**Supplemental File**

**Study 2C:** Survey Validation with Straight Cisgender Sample

 We sought to validate the allyship scale in a sample of participants who were not identified as members of the LGBT+ community. We asked participants how good of an ally they were and correlated this with their self-ratings on our Allyship scale. The study was pre-registered on aspredicted.org (#26936).

**Method**

**Participants**

 The sample contained 421 straight-identified participants (256 male, 165 female; *M*age = 37.75, *SD* = 11.17 years). With respect to self-identified race, there were 307 White participants, 40 Asian participants, 38 Black participants, 22 Latinx participants, 6 Native American participants, 6 Mixed race participants, 1 Middle Eastern participant, and 1 other identified participant.

**Measures and Procedures**

 Participants were recruited to the study via mTurk. After informed consent, they completed demographic questions. Those who indicated being a member of the LGBT+ community were redirected to another study, as pre-registered. Participants completed the following scales in randomized order.

 For convergent validity, participants completed the allyship scale items and a single-item, global measure rating themselves on how good of an ally they were to the LGBT+ community. These items were on a 7-point scale from 1(*not true*) to 7(*extremely true*). Note that the allyship scale items were rephrased to the first-person in order to assess the extent to which participants felt each behavior was true of themselves. For additional convergent validity, we investigated how self-rated allyship was related to participants’ levels of LGBT contact, explicit prejudice, homonegativity (Morrison & Morrison, 2003), and social dominance orientation (Ho et al., 2015).

**Self-reported contact** ($∝ $= .85) was adapted from (Herek & Capitanio, 1996). The measure included four items, such as “How many friends do you have who identify as LGBT?” with scale response options from 1(*None*) to 5(*Many*). The other three items asked about relatives, close acquaintances, and coworkers/colleagues.

**Explicit prejudice** was measured with two feeling thermometer items in which participants were asked to rate how cold or warm they feel toward gay and lesbian people or toward transgender people, from 0(*very cold*) to 100(*very warm*) in 10-unit increments. Because the items were very strongly correlated, *r*(399) = .84, *p* < .001, they were combined into a measure of explicit anti-LGBT prejudice.

**Homonegativity** was measured with Morrison and Morrison’s (2003) 12-item scale ($∝ $= .97), such as “LGBT people should stop shoving their lifestyle down other people’s throats.” The response scale was a 7-point scale anchored at 1(*strongly disagree*) to 7(*strongly agree*).

**Social dominance orientation** was measured with Ho et al.’s (2015) scale ($∝ $= .90). We used the short version that consisted of eight items, such as “Group equality should not be our primary goal” with a response scale from 1(*strongly oppose*) to 7(*strongly favor*).

 For discriminant validity, we assessed Openness to Experience (Gosling et al., 2003) and Impression Management (Hart et al., 2015). **Openness to Experience** was measured with two items from the Big Five scale, *r*(400) = .45, *p* < .001. **Impression Management** ($∝ $= .78) was measured with eight items, such as “I sometimes tell lies,” with response options from 1(*strongly disagree*) to 7(*strongly agree*). Higher scores indicated more impression management, that is, disagreement with items that would portray the participant in a negative light. One item (“I avoid listening”) decreased the scale’s reliability, and so it was cut from the composite.

**Results**

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

The same 11-item, three-factor scale structure reported in Study 2b was tested in the current sample, with the wording of the items modified so that participants were reporting on their own allyship behaviors. Specifically, we tested a CFA model with a non-prejudiced latent factor predicting four items (e.g., “I want equal rights for everyone”), an action latent factor predicting four items (e.g., “I speak out against anti-LGBT discrimination”), and a humility factor predicting three items (e.g., “I avoid speaking on behalf of LGBT+ people”). This model yielded good fit, RMSEA = .07, CF(.06, .09), CFI = .97, SRMR = .06.

**Convergent and Discriminant Validity**

Table S1 presents the zero-order correlations between the variables. Convergent validity of the allyship components was supported by positive correlations with self-rated global allyship and negative correlations with prejudice, homonegativity, and social dominance orientation. Unexpectedly, there was not a significant correlation between the allyship composite and self-reported LGBT contact. However, this association was marginally significant (*p* = .065) in the predicted, positive direction. A post-hoc power analysis indicated that we would need a sample size of approximately 1200 participants (four times our current sample size) to achieve .90 power to detect a correlation of this size.

In terms of discriminant validity, we expected that openness to experience and impression management should be uncorrelated or only modestly correlated with allyship. Indeed, allyship only had a small positive correlation with openness to experience, and it was not correlated with impression management.

**Table S1**

*Zero-Order Correlations Between Measured Variables in Study 2C*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1. Allyship composite
 | -- | .59\*\*\* | .09+ | -.50\*\*\* | -.70\*\*\* | -.58\*\*\* | .18\*\* | .01 |
| 1. Global self-rated allyship
 |  | -- | .27\*\*\* | -.60\*\*\* | -.61\*\*\* | -.42\*\*\* | .22\*\*\* | .03 |
| 1. Contact
 |  |  | -- | -.32\*\*\* | -.17\*\*\* | .05 | .01 | .03 |
| 1. Anti-LGBT prejudice
 |  |  |  | -- | .66\*\*\* | .51\*\*\* | -.05 | -.09+ |
| 1. Homonegativity
 |  |  |  |  | -- | .67\*\*\* | -.14\*\* | -.04 |
| 1. Social Dominance Orientation
 |  |  |  |  |  | -- | -.17\*\*\* | -.10+ |
| 1. Openness to experience
 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -- | .19\*\*\* |
| 1. Impression Management
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -- |

Note: \*\*\**p*<.001, \*\**p*<.01, \**p*<.05, +*p*<.12