally   | 5.24 (1.44)                         | 4.81 (1.59)                            | 5.22 (1.56)                              | 4.32 (1.65)                             | −0.35***         | 0.64***          | 0.64***      |              |
| Ally Leads DEI   | 5.29 (1.50)                         | 5.38 (1.63)                            | 5.37 (1.53)                              | 4.75 (2.04)                             | −0.37***         | 0.69***          | 0.67***      | 0.62***      |

Note. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

**Table 4.**  
F-Statistics and Eta-squared (Study 2).

| Measure          | F-Statistic and eta-squared                                                    |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Emotional burden | $F(3, 575) = 23.88, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.11, 95\% \text{ C.I.: } [0.06, 0.16]$ |
| Status conferral | $F(3, 575) = 12.28, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.06, 95\% \text{ C.I.: } [0.03, 0.10]$ |
| Work with ally   | $F(3, 572) = 10.84, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.05, 95\% \text{ C.I.: } [0.02, 0.09]$ |
| Time with ally   | $F(3, 573) = 10.67, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.05, 95\% \text{ C.I.: } [0.02, 0.09]$ |
| Ally Leads DEI   | $F(3, 575) = 4.48, p = .004, \eta^2 = 0.02, 95\% \text{ C.I.: } [0.001, 0.05]$ |

the cost is present regardless.

### 5.1. Theoretical contributions

This research extends and refines theories of allyship and prejudice confrontation by centering the experiences of marginalized group members. Whereas prior work has focused on perpetrators' responses (e.g., Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006) or how to motivate ally behavior (e.g., Brown et al., 2021), our studies contribute to a growing literature on how marginalized individuals perceive and are affected by allyship behaviors (e.g., Burns & Granz, 2023; Chu & Ashburn-Nardo, 2022; Hildebrand, Jusuf, & Monteith, 2020; Ponce De Leon & Rosette, 2022). We

show that when allies target marginalized individuals for help during a confrontation, it can impose a psychological cost—heightened emotional burden—that ultimately leads those individuals to grant the ally less status. These findings suggest that when well-intentioned ally behaviors place additional demands on those they aim to support, they are perceived as counterproductive. In this way, our work underscores the importance of distinguishing between allyship as it is *claimed* and as it is *experienced* (Brown & Ostrove, 2013)—reminding us that effectiveness is determined not by the actor's intent, but by the target's interpretation.

Our findings also advance recent calls to move “away from an allyship-as-identity perspective toward a practice-oriented approach” (De Souza & Schmader, 2025, p. 6). This shift emphasizes that allyship is not a stable identity, but a sustained pattern of behavior evaluated by its impact on marginalized individuals. By demonstrating that a specific allyship action can backfire, we offer concrete evidence in support of this practice-based view. Specifically, we identify a previously unexplored “allyship misstep” (Collier-Spruel & Ryan, 2024): a potentially well-intentioned behavior that increases the marginalized group members' emotional burden and reduces the ally's standing in the target's eyes. In doing so, our work extends typologies of allyship action (De Souza & Schmader, 2025; Pietri, Moser, Derricks, & Johnson, 2024) by

**Table 5.**  
Cohen's d and p-values (Study 2).

| Condition 1          | Condition 2          | Emotional burden | Status conferral | Work with ally | Time with ally | Lead DEI |
|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------|
| No Help-Seeking      | Direct Help-Seeking  | −0.91***         | 0.65***          | 0.52***        | 0.59***        | 0.30***  |
| No Help-Seeking      | General Help-Seeking | −0.14            | 0.15             | −0.05          | 0.01           | −0.05    |
| No Help-Seeking      | Only Invoke Target   | −0.24            | 0.30             | 0.07           | 0.28           | −0.06    |
| Direct Help-Seeking  | General Help-Seeking | 0.75***          | −0.52***         | −0.56***       | −0.56***       | −0.34*** |
| Direct Help-Seeking  | Only Invoke Target   | 0.65***          | −0.36**          | −0.46***       | −0.30*         | −0.34*** |
| General Help-Seeking | Only Invoke Target   | −0.10            | 0.15             | 0.11           | 0.26           | −0.01    |

Note. Cell values are the effect sizes. \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ . Asterisks derived from Tukey post-hoc tests.

**Table 6.**  
Indirect effects (Study 2).

|                                       | Status conferral |      |       |       | Work with ally |      |       |       | Time with ally |      |       |       | Lead DEI |      |       |       |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------|-------|-------|----------------|------|-------|-------|----------------|------|-------|-------|----------|------|-------|-------|
|                                       | I.E.             | SE   | LLCI  | ULCI  | I.E.           | SE   | LLCI  | ULCI  | I.E.           | SE   | LLCI  | ULCI  | I.E.     | SE   | LLCI  | ULCI  |
| Direct help-seeking condition versus: |                  |      |       |       |                |      |       |       |                |      |       |       |          |      |       |       |
| No help-seeking condition             | −0.64            | 0.12 | −0.90 | −0.41 | −0.56          | 0.11 | −0.81 | −0.36 | −0.51          | 0.12 | −0.77 | −0.29 | −0.56    | 0.12 | −0.82 | −0.34 |
| Only invoke target condition          | −0.50            | 0.11 | −0.74 | −0.30 | −0.49          | 0.10 | −0.70 | −0.30 | −0.43          | 0.11 | −0.65 | −0.24 | −0.45    | 0.11 | −0.68 | −0.25 |
| General help-seeking condition        | −0.55            | 0.12 | −0.81 | −0.34 | −0.47          | 0.11 | −0.70 | −0.29 | −0.44          | 0.11 | −0.68 | −0.25 | −0.44    | 0.11 | −0.70 | −0.25 |
| Previous three conditions combined    | −0.54            | 0.09 | −0.73 | −0.37 | −0.50          | 0.08 | −0.68 | −0.35 | −0.40          | 0.08 | −0.58 | −0.26 | −0.46    | 0.09 | −0.64 | −0.31 |

Note. I.E.: Indirect effect. SE = Standard error. LLCI = Lower level of confidence interval. ULCI = Upper level of confidence interval. For each analysis, “direct help-seeking” is coded as “1”, whereas the other conditions are coded as “0”. In the “Previous Three Combined” row, we compare the “direct help-seeking” to the other three conditions.

**Table 7.**  
Means, standard deviations, and correlations (Study 3).

| Measure                | Perpetrator:<br>present<br>Mean (SD) | Perpetrator:<br>absent<br>Mean (SD) | No help-<br>seeking<br>Mean<br>(SD) | Correlation between<br>measures |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Emotional<br>burden | 3.65 (1.71)                          | 3.07 (1.52)                         | 1.95<br>(1.13)                      |                                 |
| 2. Status<br>conferral | 4.27 (1.69)                          | 4.42 (1.51)                         | 5.75<br>(1.10)                      | −0.80**                         |

Note. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ ; −1 = No help-seeking, 0 = perpetrator absent, 1 = perpetrator present.

**Table 8.**  
Cohen's  $d$  and  $p$ -values (Study 3).

| Condition 1         | Condition 2         | Emotional burden | Status conferral |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|
| No help-seeking     | Perpetrator Absent  | 0.83***          | 1.04***          |
| No help-seeking     | Perpetrator Present | −1.17***         | −1.01***         |
| Perpetrator Present | Perpetrator Absent  | −0.36**          | 0.09             |

Note. Cell values are the effect sizes. \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

showing how certain actions, even if motivated by solidarity, can still fall short of effective allyship.

We also expand models of ineffective allyship by highlighting not only problematic motivations, but also skill deficits. While much research emphasizes the importance of authentic engagement (e.g., Kutlaca & Radke, 2022; Pietri et al., 2024), our findings highlight a more subtle form of allyship failure: poor situational judgment. Building on frameworks such as the Confronting Prejudiced Responses Model (Ashburn-Nardo et al., 2008) and findings from (Collier-Spruel & Ryan, 2024), our results suggest that directly requesting help from a marginalized group member during a confrontation may reflect a lack of interpersonal skill or judgment—thus extending our understanding of ineffective allyship.

Our findings also speak to the robustness and generalizability of help-seeking's emotional toll on marginalized group members during prejudice confrontations. Study 3 showed that the psychological burden of being asked to help was highest when the perpetrator was present—consistent with research suggesting that public confrontation heightens threat and strain (Jamieson et al., 2018; Rattan et al., 2023; Stone et al., 2011). However, the burden was still present when the perpetrator was absent (compared to the no help-seeking condition), indicating that the harm stems not only from visibility but also from the act of singling out a marginalized individual. This complements existing work on the conditions under which confrontation serves as an identity-safety cue for marginalized people (Hildebrand et al., 2020) by showing that confrontation may undermine identity safety when it involves drawing the target into the exchange. Study 2 reinforced this interpretation: emotional burden remained consistent across multiple types of direct help-seeking. Moreover, in Study 1, we observed no significant differences across identity subgroups (e.g., women of color versus White women), suggesting these effects may generalize across marginalized identities. While this claim should be interpreted cautiously due to limited statistical power, it highlights the need for further research on how intersectionality shapes reactions to ally behavior during confrontation.

Three limitations warrant consideration. First, our primary studies relied on scenario-based paradigms, which may have felt artificial to some participants. To enhance ecological validity, we incorporated a realistic email exchange context in Study 2 and a recall paradigm in Supplementary Study 3. Second, in that supplementary study, only 37.32 % of participants who were asked if they could recall a situation in which an ally directly involved them during a prejudice confrontation were able to recall that specific situation. This suggests that while the phenomenon may have meaningful consequences, it could be less

common than initially assumed. Third, our studies focused on a specific form of allyship: behaviors performed by advantaged group members. However, recent research has argued that other marginalized group members can be allies. In the context of the current work, we anticipate that another marginalized group members' help-seeking may be less emotionally burdensome for the target, as they may see it as a “collaboration” with the other marginalized group members, rather than educating the perpetrator and the ally.

Additionally, we cannot rule out that help-seeking leads marginalized group members to evaluate the allies less (i.e., confer less status on them, be less willing to work with them, etc.), therefore emotionally burdening marginalized group members. This is an inherent limitation of the statistical mediation models we employed in our studies (Fiedler, Harris, & Schott, 2018; Spencer, Zanna, & Fong, 2005). Admittedly, we do not have strong theoretical reasons to suspect that reduced evaluations of an ally lead marginalized group members to subsequently feel greater emotional burden. For status conferral to be grounded as an antecedent to emotional burden, additional theorizing is necessary. For instance, reducing the amount of status conferred on an ally may be cognitively taxing, or even disappointing. Yet, this alternative process is less parsimonious than the core of our argument: that marginalized group members' feelings about allies shape their beliefs of how much social value those allies have.

5.2. Practical implications

Our findings offer concrete guidance for allies. First, they caution against a common impulse: turning to the targeted individual for help in the moment. While this may feel inclusive or respectful, our results suggest it imposes emotional costs and may reduce the ally's perceived credibility. Instead, allies should aim to act independently when possible and seek input from marginalized colleagues privately, after the confrontation has concluded.

Importantly, however, Study 2 demonstrates that not all forms of help-seeking are equally harmful. Specifically, participants in the *general help-seeking condition*—where the ally asked the group at large for input without singling out the marginalized individual—did not report significantly greater emotional burden, nor did they evaluate the ally differently than those in the *no help-seeking condition*. This suggests that allies who feel unprepared to confront alone might consider appealing to the group as a whole, thereby minimizing additional burden on the targeted individual.

Second, our findings reinforce the idea that ineffective allyship should not be dismissed or condemned but treated as an opportunity for growth. As De Souza and Schmader (2025) argue, allyship is a sustained practice—not a static identity—and “no single allyship action meets the criteria to constitute an allyship practice” (p. 6). This view underscores the value of reflection: debriefing missteps can help allies understand their impact and improve future actions. Crucially, however, the responsibility to initiate or guide these conversations should not fall on marginalized individuals, as doing so risks compounding their emotional burden. Allies must take proactive ownership of their learning while recognizing that revisiting these moments may be taxing for those they intended to support.

Together, our studies contribute to a growing understanding of what effective—and ineffective—allyship looks like in practice. Impactful allies do more than confront bias—they remain sensitive to how their marginalized colleagues prefer such confrontations to unfold, including whether they wish to be directly targeted for help. By aligning their actions with these preferences, allies can avoid unintended psychological costs and maintain the respect and regard of those they aim to support.

Open practices statement

Materials, data, and pre-registrations are available on the following

OSF page: [https://osf.io/dphyb/?view\\_only=0e69749d48044a3b99d2bf030c02e4dc](https://osf.io/dphyb/?view_only=0e69749d48044a3b99d2bf030c02e4dc).

Funding for this research was provided by the University of Southern California Marshall School of Business.

The authors do not have any financial declarations of interest or conflicts of interest to declare for the manuscript “A (costly) penny for your thoughts? Allies cause harm by seeking marginalized group members’ help when confronting prejudice.”

### CRedit authorship contribution statement

**Merrick R. Osborne:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Project administration, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Eric M. Anicich:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Validation, Supervision, Project administration, Methodology, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Conceptualization. **Cydney H. Dupree:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Validation, Supervision, Methodology.

### Declaration of competing interest

None.

### Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2025.104865>.

### References

- Adler, N. E., Epel, E. S., Castellazzo, G., & Ickovics, J. R. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy, White women. *Health Psychology, 19*(6), 586–592. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.19.6.586>
- Allen, B. J. (1995). “Diversity”; and organizational communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 23*(2), 143–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909889509365420>
- Amanatullah, E. T., & Tinsley, C. H. (2013a). Ask and ye shall receive? How gender and status moderate negotiation success. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, 6* (4), 253–272. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ncmr.12014>
- Amanatullah, E. T., & Tinsley, C. H. (2013b). Punishing female negotiators for asserting too much... or not enough: Exploring why advocacy moderates backlash against assertive female negotiators. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 120*(1), 110–122.
- Anderson, C., Brion, S., Moore, D. A., & Kennedy, J. A. (2012). A status-enhancement account of overconfidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*(4), 718–735. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029395>
- Ashburn-Nardo, L., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2008). The confronting prejudiced responses (CPR) model: Applying CPR in organizations. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7*(3), 332–342.
- Baer, M. D., Dhensa-Kahlon, R. K., Colquitt, J. A., Rodell, J. B., Outlaw, R., & Long, D. M. (2015). Uneasy lies the head that bears the trust: The effects of feeling trusted on emotional exhaustion. *Academy of Management Journal, 58*(6), 1637–1657. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0246>
- Birnbaum, H. J., Wilson, D., & Waytz, A. (2024). Advantaged groups misperceive how allyship will be received. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 181*, Article 104309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2024.104309>
- Bonam, C. M., Nair Das, V., Coleman, B. R., & Salter, P. (2019). Ignoring history, denying racism: Mounting evidence for the Marley hypothesis and epistemologies of ignorance. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 10*(2), 257–265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617751583>
- Boykin, C. M., Brown, N. D., Carter, J. T., Dukes, K., Green, D. J., Harrison, T., ... Williams, A. D. (2020). Anti-racist actions and accountability: Not more empty promises. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, 39*(7), 775–786. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-06-2020-0158>
- Brown, K. T., & Ostrove, J. M. (2013). What does it mean to be an ally?: The perception of allies from the perspective of people of color. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43*(11), 2211–2222.
- Brown, R. M., Craig, M. A., & Apfelbaum, E. P. (2021). European Americans’ intentions to confront racial bias: Considering who, what (kind), and why. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 95*, 104123.
- Burns, M. D., & Granz, E. L. (2023). “Sincere white people, work in conjunction with us”: Racial minorities’ perceptions of white ally sincerity and perceptions of ally efforts. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 26*(2), 453–475.
- Champely, S., Ekstrom, C., Dalgard, P., Gill, J., Weibelzahl, S., Anandkumar, A., ... De Rosario, M. H. (2018). *Package ‘pwr’: R Package. Version, 1*(2). (<http://14.63.219.55/web/packages/pwr/pwr.pdf>).
- Chen, G., Hambrick, D. C., & Pollock, T. G. (2008). Puttin’ on the ritz: Pre-Ipo enlistment of prestigious affiliates as deadline-induced remediation. *Academy of Management Journal, 51*(5), 954–975. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2008.34789666>
- Chu, C., & Ashburn-Nardo, L. (2022). Black Americans’ perspectives on ally confrontations of racial prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 101*, Article 104337.
- Cleveland Clinic. (2020, November 24). Stress: Coping with life’s stressors. <https://my.clevelandclinic.org/health/articles/6392-stress-coping-with-lifes-stressors>.
- Collier-Spruel, L. A., & Ryan, A. M. (2024). Are all allyship attempts helpful? An investigation of effective and ineffective allyship. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 39*(1), 83–108.
- Collins, J. C., Zhang, P., & Sisco, S. (2021). Everyone is invited: Leveraging bystander intervention and ally development to cultivate social justice in the workplace. *Human Resource Development Review, 20*(4), 486–511.
- Conway, A. (2021, March 8). *The 4 a’s of stress relief*. Mayo Clinic Health System. <https://www.mayoclinichealthsystem.org/hometown-health/speaking-of-health/the-4-as-of-stress-relief>.
- Cose, E. (1997). *Color-blind: Seeing beyond race in a race-obsessed world*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Crosby, J. R. (2015). The silent majority: Understanding and increasing majority group responses to discrimination. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 9*(10), 539–550. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12196>
- Crosby, J. R., King, M., & Savitsky, K. (2014). The minority spotlight effect. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 5*(7), 743–750. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550614527625>
- Crosby, J. R., & Monin, B. (2013). How the opinions of racial minorities influence judgments of discrimination. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 35*(4), 334–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2013.803963>
- Crosby, J. R., Monin, B., & Richardson, D. (2008). Where do we look during potentially offensive behavior? *Psychological Science, 19*(3), 226–228. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02072.x>
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 784.
- De Souza, L., & Schmader, T. (2022). The misjudgement of men: Does pluralistic ignorance inhibit allyship? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 122*(22), 265–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000362>
- De Souza, L., & Schmader, T. (2025). When people do allyship: A typology of allyship action. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 29*(1), 3–31.
- DiPrete, T. A., & Soule, W. T. (1988). Gender and promotion in segmented job ladder systems. *American Sociological Review, 26*–40.
- Djurđević, E., Stoverink, A. C., Klotz, A. C., Koopman, J., da Motta Veiga, S. P., Yam, K. C., & Chiang, J. T.-J. (2017). Workplace status: The development and validation of a scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(7), 1124–1147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000202>
- Duguid, M. (2011). Female tokens in high-prestige work groups: Catalysts or inhibitors of group diversification? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 116*(1), 104–115.
- Dupree, C. H. (2024). Words of a leader: The importance of intersectionality for understanding women leaders’ use of dominant language and how others receive it. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 69*(2), 271–323. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00018392231223142>
- Eliezer, D., & Major, B. (2012). It’s not your fault: The social costs of claiming discrimination on behalf of someone else. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 15* (4), 487–502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430211432894>
- Ely, R. J. (1994). The effects of organizational demographics and social identity on relationships among professional women. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 203*–238.
- Fiedler, K., Harris, C., & Schott, M. (2018). Unwarranted inferences from statistical mediation tests – An analysis of articles published in 2015. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 75*, 95–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.11.008>
- Gervais, S. J., & Hillard, A. L. (2014). Confronting sexism as persuasion: Effects of a confrontation’s recipient, source, message, and context. *Journal of Social Issues, 70* (4), 653–667. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12084>
- Good, J. J., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Sanchez, D. T. (2012). When do we confront? Perceptions of costs and benefits predict confronting discrimination on behalf of the self and others. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 36*(2), 210–226.
- Hildebrand, L. K., Jusuf, C. C., & Monteith, M. J. (2020). Ally confrontations as identity-safety cues for marginalized individuals. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 50*(6), 1318–1333.
- Hodgson, K. Stop telling women to fix sexist workplaces. UX Collective. <https://uxdes.ign.cc/stop-telling-women-to-fix-sexist-workplaces-bb042525e160>.
- Ibarra, H. (1995). Race, opportunity, and diversity of social circles in managerial networks. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(3), 673–703. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256742>
- Isaakyan, S., Sherf, E. N., Tangirala, S., & Guenter, H. (2021). Keeping it between us: Managerial endorsement of public versus private voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 106*(7), 1049.
- Jachimowicz, J. M., To, C., Agasi, S., Côté, S., & Galinsky, A. D. (2019). The gravitational pull of expressing passion: When and how expressing passion elicits status conferral and support from others. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 153*, 41–62.
- Jamieson, J. P., Crum, A. J., Goyer, J. P., Marotta, M. E., & Akinola, M. (2018). Optimizing stress responses with reappraisal and mindset interventions: An integrated model. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping, 31*(3), 245–261.

- Johnson, W. B., & Smith, D. G. (2020). *How men can confront other men about sexist behavior*. Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2020/10/how-men-can-confront-other-men-about-sexist-behavior>.
- Judge, T. A., & Cable, D. M. (2004). The effect of physical height on workplace success and income: Preliminary test of a theoretical model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 428–441. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.428>
- Kaur, H. (2020, May 3). *A guide to how you can support marginalized communities*. CNN. <https://www.cnn.com/2020/05/30/us/how-to-be-an-ally-guide-trnd/index.html>.
- Kayaalp, A., Page, K. J., & Rospenda, K. M. (2021). Caregiver burden, work-family conflict, family-work conflict, and mental health of caregivers: A mediational longitudinal study. *Work & Stress*, 35(3), 217–240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2020.1832609>
- Knowlton, K., Carton, A. M., & Grant, A. M. (2022). Help (un) wanted: Why the most powerful allies are the most likely to stumble—And when they fulfill their potential. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 42, Article 100180.
- Kutlaca, M., & Radke, H. (2022). Towards an understanding of performative allyship: Definition, antecedents and consequences. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 17, Article e12724.
- Leary, M. R., Jongman-Sereno, K. P., & Diebels, K. J. (2014). The pursuit of status: A self-presentational perspective on the quest for social value. In J. T. Cheng, J. L. Tracy, & C. Anderson (Eds.), *The psychology of social status* (pp. 159–178). New York: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-0867-7\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-0867-7_8).
- Loyd, D. L., & Amoroso, L. M. (2018). Undermining diversity: Favoritism threat and its effect on advocacy for similar others. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 22(3), 143.
- Merton, R. K. (1968). The Matthew effect in science. *Science*, 159(3810), 56–63. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.159.3810.56>
- Nelson, J. C., Adams, G., & Salter, P. S. (2013). The Marley hypothesis: Denial of racism reflects ignorance of history. *Psychological Science*, 24(2), 213–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612451466>
- Novak, M., & Guest, C. (1989). Application of a multidimensional caregiver burden inventory. *The Gerontologist*, 29(6), 798–803.
- Park, J. W., Vani, P., Saint-Hilaire, S., & Kraus, M. W. (2022). Disadvantaged group activists' attitudes toward advantaged group allies in social movements. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 98, Article 104226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2021.104226>
- Paulise, L. (2023, August 28). *How to manage anxiety with these 4 distancing techniques*. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/lucianapaulise/2023/08/28/manage-workplace-anxiety-with-these-4-distancing-techniques/?sh=728c013c4fe7>.
- Pietri, E. S., Moser, C. E., Derricks, V., & Johnson, I. R. (2024). A framework for understanding effective allyship. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 3(10), 686–700.
- Ponce De Leon, R., & Rosette, A. S. (2022). "Invisible" discrimination: Divergent outcomes for the nonprototypicality of black women. *Academy of Management Journal*, 65(3), 784–812.
- Rattan, A., Kroeper, K., Arnett, R., Brown, X., & Murphy, M. (2023). Not such a complainer anymore: Confrontation that signals a growth mindset can attenuate backlash. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 124(2), 344.
- Richeson, J. A., Trawalter, S., & Shelton, J. N. (2005). African Americans' implicit racial attitudes and the depletion of executive function after interracial interactions. *Social Cognition*, 23(4), 336–352. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2005.23.4.336>
- Saguy, T., Fernández, S., Branscombe, N. R., & Shany, A. (2020). Justice agents: Discriminated group members are perceived to be highly committed to social justice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 46(1), 155–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219845922>
- Sherf, E. N., Tangirala, S., & Weber, K. C. (2017). It is not my place! Psychological standing and men's voice and participation in gender-parity initiatives. *Organization Science*, 28(2), 193–210. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2017.1118>
- Simohnson, U., Montealegre, A., & Evangelidis, I. (2025). Stimulus sampling reimaged: Designing experiments with mix-and-match. Analyzing Results with Stimulus Plots. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 129(1), 71–90. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000449>
- Spencer, S. J., Zanna, M. P., & Fong, G. T. (2005). Establishing a causal chain: Why experiments are often more effective than mediational analyses in examining psychological processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6), 845–851. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.845>
- Stone, J., Whitehead, J., Schmader, T., & Focella, E. (2011). Thanks for asking: Self-affirming questions reduce backlash when stigmatized targets confront prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(3), 589–598.
- Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., Fitzgerald, D. C., & Bylsma, W. H. (2003). African American college students' experiences with everyday racism: Characteristics of and responses to these incidents. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 29(1), 38–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798402239228>
- Swim, J. K., & Thomas, M. A. (2006). Responding to everyday discrimination: A synthesis of research on goal-directed, self-regulatory coping behaviors. In *Stigma and group inequality* (pp. 119–140). Psychology Press. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781410617057-11/responding-everyday-discrimination-synthesis-research-goal-directed-self-regulatory-coping-behaviors-janet-swim-margaret-thomas>.
- theSkimm Staff. (2023, March 9). *Send this to a man*. theSkimm. <https://www.theskimm.com/stateofwomen/send-this-to-a-man>.
- Tita-Reid, N. Beware of burning out your Black employees. Fortune. <https://fortune.com/2020/06/08/black-people-workplace-racism-diversity/>.
- Torrez, B., Dupree, C. H., & Kraus, M. W. (2024). How race influences perceptions of objectivity and hiring preferences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 110, Article 104524.
- Van Zomeren, M. (2013). Four core social-psychological motivations to undertake collective action. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7(6), 378–388.
- Vani, P., Alzahawi, S., Dannals, J. E., & Halevy, N. (2023). Strategic mindsets and support for social change: Impact mindset explains support for black lives matter across racial groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 49(8), 1295–1312. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672221099710>
- Vorauer, J. D., & Petsnik, C. (2023). The disempowering implications for members of marginalized groups of imposing a focus on personal experiences in discussions of intergroup issues. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 125(1). <https://psycnet.apa.org/psycarticles/2023-35963-001.pdf>.
- Vorauer, J. D., & Sakamoto, Y. (2008). Who cares what the outgroup thinks? Testing an information search model of the importance individuals accord to an outgroup member's view of them during intergroup interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1467–1480. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012631>
- Wells, G. L., & Windschitl, P. D. (1999). Stimulus sampling and social psychological experimentation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(9), 1115–1125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672992512005>
- Wilton, L. S., Rattan, A., Abrams, S., & Genao-Perez, Y. (2022). Lay beliefs about who can bridge the black-white racial gap during interracial exchanges. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 13(2), 533–542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506211038150>
- Wilson, B. L. (2020). *Perspective: I'm your black friend, but I won't educate you about racism. That's on you*. Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/06/08/black-friends-educate-racism/>.