INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

RICE UNIVERSITY

**The Manifestation and Remediation of Pregnancy Discrimination in Hiring
Situations**

by

Stephanie M. Kazama

A THESIS SUBMITTED
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

Master of Arts

APPROVED, THESIS COMMITTEE:

Michelle Hebl, Radalov Tsanoff Assistant
Professor, Chair
Psychology and Management

Robert Dipboye, Professor
Psychology and Management

Miguel Quiñones, Associate Professor
Psychology and Management

HOUSTON, TEXAS

May, 2002

UMI Number: 1408673

UMI Microform 1408673

Copyright 2002 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

MAY, 2002

ABSTRACT

The Manifestation and Remediation of Pregnancy Discrimination in Hiring
Situations

by

Stephanie M. Kazama

Using a field study methodology, the current research investigates potential formal and interpersonal discrimination against pregnant women in hiring situations, as well as how such discrimination might be remediated. Female confederates, who were manipulated with a prosthesis to sometimes appear pregnant, applied for part-time jobs in local retail stores. Multiple sources of data were gathered from their interactions with store employees and analyzed for instances of formal discrimination (e.g., job callbacks) and interpersonal discrimination (e.g., smiling). Results indicated that although employees were giving pregnant and non-pregnant applicants job callbacks at approximately the same rates, pregnant applicants were being discriminated against through other formal channels and interpersonally. Moreover, attempts to remediate

pregnancy discrimination were largely unsuccessful. Theoretical and practical considerations of these findings will be address. Further exploratory results are also discussed, and the theoretical and practical considerations of these findings are addressed.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the many people without whom this paper would not have been possible. First, I would like to thank my advisor, Mikki Hebl, for her advice and direction. I would also like to thank my committee members Mickey Quinones and Bob Dipboye for their help with the design, analysis and presentation of this research. Mike Bryne, Scott Tonidandel, and Jessica Foster were instrumental in helping me with the analysis of the data. Thank you also to Colleen Dutton and Maureen Howard, for sharing their time and their human resource expertise. I greatly appreciate the support and research help of Andy Kazama. Finally, last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank all the graduate and undergraduate student confederates and research assistants who participated in this research. Their humor and good natured approach, combined with their diligence and conscientiousness, not only made this research possible, but also enjoyable.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgment.....	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	viii
List of Appendices	ix
Introduction.....	1
Stereotypes and Discrimination Against Pregnant Employees	4
How Does Discrimination Manifest Itself.....	11
Formal Discrimination	11
Interpersonal Discrimination.....	14
Remediation.....	17
Acknowledgment of Past Experience	17
Acknowledgment of Childcare Arrangements	19
The Current Research	20
Method.....	21
Confederates	21
Stores Utilized.....	21
Procedure	22
Dependent Measures of Formal Discrimination.....	26
Dependent Measures of Interpersonal Behavior	26
Dependent Measures of Applicant Behavior.....	30

Store-Related Independent Variables.....	30
Manager Related Independent Variables	31
Results.....	32
Preliminary Analysis.....	32
Analysis of Formal Measures of Discrimination	33
Analysis of Interpersonal Measures of Discrimination	39
Further Exploratory Results.....	47
Analysis of Formal Measures of Discrimination	49
Analysis of Interpersonal Measures of Discrimination	51
Discussion	58
Implications	63
Limitations.....	64
Future Research	66
Conclusion	67
References	69
Appendix A	78
Appendix B	79
Appendix C	80
Appendix D	83
Appendix E	86

List of Tables

- Table 1. Verbal Intentions to Hire by Condition
- Table 2. Number and Percent of Callbacks by Condition
- Table 3. Means for Hostility and Benevolence for Applicants, Observers,
and Condition Blind Coders
- Table 4. Average Hostility and Benevolence by Source and Condition
- Table 5. Number of Job Callbacks by Condition and Store Type

List of Figures

- Figure 1. Proposed model of pregnancy discrimination in hiring situations.
- Figure 2. Perceived employee hostility measured by applicants and observers across condition.
- Figure 3. Perceived employee benevolence measured by applicants and observers across condition.
- Figure 4. Perceived employee hostility measured by applicants as function of condition and store type.
- Figure 5. Perceived employee hostility measured by applicants and observers across condition when manager gender is used as a covariate.

List of Appendices

Appendix A Script

Appendix B Person Perception Questionnaire

Appendix C Applicant Questionnaire

Appendix D Observer Questionnaire

Appendix E Coder Questionnaire

"I'd give her an interview but I'd find some way not to hire her."

-quote by a department chair at a major university about hiring a
pregnant job applicant

As recently as 1991, 46% of a sample of MBA students admitted that they would not hire a pregnant employee (Gueutal & Taylor). This finding is shocking given that it is illegal for most organizations to discriminate against pregnant women and theoretically, most MBAs will be organizational leaders with hiring capabilities. It is also one of many studies evidencing discrimination toward pregnant women (see also Corse, 1990; Franco, Evans, Best, Zrull, & Pizza, 1983; Halpert, Wilson, & Hickman, 1993; Slonaker & Wendt, 1991; Walton et al., 1988). While laboratory and survey data have demonstrated consistently the discriminatory treatment of women who become pregnant after obtaining a job, little research has examined hiring discrimination against already pregnant women. The proposed research will address this gap in the literature by investigating ways in which discrimination is manifested in actual hiring situations and how such discrimination might be remediated.

This line of research makes a number of important contributions. First, the necessity for more clearly understanding pregnancy hiring discrimination is considerable given the unprecedented rate at which women are performing dual roles as both mother and employee in American society. In particular, approximately 60% of married women with children below the age of six are currently in the workforce, a percentage dramatically higher than the 18.6% of

such women in 1960 (Kimmel, 2000). Reports from the National Survey of Family Growth (1997) indicate that as of 1995, 52% of pregnant women were employed during their pregnancy. This trend of women having both a job and raising children is expected to continue, as 75% of women in today's workforce are estimated to become pregnant at least once while they are employed (Cleveland, Stockdale, & Murphy, 2000).

Second, this research assesses more naturalistic discriminatory behaviors that are less susceptible to influences of political correctness or social desirability. That is, despite the extensive use of laboratory and survey methodologies (e.g., Corse, 1990; Davis & Lennon, 1983; Halpert & Burg, 1997; Halpert et al., 1993; Gueutal & Taylor, 1991; Langer, Fiske, Taylor, & Chanowitz, 1976; Lyness, Thompson, Francesco, & Judiesch, 1999; Taylor & Langer, 1977), few studies in the pregnancy discrimination literature have taken a field study approach (i.e., Clark, 1998; Gueutal, Luciano, & Michaels, 1995). This omission has provided few externally valid conclusions that address how employers and co-workers actually behave towards pregnant women in a work environment. Typically, researchers of pregnancy discrimination use laboratory or survey studies with MBA or college students as research participants (e.g. Halpert et al., 1993; Corse, 1990; Franco et al., 1983; Gueutal & Taylor, 1991). Unfortunately, such studies do not assess how those in actual hiring positions will react in a work setting when they are bound by hiring laws and face real ramifications for hiring pregnant women. In a laboratory study, or when using a non-working sample, it is difficult to assess true reactions towards pregnant women because

there are neither implications for hiring pregnant women nor are there repercussions for discriminatory behavior against them. The current study's adoption of a field study methodology provides one of the first assessments of the treatment and potential discrimination of pregnant job applicants by employers in actual hiring situations. Such a methodology also eliminates the potential confound that pregnant women are behaving in ways that interact with, or contribute to their discrimination.

Third, this research attempts to clearly document how discrimination is manifested. Previous research on sex discrimination has indicated that sexism can be manifested through hostile as well as benevolent expressions (Glick & Fiske, 1996). These researchers demonstrate that seemingly positive speech and action that highlight women's subservience to men can be just as discriminatory in their implications as openly negative speech and action. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this broadened definition of sexism, including both benevolent and hostile sexism, may help us to more fully understand the ways in which pregnant women experience discrimination. In addition, the current research encompasses one of the first attempts to analyze pregnancy discrimination at the microlevel, measuring both verbal and nonverbal responses in order to capture formal discrimination as well as more covert, interpersonal forms of discrimination (e.g. see Hebl, Foster, Mannix, & Dovidio, in press; Mannix, 2001).

Fourth, although past research has examined pregnant workers, little research has investigated ways to attenuate pregnancy-related discrimination. In

the current research, we focus on one remediation strategy, that of directly acknowledging one's condition. This strategy has been shown to have favorable consequences for some stigmatized job applicants (Hebl & Kleck, 2001), and can even reduce prejudice and discrimination (Belgrave & Mills, 1981; Hastorf, Wildfogel, & Cassman, 1979; Mills, Belgrave, & Boyer, 1984). Remediation techniques that address employers' concerns about their pregnancies may be particularly beneficial for pregnant women.

In sum, the current research will investigate if and how pregnant women are discriminated, as well as how such discrimination might be remediated. To begin, we discuss stereotypes and current manifestations of discrimination, and then examine sources of discrimination and distinguish between two different types of discrimination. Finally, we look at compensation strategies pregnant job applicants might employ.

Stereotypes and Discrimination Against Pregnant Employees

To fully address the discrimination that pregnant workers potentially face, we adopt a working model that depicts our representation of this discrimination (see Figure 1). In particular, we propose that pregnancy discrimination encompasses both the ill-effects from 1) actual difficulties associated with hiring pregnant women; as well as 2) negative stereotypes. To some extent, discrimination toward pregnant women is based on experiences people have had in which a pregnant employee may have inconvenienced the rest of the work group and the very real logistical problems of hiring a worker who may be absent for several weeks (Gueutal & Taylor, 1991). Research has shown that many

pregnant women do experience a reduced interest in their jobs during pregnancy and place a greater emphasis on family (Hess-Strauthamer, 1985; Schultz & Henderson, 1985; Smith, 1999). During maternity leave, other coworkers are often left to cover for the pregnant woman who can be gone from four weeks up to several months (Gueutal & Taylor, 1991). Current research reveals that only about 15% of mothers actually return to work within one month of giving birth (Klerman & Leibowitz, 1999). This absence adds to coworkers' workload and can lead to resentment of the pregnant woman. The time it takes for the majority of women to return to work is not encouraging for employers. Thus, as Figure 1 illustrates, one of the reasons for discrimination is due to the logistic difficulties of hiring pregnant women (see Path A).

Figure 1

Actual disruption in the workplace from a coworker's pregnancy however, does not explain all of the discrimination toward pregnant employees. Research has shown that even when pregnant workers' behaviors have been standardized, stereotypes still result in pregnant employees being negatively rated. For instance, Halpert et al. (1993) had participants watch a videotape of an employee. The confederate employee was manipulated to look either non-pregnant or pregnant. The employee performed the same actions for each scenario, and the tapes were identical except for the pregnant or non-pregnant condition of the confederate. When participants were subsequently asked to rate the employees' performance, the pregnant employee received significantly lower

performance ratings than the non-pregnant employee. Male participants were particularly more likely than female participants to rate the pregnant employee poorly. Similarly, Gueutal and Taylor (1991) found that pregnant employees are rated as being less efficient than non-pregnant employees, and male participants hold more negative attitudes towards pregnant workers. These studies importantly show that pregnant employees are disadvantaged by stereotypes that others hold and that gender may play a large role in the devaluation of pregnant workers.

Stereotypes against pregnant women are informed by some recent research conducted on more general types of sex discrimination. In particular, Glick and Fiske (1996; 1999) differentiate between two types of sexism; benevolent sexism and hostile sexism. They argue that discrimination against women is unique because it not only occurs through hostile expressions that are encountered by other stigmatized groups, but also occurs through subjectively positive expressions. According to the researchers, throughout history men have created power structures in which they hold higher status than women and thus can dominate them. Men's dependence on women, however, has resulted in the simultaneous creation of stereotypes of women which are subjectively positive. Such stereotypes serve to give women positive ideals which typically are subservient to men. Examples of this benevolent sexism in modern society include, "feelings of protectiveness toward women, the belief that men should provide for women, and the notion that women are men's 'better half,' without whom men are incomplete" (Glick & Fiske, 1999, p. 211). Thus, sexism can be

expressed not only through verbal and nonverbal expressions that denigrate women, but also through positive expressions that seek to reward women for being subservient. This dichotomy of behavior can be evidenced in the manifestation of discrimination of pregnant employees.

Research looking at stereotypes of pregnant women has revealed distinct classes of stereotypical reactions to pregnant women that correspond to Glick and Fiske's (1996; 1999) benevolent and hostile sexism. First, heightened ascriptions of femininity and dependency to pregnant workers have been shown to undermine their perceived capability. Previous research has demonstrated that the visual cue of pregnancy evokes strong feminine stereotypes and highlights their "sexual and reproductive uniqueness" (Pattison & Gross, 1996; Sheppard, 1992; Taylor & Langer, 1977). For instance, Corse (1990) reported that women are often surprised at the attention their pregnancy attracts from even strangers and claims that they often "ask... how she's feeling, predict the sex of her child, ask her what names the baby might be given, joke about her sexuality, and call her 'Mom'" (p. 27). Similarly, other research shows that pregnancy results in a change of work and social status for the pregnant woman (Wolkind & Zajicek, 1981).

Additionally, visibly pregnant women comprise a separate social category from non-pregnant women that results in differential treatment by friends and family, as well as strangers (Walton et al., 1988). Specifically, pregnant women are viewed as childlike and in need of assistance. Walton et al. (1998) contend that "the pregnant woman in our society is seen as more childlike than is a non-

pregnant woman of the same age" (p. 324). As a result people interact with pregnant women using a "child among adults" script, in which the pregnant woman is assumed to need help on common adult tasks and that another adult is responsible for taking care of her.

Consistent with social role theory (Eagly, 1987), these attitudes reflect feelings that female workers should be engaged in work revolving around nurturing roles; are not interested in careers; are not reliable workers, and are too emotional, conciliatory, and submissive. For instance, candidates who are pregnant or who have young children are considered to be less capable of handling job responsibilities than candidates without children (Foster & Hebl, 2002). However, female job applicants who are pregnant or have children are rated more favorably for feminine jobs and less favorably for masculine jobs (Foster & Hebl, 2002). Men react to strong stereotypes that cast pregnant women as highly feminine by particularly denigrating pregnant women who act aggressively and positively reinforcing those who act in feminine ways (Corse, 1990; Taylor & Langer, 1977). Stereotypical beliefs about pregnant women are maintained through confirmation biases and selective encoding, suggesting that stereotypes of what pregnant women should be like may overshadow any incongruent information (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Thus, in line with benevolent sexism these stereotypes are subjectively positive but serve to weaken a woman's status.

A second class of stereotypical reactions to pregnant women revolves around pregnancy as being reacted to in hostile ways and being viewed as a

stigma. In Goffman's (1963) terms, pregnancy might be considered as "an aberration of the body." In line with this, pregnant women may be treated similarly to individuals with such stigmatized conditions as scars, obesity, and physical handicap (Langer et al., 1976; Davis & Lennon, 1983). Research demonstrates that pregnant women are reacted to in similar ways (i.e., increased staring, increased interpersonal space, increased perceptions of negative behavior) as these stigmatized groups (Kleck & DeJong, 1981; Harris, Harris, & Bochner, 1982; Langer et al., 1976). Studies suggest that many supervisors and coworkers with open hostility when a woman becomes pregnant, and pregnant employees may face an "eruption of hostility and prejudice at work when they announce their pregnancy" (Swiss & Walter, 1993, p.26). In fact, pregnant workers report that 28% of their peers reacted openly negatively to their pregnancy (Halpert & Burg, 1997). When the woman was a manager, the number of subordinates who were negative about the pregnancy was 48%. Furthermore, many coworkers believe that a pregnant worker will hurt group performance and inconvenience them (Franco et al., 1983). Such research suggests that pregnant workers are viewed as burdensome, disruptive, and poor performers. Therefore, in addition to being seen as having "an aberration of the body," pregnant women might also be viewed as having "characterological flaws," another category of stigmas defined by Goffman (1963). Openly hostile discrimination toward women serves to denigrate them in more direct ways (Glick & Fiske, 1996; 1999).

We believe that the cumulative result of both benevolent and hostile expressions of negative stereotypes and actual negative experiences arising from hiring pregnant women will result in substantial discrimination towards pregnant women in hiring situations (see Figure 1). To further explore this hypothesis we examine how current laws and societal values will affect the manifestation of this discrimination.

How Does Discrimination Manifest Itself?

Lawmakers and social groups have been engaged in attempts at alleviating pregnancy discrimination for several decades. Although enormous strides have been made, the recent distinction made between formal and interpersonal discrimination by Hebl et al. (in press) suggests that only certain manifestations of discrimination have been addressed while others have been ignored, allowing some forms of discrimination to go undetected.

Formal Discrimination

Research shows that one way discrimination is expressed is through overt discrimination or what Hebl et al. (in press) refers to as "formal discrimination." This discrimination involves explicit behaviors that often are legally sanctioned to prohibit an individual from participating in or becoming part of a group. Past research has clearly documented formal discrimination on the basis of gender (Rosenstein & Hitt, 1986) and race (Bodenhausen & Wyer, 1985; Bond, DiCandia, & MacKinnon, 1988; Clark & Clark, 1947; Porter & Geis, 1981). Previous interventions with other stigmatized groups have shown some level of success at diminishing expressions of formal discrimination, in part, because

such interventions have consisted of instituting organizational policies that mandate equality, passing city and state ordinances, as well as passing nationwide laws.

Examples of formal discrimination with regard to pregnancy might include firing or refusing to hire a pregnant employee, refusing to give a pregnant employee a promotion, or refusing a pregnant employee maternity leave. Though illegal, evidence of pregnant employees being fired, demoted, or denied raises or promotions as a result of their pregnancies have all been previously documented (Hughes, 1991; Swiss & Walker, 1993; Thompson & Francesco, 1996). For instance, women taking maternity leave are ten times more likely to be fired than employees taking other types of medical leave (Slonaker & Wendt, 1991). In addition, less explicit forms of discrimination include the exclusion of pregnant employees from staff meetings, refusing them travel assignments or important tasks or projects, or eliminating a pregnant employee's job through restructuring (Harris, 1992; Thompson & Francesco, 1996).

Important pieces of legislation, such as the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 and the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, attempt to curb formal pregnancy discrimination, but they also provide employers with several loop holes. Under the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, it is illegal to refuse to hire or promote an employee based upon her pregnancy or to terminate the employment of a pregnant woman arbitrarily. Employers must classify pregnancy as a short-term disability and provide pregnant workers with all the accommodations given to other employees with short term disabilities (Gardin & Richwald, 1986). This

law however, only applies to organizations with fifteen or more employees. The Family and Medical Leave Act gives all employees the right to up to twelve weeks of unpaid leave without threat to their jobs for pregnancy, personal illness, or the illness of a family member; however, this Act does not cover those working for any company of fewer than 50 employees or employees in the top tenth of an organization's compensation scale if that organization can prove their leave will cause injury to the company (Cleveland et al., 2000). The result of these exemptions is that only about 40% of the population is covered by the Family and Medical Leave Act, leaving the majority of Americans vulnerable to discrimination (see Bennett-Alexander & Pincus, 1998).

Another major problem of current legislation is enforcement. When a woman becomes pregnant after already obtaining a position, discrimination against the woman by removing her from the job or demoting her requires an obvious and flagrant violation of the law. However, discriminatory actions in hiring practices are difficult to identify, making them much harder to control. An employer can easily offer alternative justifications for not hiring a woman other than her pregnancy and thus circumvent legal backlash. Without the fear of negative repercussions, employers have a fair amount of latitude in discriminating against pregnant job applicants. Hiring discrimination has been addressed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in racial discrimination cases through the establishment of the "four-fifths" rule. The "four-fifths" rule declares that a protected group must be hired at a rate of four fifths of that of the most selected group. Adverse impact laws have also mandated that

hiring practices cannot have a negative effect against members of a protected group (Manese, 2000). Applying these statutes to hiring in cases of pregnancy becomes virtually impossible. One, pregnancy is a temporary condition, making adverse impact statistics difficult to calculate. Two, there are few pregnant women who apply for jobs, making it difficult to find evidence of violations against the four fifths rule. That is, if there are not many individuals from protected groups applying for jobs, it is virtually impossible to attribute any imbalances in ratios to discrimination. In sum, there are prevalent negative stereotypes about pregnant workers and employers can easily discriminate against pregnant women in hiring situations without legal ramifications. Thus, we predict that:

Hypothesis 1: Women who are pregnant will experience greater formal hiring discrimination than women who are not pregnant.

Interpersonal Discrimination

It is not necessarily the case that pregnant women will simply receive negative treatment (e.g., see Glick & Fiske, 1996). In fact, pregnant workers may be receiving very conflicting messages (Leibenluft, 1984). Leibenluft found that colleagues of a pregnant worker had overly positive affect toward the pregnant employee as well as high rates of anger and hostility that were not openly expressed; therefore pregnancy discrimination may not be occurring in direct and obvious ways. That is, discrimination may not be manifest only through formal channels. Pregnant women may be encountering another type of discrimination.

This less explicit type of discrimination, referred to as interpersonal discrimination (Hebl et al., in press; Mannix, 2001) may or may not be exhibited

intentionally and often involves more subtle, interpersonal cues (e.g., eye contact, lack of warmth, shortened interaction length). Because there are no laws about the extent to which one has to be friendly and collegial to another individual, interpersonal discrimination may be more frequently displayed. Similarly, because there is a low social acceptability for formal types of discrimination, discrimination can be rechanneled through less explicit measures at the verbal, paraverbal, and nonverbal levels.

Interpersonal discrimination has been demonstrated against several populations. Work with homosexual job applicants, finds that store managers speak less, are less helpful, more standoffish, less interested, more likely to end the conversation prematurely, and more likely to avoid eye contact with homosexual than non-homosexual applicants (Hebl et al., in press). Similarly, when presented with obese customers seeking assistance, salespeople have shorter interactions, stand at a greater distance, make less eye contact, smile and nod less frequently, and are less helpful, less friendly, and more rude with obese individuals compared to normal weight individuals (Mannix, 2001). Although not specifically labeled "interpersonal discrimination," evidence suggests that female leaders received significantly less positive nonverbal feedback (e.g. less smiling, less nodding) than male leaders (Butler & Geis, 1990).

Interpersonal discrimination may be important to examine in hiring situations involving pregnant women because prejudice may manifest itself at a microlevel.

If hostile sexism is expressed in interactions with pregnant applicants, we expect to observe discriminatory behavior similar to these previous studies. In such situations, we predict that employers interviewing a pregnant woman will demonstrate negative nonverbal behavior similar to the response given to other stigmatized groups including increased distance; decreased smiling, eye contact, and salesperson nodding; negative affective responses such as being less helpful, less friendly, ruder, and more willing to end the conversation prematurely.

However, if benevolent sexism is expressed, we expect employers to treat job applicants as if they were exceptionally feminine and childlike. Employers are hypothesized to be friendlier towards the pregnant applicants and treat them in childlike ways, using such nonverbal cues as increased smiling, eye contact, touching, and nodding. They might also demonstrate positive but somewhat condescending affective responses (e.g., being friendlier, being more helpful and less rude) and attempt to assert their dominance by making diminutive references (i.e., "honey", "dear") (Butler & Geis, 1990; Walton et al., 1988). While suggesting different expressions of interpersonal discrimination, both hostile and benevolent sexism converge in predicting that:

Hypothesis 2: Women who are pregnant will experience greater informal discrimination in hiring situations than women who are not pregnant.

The current research will particularly attempt to document the existence of interpersonal discrimination. Additionally, it will clarify whether the verbal, paraverbal, and nonverbal reactions are more in line with hostile or benevolent sexism, or a combination of both.

Remediation

If pregnant women are targets of discrimination, they may develop strategies to attenuate the ill-effects and enhance their employment opportunities. One strategy may involve that of acknowledging the condition up front. Hebl and Kleck (2001) argue that if individuals in hiring situations acknowledge their stigmas they may be able to reduce employer stereotypes by "addressing an underlying source of tension that interviewers are not otherwise legally able to discuss (p. 4)." An acknowledgment by pregnant applicants may be particularly effective to the extent that they address or alleviate concerns of how disruptive their pregnancies will be. We believe two concerns are particularly important for pregnant women to address - previous experience combining pregnancy and work and their childcare arrangements. We believe that acknowledging these constraints may attenuate the amount of discrimination facing pregnant workers.

Acknowledgment of Past Experience

Pregnant applicants, if possible, might acknowledge that they have already dealt with managing a job and pregnancy successfully and are prepared to do so again. Approximately 48% of women who had recently had children felt their supervisors harbored concerns about how soon they would return to work, and if they would quit their jobs after having their babies (Halpert & Burg, 1997). These fears are not unsubstantiated. A study by the U.S. Census Bureau (2000) found that in 1998 only 36% of mothers were working full time within a year of giving birth, compared to 52% of mothers who did not give birth in the last year.

Part-time workers are even less likely to return to work after a pregnancy (only 10% of them do) and if they do return to the workforce, many switch jobs entirely (Klerman & Leibowitz, 1999).

One source of encouragement for employers worried about losing employees to long maternity leaves or unemployment is a longitudinal study following pregnant women before and up to 20 years after their first birth (Mott & Shapiro, 1983; Shapiro & Mott, 1994). They found that the strongest predictor of eventual work activity was not some demographic or economic variable, but was the work activity in the months surrounding (both before and after) the birth. Furthermore, they revealed that if a woman comes back to work quickly after her first pregnancy, it is a good indication that she will return to work quickly after her second pregnancy.

Acknowledgment of working during a previous pregnancy and quickly returning to work after the birth of a child may reduce employer's concerns about the pregnant applicant's tenure with the company. Legally, the employer will be unable to ask the applicant about work during and after previous pregnancies. We believe that an applicant who volunteers this information will somewhat alleviate an employer's anxiety about an applicant's long term potential with the company.

Hypothesis 3: Pregnant women who acknowledge that they have had previous experience combining work and pregnancy will experience less formal and interpersonal discrimination than pregnant women who do not mention this.

Acknowledgment of Childcare Arrangements

Childcare is a particular source of concern for working mothers because they, in comparison with working fathers, bear the brunt of childcare duties even if both spouses work an equal amount (Burden & Googins, 1987; Fernandez, 1986; Googins, 1991; Neal, Chapman, Ingersoll-Dayton, Emlen, 1993; Scott & McClellan, 1990; VandenHeuvel & Wooden, 1995). Childcare issues have been demonstrated to affect a working mother's tardiness, work satisfaction, stress level, absenteeism, and productivity (Fernandez, 1986; Googins, 1991; Harrell & Ridley, 1975; Northcott, 1983). For instance, when a child gets sick, women stay home twice as often as men (Burden & Googins, 1987). Compared to women without children and women with older children, women with young children typically spend less time working, and are not as involved in their work (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000).

We believe that employers are aware of the impact childcare responsibilities have on working mothers' productivity and time spent at work. Employers concerns about how disruptive having a newborn baby is going to be on an employee's work schedule may be alleviated by acknowledging the existence of reliable, flexible daycare. Such an acknowledgment may make an applicant a more likely job candidate by addressing fears the employer has that he or she is legally unable to ask.

Hypothesis 4: Pregnant women who verbally acknowledge the availability of daycare for their child will experience less formal and interpersonal discrimination than pregnant women who do not.

The Current Research

In order to test these hypotheses, we designed a field study that closely approximates a real-world situation for pregnant job applicants. In particular, we examine store employee reactions to pregnant applicants, and assess both formal and interpersonal types of discrimination. Women of childbearing age acted as confederates and applied for jobs at local retail stores. In three of the conditions the applicants wore pregnancy prostheses, while in the fourth condition they did not. In the Non-Pregnant condition, applicant confederates made no mention of pregnancy, childcare, or working during a pregnancy. A Pregnant Control condition followed the exact same script as the Non-Pregnant applicant and similarly made no mention of childcare, or working during a pregnancy. In another pregnant condition (Previous Experience), applicants mentioned that they had previous experience combining work and pregnancy, potentially addressing employer concerns about their ability to work during pregnancy. Finally, in the last pregnant condition (Childcare), confederates mentioned having reliable and flexible childcare, thus addressing potential concerns of employers about childcare. All of the interactions were audio-taped by the applicant and transcripts of these tapes were produced. After the completion of each trial the applicant and the observer completed evaluation questionnaires.

Method

Confederates

Applicants. Applicants for this study were women of childbearing age, all between the ages of 21 and 30.

Observers. Observers for this study were male and female undergraduate students at a small southwestern university.

Stores Utilized

We collected data in seven large southwestern malls. To make sure that we obtained stores that were actually hiring, retail stores were called beforehand and only those stores that acknowledged that they were hiring were used in our sample. To standardize the type of store, we avoided using department stores (too large), maternity clothing stores (salespeople who cater to pregnant women may detect the presence of the pregnancy prosthesis) and restaurants. Since only stores with more than 15 employees are prohibited from formally discriminating against pregnant women, we targeted stores that had greater than 15 employees (i.e., retail chains) so that all instances of formal discrimination would be considered illegal.

Materials

To simulate 6-7 month pregnant applicants, we used pregnancy prostheses that were professionally constructed, business casual maternity outfits (grey pants and a blue button down shirt) and wedding bands. In the control condition, non-pregnant applicants wore similarly matching outfits (dark pants and a button down shirt). All participants also carried hidden mini-cassette

recorders so that they could audiotape the conversations for eventual coding. Confederate observers wore causal clothing.

Procedure

Before this experiment was begun, we took precautions to ensure ethical practices, such as consulting with a lawyer to ensure that we followed federal and state laws regarding both applying for jobs and audiotaping conversations. Additionally, all confederates signed a consent form in which they acknowledged their participation in the experiment and their consent to being audiotaped. Confederates were instructed not to misrepresent themselves on job applications, and to give truthful personal information on all applications. Furthermore, data were numerically coded, thus ensuring the anonymity of the stores used in the study.

In an attempt to standardize behavior, confederates participated in a training session prior to beginning any trials. For the confederate applicants, the session was devoted to the memorization of a script that confederates followed in their interactions (see Appendix A), role playing to practice the interactions, a discussion of various contingencies to the script, and an opportunity to gain familiarity with the pregnancy prosthesis. During this training session we also took digital pictures of the applicants in the pregnancy prosthesis that were later used in a manipulation check to ensure that the confederates looked pregnant and credible when wearing the prosthesis (see Appendix B). In addition, confederate observers were taught how to code verbal and nonverbal behaviors and given an overview of the experimental procedure.

We collected data at seven malls and selected particular stores through a prescreening process in which an undergraduate researcher called potential stores no more than one week before the experiment and inquired about job availability. We conducted experimental trials only at those stores that were hiring.

Once at the mall, we designated a "command center" in an unobtrusive location, which was used to direct applicant/observer pairs to return to after each session they ran (or store that they visited). Each applicant/observer pair followed a distinct sequence of conditions that included two trials of each condition for a total of eight trials per pair. The applicant/observer pairs remained the same throughout the trials. Because of the complexity of the pregnancy prosthetic costume, we always had confederates arrive at the mall wearing the pregnancy prostheses. Thus, for every applicant/observer pair, the pregnancy trials were always run before the non-pregnant trials.

For each trial, the observer entered the assigned store first while the applicant waited at a location near the store. The observer became seemingly engrossed in looking at merchandise. So that the applicant and observer did not appear to be acquainted, the applicant waited and entered the store approximately one minute after the observer had entered. Upon entering the store, the applicant approached the store clerk and immediately asked to speak with the manager. If the manager was unavailable, applicants continued the interaction with the clerk. In 67 cases (or 77.9% of the time) the applicants talked to a manager. In 18 cases (or 20.9% of the time) the applicant spoke with a

clerk. In one additional case it was unclear whether the store employee was a manager or a clerk. Applicants spoke with non-managerial personnel at approximately equal rates (Non-pregnant, 6; Pregnant Control, 3; Previous Experience, 4; Childcare, 5). Tests performed on the dependent variables (applicant benevolence, applicant hostility, observer benevolence, observer hostility, coder benevolence, coder hostility, and job callbacks) ensured us that position of the store employee did not significantly influence any of the measures: Univariate analyses of variances found that there were no significant differences based on employee position for any of the dependent variables (applicant hostility: $F(1, 83) = 0.03$, $p = .87$; applicant benevolence: $F(1, 83) = .31$, $p = 0.58$; observer hostility: $F(1, 82) = 2.56$, $p = .11$; observer benevolence: $F(1, 82) = .34$, $p = .56$; coder hostility: $F(1, 47) = .72$, $p = .40$; coder benevolence: $F(1, 47) = .014$, $p = .91$;¹ job callbacks: $\chi^2(1) = .07$, $p = .79$). Thus, differences in rank of the employee that applicants spoke with did not significantly affect any of the dependent variables.

When the manager arrived (or it was indicated that the manager was not available), the applicants followed the script they had memorized, which asked 1) "Are there any jobs available?" 2) "Can I fill out an application?" 3) "What would I be doing if I got a job here?" and 4) "Do you think you will hire me?" These questions were aimed at engaging the manager in an interaction revolving around hiring the applicant. Furthermore, the fourth question was aimed at assessing formal discrimination.

¹ Even if all the coder ratings of the condition aware trials are included, this still is not significant.

In the two acknowledgment conditions, confederates added one additional sentence to the beginning of the script. This sentence was stated to either the manager or, in instances when the manager was unavailable, to a clerk, before applicants asked about job availability. In the "Previous Experience" condition, the applicant mentioned her experience with a previous pregnancy to attenuate the manager's concerns about the applicant's ability to work while pregnant ("I've had experience balancing pregnancy and work."). In the "Childcare" condition the applicant mentioned having adequate daycare in an attempt to relieve the manager's concerns about childcare ("I have reliable and flexible childcare.").

Throughout the interaction the observer monitored the employee's behavior, specifically noting the measures of interpersonal discrimination identified by Hebl et al. (in press) as well as other nonverbal measures (e.g., see Butler & Geis, 1990; Davis & Lennon, 1983; Langer et al., 1976; Leibenluft, 1984; Walton et al., 1988). The observer also reported on the consistency of the applicant's behavior across all trials.

At the end of the interaction the applicant left the store and the observer waited one to two minutes before leaving the store to see if the employees discussed the applicant immediately after her departure. Both confederates returned to the command center and filled out questionnaires about the interaction (see Appendices C and D). The experimenter checked the audiotapes to make sure the recording device continued to work properly and then assigned the confederates to their next store.

Dependent Measures of Formal Discrimination

Job callbacks. We measured formal discrimination by having applicants report to us on whether or not they were hired on the spot or were called back for a job interview within a two-month time frame. Of all the trials, only one applicant was offered a job on the spot. In twenty-three other trials, applicants received callbacks.

Verbal intentions to hire. Responses to the interview question "Do you think you will hire me?" were coded as a measure of formal discrimination. The number of negative, positive, and non-committal responses were tallied for all audible tapes.

Employee references to pregnancy. Applicant and employee interactions were reviewed for statements and questions made by the employees regarding the applicant's pregnancy. All employee statements and questions referencing the applicant's pregnancy were categorized by human resource professionals as either legal or illegal discrimination.

Other measures of formal discrimination. Additional instances of formal discrimination (e.g., talking about the applicant after she left or suggesting no jobs were available) that occurred during or after the interactions were recorded and tallied.

Dependent Measures of Interpersonal Behavior

Both applicants and observers filled out a Likert type questionnaire after each trial that measured the extent of formal and interpersonal discrimination experienced in the previous interaction (see Appendixes C and D). The verbal

content of the interactions was also coded from audiotapes by condition blind raters (see Appendix E).

Applicant rated interpersonal discrimination. Applicant confederates completed a 28-item questionnaire comprised of items measuring interpersonal discrimination and items asking informational questions about the interaction (i.e., “Did you fill out an application?”, “Did you speak to a manager?”) immediately following each trial (see Appendix C). Seventeen of these items were generated from previous work on interpersonal and non-verbal discrimination (Hebl et al. (in press), Mannix (2001), Butler and Geis (1990), and Walton et al., (1998)). Confederate applicants assessed items on a 7-point Likert type scale from 0 (not at all) to 6 (very much). A factor analysis performed on these items generated a two factor solution. One factor was comprised of eight items and assessed benevolence, while a second factor was comprised of five items and assessed hostility. The benevolence factor had a reliability of .91 and the hostility factor had a reliability of .82. The two factors were negatively correlated ($r = -0.32$, $p = .001$). Of the 17 items, two of these items, “How many diminutive references did the person make toward you?” and “How much did the person touch you during the conversation?” failed to produce any meaningful variation and were not included in any further analysis. Two additional questions “To what extent was the person overfriendly?” and “To what extent did the person stare at your stomach?” did not load clearly on any factor and were removed from the analysis.

Observer rated interpersonal discrimination. To obtain consistency across applicant and observer factors, the observer factor structure was based on the applicant factor structure. Observer confederates completed an 18-item questionnaire immediately following each trial. One of these questions was aimed at assessing the marital status of the manager. Another was a measure of consistency in the applicant's behavior. The remaining sixteen of these questions measured interpersonal discrimination and were identical to the items on the applicant interpersonal discrimination measure. Confederate observers assessed items on a 7-point Likert type scale from 0 (not at all) to 6 (very much). Again the items "How many diminutive references did the person make to the applicant?" and "How many times did the person touch the applicant?" failed to produce any meaningful variability and were removed from the analysis. Three additional items, "To what extent did the person stare at the applicant's stomach?", "How nervous was the person when talking to the applicant?", and "How over friendly was the person with the applicant?", reduced the overall reliability of the composite score and were removed. The remaining 11 questions were classified in the same way as the applicant questions were classified. The observer hostility factor was composed of 4 items which had a reliability of .87. A logarithmic transformation was then performed on the factor to reduce skewness. The observer benevolence factor was composed of seven items and had a reliability of .91. The observer benevolence and observer hostility factors correlated with each other at $r = -.73$, $p = 0.001$.

Coder rated interpersonal discrimination. Condition-blind coders listened to the taped interactions and completed a 17-item questionnaire following each trial. Ten of the coder questions were identical to the interpersonal discrimination items on the applicant and observer questionnaires. The other seven questions on the coder rating sheet asked applicants to evaluate whether coders felt that applicants were being treated differently. Two of these questions, "To what extent did the manager seem to stigmatize the individual?" and "Do you think that the applicant was pregnant?" tested whether coders could detect differences in the interpersonal behavior of store employees in different conditions. The question asking about stigmatization was rated on a Likert scale from 0 (Not at all) to 6 (very much). The other question, "Do you think the applicant was pregnant?" required a yes or no answer.

Items from the questionnaire were categorized as either benevolent or hostile. One item "To what extent did the person try to end the interaction prematurely" was considered a reverse scored benevolence item for the applicant and observers. For the coders however, this item was reliably correlated with the hostility items. Additionally, one item, "How many diminutive references did the manager make to the applicant?" was deleted because like in the applicant and observer interactions it failed to produce any significant variation. Additionally, the item "How nervous does the manager seem when talking to the applicant?" did not show any variation in coder response, probably because this may be more evident in nonverbal behaviors. Of the remaining eight items, five were considered benevolent discrimination and three were

considered hostile. The benevolence factor had a reliability of .87 and the hostility factor had a reliability of .76.

While listening to each tape, the coder was able to read a transcript of the interaction. To ensure that pregnancy status was not revealed by the statements in the acknowledgment conditions, all tapes and transcripts began after the acknowledgment statements and immediately preceding the question "Do you have any jobs available?". Only 70 of the 86 interactions were coded due to poor tape quality of 16 of the tapes. In 20 of the remaining 70 interactions information was revealed about the condition of the applicant. These trials were removed from the data to ensure that coders were blind to the condition of the applicant.

Dependent Measures of Applicant Behavior

Observers evaluated applicants on how well they standardized their behavior over the trials. A single measure of "To what extent did the applicant vary her behavior from previous trials" was assessed on a 7-point Likert type scale from 0 (not at all) to 6 (very much).

Store-Related Independent Variables

To examine potential store-related differences, we attempted to measure how crowded the store was, the number of employees the store had, and the type of store merchandise (e.g., clothing versus non-clothing). The crowdedness of the store did not prove to be a discriminating measure as the vast majority of stores we entered were not crowded. This was largely due to the availability of the confederates to participate in the experiment during low volume store hours. To ensure that instances of formal discrimination were in fact illegal, we tried to

only perform trials in stores with greater than 15 employees. Of the 86 stores we entered, only one was determined have less than 15 employees and was removed from the analyses of formal discrimination. Additionally, store type did affect patterns of manager interpersonal behavior as rated by both the applicants and observers. Stores were dichotomized into those which sold clothing and accessories and those which did not. Examples of non-clothing stores include stores which sold compact discs, books, souvenirs, and home decorations. These results will be explored more fully in the experimental results section.

Manager-Related Independent Variables

Specific manager characteristics were also assessed for differences. These characteristics included measures of the managers' marital status, parental status, and gender. Marital status was assessed by having confederates record the presence or absence of a wedding ring on the employees' left hands. This proved to be difficult to evaluate as often confederates forgot to check for a ring, or were confused about whether or not a ring was a wedding band. The poor quality of this data resulted in its removal. Parental status was measured by employee references to his or her personal life. Such references did not occur frequently enough to be included in our analyses. Gender of the employee however, significantly impacted the results and will be explored more fully in the experimental results section.

Results

Preliminary Analysis

Applicant standardization. To eliminate the possibility that differences in employee instances of formal and interpersonal discrimination were due to variations in applicants' behavior, an initial analysis tested the standardization of applicant behavior across conditions as rated by the confederate observers. Results indicated that applicant behavior was standardized and did not vary across conditions, $F(3, 70) = .39, p = 0.76$.

Rater agreement. To check for agreement among raters, we examined the correlations between benevolent and hostile factors generated from applicant, observer, and coder² data. The benevolence factors of all three groups of raters were correlated (applicants and observers, $r = .61, p = 0.0001$; applicants and coders, $r = .35, p = .01$; observers and coders, $r = .30, p = .03$). The hostility factors from applicant and observer data were also correlated ($r = .43, p = 0.001$), as were the hostility factors generated from observers and coders ($r = .35, p = .01$). Hostility factors generated from applicant and coder data however, were not correlated, but were in the same direction ($r = .18, p = .20$). Overall, then, ratings from applicants, observers, and coders indicated a high level of agreement on both factors.

Manipulation check. For each confederate applicant, five packets containing a survey and a picture of the confederate wearing a pregnancy prostheses were distributed to undergraduate students who were naïve to the hypothesis. While looking at a black and white picture of the applicant, the

students were asked to answer a series of questions about the applicant.

Imbedded in seven filler questions, were the items “How pregnant does this woman appear?” (rated on a scale from 0 (not at all pregnant) to 6 (very pregnant)), and “Please guess this woman’s month of pregnancy” (open ended item).

On the 7-point appearance scale, participants reported that on average, applicants appeared to be in the later stages of a pregnancy ($M = 4.6$, $SD = 1.52$). When each applicant was analyzed individually, the applicant perceived to be least pregnant was rated as being in the middle of a pregnancy, ($M = 2.8$, $SD = 1.30$) and the applicant perceived as most pregnant was rated as being in the late stages of a pregnancy ($M = 5.6$, $SD = .55$). On the open-ended item in which participants guessed the amount of time pregnant, the responses ranged from 4.8 months ($SD = 1.48$) to 7.7 months ($SD = .67$). On average applicants were seen as 6.4 months pregnant ($SD = 1.59$). Overall, these results suggest that the applicants were seen as approximately five to seven months pregnant. Given that the pictures provided only a static view of the applicants, it is reasonable to conclude that the manipulation would be even more salient for store employees who viewed the pregnant applicants from multiple angles.

Analysis of Formal Measures of Discrimination

Hypothesis 1 predicted that pregnant women would be targets of more formal discrimination than non-pregnant women. We also predicted that pregnant women who acknowledged their condition and made remediation statements would be recipients of significantly less formal discrimination than

² All 70 coder trials were included in this analysis.

those that did not (Hypotheses 3 and 4). To test these hypotheses, we examined the number of job callbacks applicants received, verbal responses employees made when asked directly if they would hire the applicant, statements employees made about the applicants' pregnancy, and instances of formal discrimination that arose during the experiment.

Job callback data. Job callbacks were analyzed using a logistic regression with job callbacks as the outcome variable and condition as the predictor variable. Analysis was performed on the 82 stores in which confederates filled out applications (20 Non-Pregnant, 22 Pregnant Control, 19 Previous Experience, and 21 Childcare). Not included in this analysis were the three stores in which applicants completed interactions with store employees, but could not fill out an application because the store did not currently have any applications available. Although this may have been a way for stores to discourage unwanted applicants, we chose to exclude these trials from our analysis. We also excluded one store that employed fewer than 15 employees because instances of formal discrimination in this store would be legal.

The distribution of callbacks in the four conditions was incongruent with our hypothesis. Of the 82 stores in which applications were filled out, 24 applicants (or 29.3%) received job callbacks. Contrary to the hypothesis, approximately equal numbers of applicants in the Non-Pregnant condition and the Pregnant Control condition received job callbacks (ten in the Non-Pregnant condition and nine in the Pregnant Control condition). The distribution of callbacks in the acknowledgment conditions contradicted our hypotheses as well.

Applicants in the acknowledgment conditions received a decrease in callbacks (Previous Experience, three callbacks, Childcare, two callbacks) rather than the hypothesized increase, compared to applicants in the Pregnant Control condition (9 callbacks) (see Table 2 for percentages).

Table 2

Number and Percent of Callbacks by Condition

Condition	Number of callbacks	N	Percent that received callbacks
Non-Pregnant	10	20	50
Pregnant Control	9	22	40.9
Previous Experience	3	19	15.8
Childcare	2	21	9.5

The overall model for the logistic regression was statistically significant, suggesting that condition does indicate whether or not applicants receive job callbacks, $\chi^2(3, N = 82) = 11.87, p = .01$. The variance accounted for by this model, as measured by the Cox and Snell R square, was .14. Additionally, using the Wald criterion, results confirmed that the Previous Experience condition and the Childcare condition were significantly different from the Non-Pregnant condition in predicting job callbacks (Previous Experience; $z = 4.70, p = .03$; Childcare; $z = 6.73, p = .01$), but the Pregnant Control condition was not significantly different from the Non-Pregnant condition ($z = .35, p = .55$).

Verbal intentions to hire. There were a total of 38 audible responses to the question “Do you think you will hire me?”. Examination of these responses revealed that there was only one negative response. Instead of demonstrating the hypothesized formal discrimination, examination of these responses revealed

that there was little discrimination as measured by verbal admissions of intention to hire. The remaining responses were categorized as either “positive” (19 responses), “non-committal” (15 responses), or “other” if the employee did not answer the question (3 responses). Table 1 illustrates the number of each statement type by condition.

Table 1

Verbal Intentions to Hire by Condition

Condition	Statement of Intention			
	Negative	Positive	Non-Comittal	Other
Non-Pregnant	0	9	2	0
Pregnant Control	1	4	5	1
Previous Experience	0	5	1	0
Childcare	0	1	7	2

In contradiction to our hypothesis that pregnant job applicants would receive greater formal discrimination, employees demonstrated little formal discrimination in the form of verbal responses to any of the applicants

Employee references to pregnancy. Audio taped interactions between store employees and applicants were screened for statements and questions spoken by employees regarding the applicants’ pregnancies. Of the 55 trials in which the tapes were audible and the applicant was in one of the three pregnancy conditions, managers/clerks made comments or asked questions about the pregnancy in 19 of the trials (34.5% of the time). References to the pregnancy were approximately equally distributed among pregnancy conditions

(Pregnant Control, six references; Previous Experience, six references; Childcare, seven references).

Of the 18 interactions in which the employee referenced the pregnancy, 11 references came from managers and seven references were from clerks. Two practicing human resource professionals reviewed the 19 references. Together, they evaluated eight out of the 11 references made by managers as illegal discrimination. These references were made primarily about the applicant's due date. Applicants were instructed to respond to these questions by indicating that they were seven months pregnant. Other references to the applicants' pregnancies included asking about names for the baby, asking about the sex of the baby, and mentioning the pregnancy when discussing what the applicant would be doing if they got a job at the store. They also indicated that because store clerks had no authority in hiring, comments they made regarding the applicants' pregnancies could not be considered illegal discrimination. They did suggest though, that seven out of the seven references the clerks made were questionable or in poor taste, and would have been considered illegal had they been made by a manager (e.g., "When is that baby going to come out?")

Overall then, of the 55 audible tapes in which applicants were in pregnancy conditions, managers made illegal references to the applicant's pregnancy 14.5% of the time. This percentage is even greater if you consider only those trials in which the applicant spoke to a manager (illegal references 19% of the time). Thus, these results document formal discrimination against

pregnant women. No differences however, were demonstrated between pregnancy conditions.

Other formal discrimination. Additionally, there were several instances of formal discrimination that we did not expect. For example, in eight of the trials, all of which were in the pregnant conditions, the observers reported that the employees spoke of the applicant with each other, and sometimes with other customers in the store, after the applicant had left. These comments included such things as jokes about the pregnant applicant, statements of how the pregnant applicant should not be applying, how much it would hurt the baby for the applicant to work, and the inability of the pregnant applicant to do the job. Also, despite the fact that undergraduate researchers had called every store and received an affirmative response about job availability, in six stores candidates were told that there were not any jobs available. Interestingly, all of these responses were made to applicants in pregnant conditions. In one case, the store acknowledged that they were hiring on the phone and had a hiring sign in the window, but told the pregnant applicant that they were not hiring. These instances further document formal discrimination against pregnant women.

Overall, these results present a complex picture of formal discrimination against pregnant women in hiring situations. While there are no significant differences in job callback rates between applicants in the Non-Pregnant and applicants in the Pregnant Control condition, other evidence of formal discrimination was found. Additionally, the predictions of Hypotheses 3 and 4

that acknowledgment would mitigate formal discrimination proved to be inaccurate as acknowledgment served to increase formal discrimination.

Analysis of Interpersonal Measures of Discrimination

Hypothesis 2 predicted that pregnant job applicants would be targets of significantly more interpersonal discrimination than non-pregnant job applicants. Moreover, Hypotheses 3 and 4 predicted that acknowledgment of a pregnancy combined with a statement intended to remediate employer concerns would result in significantly less interpersonal discrimination. To test these hypotheses, we measured perceptions of employee interpersonal discrimination as rated by confederate applicants and observers as well as condition blind coders.

Applicant perceptions. Applicant evaluations of employee interpersonal discrimination were analyzed by a four cell ONEWAY combined Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) using the Wilks' lambda criterion. Pregnancy condition of the applicant acted as the independent variable and the two factors of applicant perceived hostility and benevolence served as the dependent variables. A total of 86 trials were included in the data (21 Non-Pregnant, 22 Pregnant Control, 22 Previous Experience, and 21 Childcare).

Hypothesis 2 was first evaluated using planned comparisons. Specifically, we wanted to examine differences in employee interpersonal behavior in the Non-Pregnant condition versus the conditions in which the applicants were wearing the pregnancy prosthesis. This comparison confirmed our hypothesis and indicated that applicants in the Non-Pregnant condition were treated significantly different from applicants in the pregnant conditions, $F(2, 81) = 7.46$,

$p = 0.001$. Means indicated that applicants perceived employees as demonstrating less hostile and more benevolent behavior when they were in the Non-Pregnant condition compared to when they were in the pregnant conditions (see Table 3).

Table 3

Means for Hostility and Benevolence for Applicants, Observers, and Condition Blind Coders

Condition	Applicant						Observer						Condition Blind Coder					
	Hostility			Benevolence			Hostility			Benevolence			Hostility			Benevolence		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Non-Pregnant	0.29	0.65	21	3.52	1.34	21	0.55	0.48	21	3.86	1.21	21	1.98	0.17	14	2.57	0.30	14
Pregnant Control	1.26	1.05	22	3.29	0.94	22	0.89	0.46	21	3.46	1.09	21	1.94	0.19	12	1.96	0.33	12
Previous Experience	1.19	1.02	22	3.06	1.39	22	0.90	0.45	22	3.46	1.27	22	1.94	0.02	11	2.50	0.03	11
Childcare	1.27	1.19	21	2.45	1.32	21	0.87	0.50	21	3.10	1.10	21	1.80	0.02	11	2.26	0.03	11

A second comparison evaluated differences between the Pregnant Control condition versus the two pregnant acknowledgment conditions. Differences between these groups however, were not confirmed, $F(2, 81) = 1.50$, $p = 0.22$.

Further exploration of the omnibus MANOVA revealed a significant effect for condition, $F(6, 162) = 3.35$, $p = .004$, $\eta^2 = .11$. Univariate analysis showed that this effect was significant for both the hostility factor, $F(3, 82) = 4.89$, $p = .004$, $\eta^2 = .52$, and the benevolence factor, $F(3, 82) = 2.82$, $p = 0.04$, $\eta^2 = .09$. As Figure 2 indicates, perceived employee hostility is lowest in the Non-Pregnant condition ($M = .29$, $SD = .65$) and is significantly greater for each of the pregnant conditions (Pregnant Control: $M = 1.26$, $SD = 1.05$, Tukey HSD, $p = .01$; Previous Experience: $M = 1.19$, $SD = 1.02$, Tukey HSD, $p = .02$; Childcare: $M = 1.27$, $SD = 1.19$, Tukey HSD, $p = .01$). None of the pregnant conditions however, proved to be significantly different from each other.

Figure 2

Figure 3 demonstrates that this pattern is reversed for the benevolence factor.

Figure 3

Applicants perceived employee benevolence to be the greatest in the Non-Pregnant condition ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 1.34$) and slightly decreased in the Pregnant Control condition ($M = 3.29$, $SD = .94$) and the Previous Experience condition ($M = 3.06$, $SD = 1.39$). In the Childcare condition, applicants perceived employees as being significantly less benevolent than in the Non-Pregnant condition ($M = 2.45$, $SD = 1.32$, Tukey HSD, $p = .035$).

Overall, in confirmation of Hypothesis 2, applicants did report increased levels of interpersonal discrimination in the pregnant conditions compared to the Non-Pregnant condition. Additionally, Hypotheses 3 and 4 were not supported and interpersonal discrimination was accentuated rather than remediated by acknowledgment.

Observer perceptions. We analyzed observer confederate evaluations of the interaction by using a four cell ONEWAY combined Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) using the Wilks' lambda criterion. Pregnancy condition (Non-Pregnant, Pregnant Control, Previous Experience, or Childcare) again acted as the independent variable and the observer perceptions of employee hostility and benevolence were dependent variables. A total of 85 trials were included in the data (21 Non-Pregnant, 21 Pregnant Control, 22 Previous Experience, and 21 Childcare). There is one fewer observer trial than applicant trial because in one instance an observer entered a different store than the applicant, and the interaction took place without the observer's coding.

Similar to the analysis of applicant perceptions, planned comparisons were first used to evaluate our hypotheses. Again a contrast examined

differences in employee interpersonal discrimination between the Non-Pregnant condition and the three pregnant conditions. In line with our hypothesis, results revealed that observers did perceive differences in employee interpersonal discrimination based on whether the applicant was pregnant or not, $F(2, 80) = 3.98$, $p = 0.02$. As with the applicant data, means showed that observers perceived employees as being less hostile and more benevolent to non-pregnant applicants than pregnant applicants (see Table 3). A second contrast examined differences in observer perceptions of employee interpersonal discrimination between the Pregnant Control condition and the two pregnant acknowledgment conditions. Results found that there were no significant differences between the Pregnant Control condition and the acknowledgment conditions, $F(2, 80) = 0.36$, $p = 0.69$.

Further exploration of the omnibus MANOVA revealed a marginal effect for condition, $F(6, 160) = 1.94$, $p = .08$, $\eta^2 = .07$. Univariate analyses found condition had a significant effect on observer rated hostility ($F(3, 81) = 2.65$, $p = 0.05$, $\eta^2 = .09$) and a non-significant effect on observer rated benevolence ($F(3, 81) = 1.48$, $p = .23$, $\eta^2 = .05$). Post hoc tests however, did not show any significant differences in perceive hostility between conditions. As Figure 2 demonstrates, observer perceptions of employee hostility demonstrated a similar trend to applicant rated hostility. In the Non-Pregnant condition, observers reported low levels of employee interpersonal hostility ($M = .55$, $SD = .48$), while in the three pregnant conditions observers reported higher levels of employee

hostility (Pregnant Control: $\underline{M} = .89$, $\underline{SD} = .46$; Previous Experience: $\underline{M} = .90$, $\underline{SD} = .45$; Childcare: $\underline{M} = .87$, $\underline{SD} = .50$).

Additionally, although the trend was not significant, the benevolence factor showed a similar pattern to the applicant data (see Figure 3). Like the applicants, observers rated employees as being most benevolent to the Non-Pregnant applicants ($\underline{M} = 3.86$, $\underline{SD} = 1.21$), slightly less benevolent to applicants in the Pregnant Control ($\underline{M} = 3.46$, $\underline{SD} = 1.09$) and Previous Experience ($\underline{M} = 3.46$, $\underline{SD} = 1.27$) conditions, and least benevolent to applicants in the Childcare condition ($\underline{M} = 3.10$, $\underline{SD} = 1.10$).

Results of a within subjects MANOVA indicated that the observer ratings of hostility were significantly less negative than the ratings of hostility made by the applicants, $F(1, 81) = 14.69$, $p = .0001$ (See Table 4 for means).

Table 4

Average Hostility and Benevolence by Source and Condition

Condition	Hostility				Benevolence			
	Applicant		Observer		Applicant		Observer	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Non-pregnant	0.29	0.65	0.94	0.97	3.52	1.34	3.86	1.21
Pregnant Control	1.23	1.06	1.69	1.27	3.20	0.86	3.46	1.09
Previous Experience	1.19	1.02	1.71	1.12	3.06	1.39	3.46	1.27
Childcare	1.27	1.19	1.67	1.22	2.45	1.32	3.10	1.10

Similarly, observer ratings of benevolence were significantly higher than applicant ratings of benevolence, $F(1,81) = 12.14$, $p = .001$ (See Table 4).

Overall these findings support the contention of Hypothesis 2 that pregnant applicants receive more interpersonal discrimination than non-pregnant applicants. However, there is no indication to support Hypotheses 3 and 4 that pregnant control applicants and applicants in the acknowledgment conditions receive differential treatment. Moreover, these findings suggest that observers and applicants see similar patterns of interpersonal discrimination.

Coder perceptions. Coder evaluations of employee interpersonal discrimination were analyzed by a four cell ONEWAY combined MANOVA using the Wilks' lambda criterion. Condition of the applicant was the independent variable and coder perceptions of employee hostility and benevolence served as dependent variables. The 50 trials in which the coders were blind to the condition of the applicant were included in the analyses (15 Non-Pregnant, 13 Pregnant Control, 11 Previous Experience, and 11 Childcare). Similar to the applicant and observer data, Hypothesis 2 was first evaluated using planned comparisons. The planned comparison evaluating coder perceptions of differences in employee interpersonal discrimination towards applicants in the Non-Pregnant condition versus those in the pregnant conditions found no significant differences, $F(2, 44) = 1.04$, $p = .36$ (see Table 3 for means). A second contrast evaluating differences in coder perceptions of employee interpersonal discrimination towards applicants in the pregnant condition versus those in the acknowledgment condition also found no significant differences, $F(2, 44) = .08$, $p = .92$. Further exploration of the omnibus MANOVA failed to confirm

our hypothesis and found no significant differences for condition, ($F(6, 90) = .45$, $p = .84$, $\eta^2 = .03$)³.

Additionally, to test our hypothesis that differences do exist in employee interpersonal discrimination between non-pregnant and pregnant applicants we evaluated the rate at which coders could correctly determine the condition (pregnant or non-pregnant) of the applicant. In the 50 trials in which no references to pregnancy were made, coders were able to correctly indicate that applicants were in the Non-Pregnant condition 12 out of 15 times (80% accuracy) from the tone of the conversation. In the pregnant conditions, coders were only slightly above chance level for guessing whether applicants were pregnant or not (Pregnant Control, 53.8%; Previous Experience, 63.6%; Childcare, 54.5%). Thus, coders could detect when applicants were not pregnant but had greater difficulty accurately identifying when applicants were pregnant. Part of the reason for this difficulty may have come because the coders did not know the ratio in which pregnant to non-pregnant trials occurred. They may have been assuming that non-pregnant and pregnant trials each occurred 50% of the time.

Coders also responded to an item measuring perceived stigmatization. When asked, "To what extent did the manager seem to stigmatize the individual?" the coders found a marginally significant difference, $F(3, 45) = 2.24$, $p = 0.10$, $\eta^2 = .13$. The coders rated stigmatization lower for the Non-Pregnant condition ($M = .80$, $SD = 1.15$) than the pregnant conditions (Pregnant Control; $M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.63$; Previous Experience: $M = 1.55$, $SD = 1.29$; Childcare: $M = 1.10$, $SD = .88$). None of these differences however were statistically significant.

³ These results also failed to reach significance when all coder data was included.

Overall, the coder evaluations of the interactions failed to confirm out hypotheses and did not detect and significant differences. Two other measures, identification rates of non-pregnant applicants and perceived stigmatization, however, suggest that coders could detect differences in the treatment of pregnant and non-pregnant job applicants.

Overall, Hypothesis 2 was supported. Data generated from applicant, observer, and, to some extent, coder perceptions suggest that non-pregnant applicants are targets of significantly less interpersonal discrimination (both benevolent and hostile) than pregnant applicants. Our predictions in Hypotheses 3 and 4 that applicant acknowledgment would remediate interpersonal discrimination was not confirmed. Instead applicant acknowledgment increased interpersonal discrimination.

Further Exploratory Results

Although our initial hypotheses only predicted differences in formal and interpersonal discrimination based on condition, we also measured several individual differences at both the store and employee level to gain a better understanding of patterns of discrimination against pregnant women. Of these variables, store type and manager gender significantly impacted measures of discrimination. Specifically, results indicated that the ratings of hostility by both observers and applicants were dependent store type (applicants $F(1, 84) = 7.43$, $p = .01$; observers $F(1, 83) = 4.96$, $p = .03$). Applicants rated employees in clothing and accessory stores as demonstrating greater interpersonal hostility than employees in non-clothing stores (clothing stores: $M = 1.24$, $SD = 1.02$; non-

clothing stores: $\underline{M} = 6.2$, $\underline{SD} = 1.03$) as did observers (clothing: $\underline{M} = .89$, $\underline{SD} = .48$; non-clothing: $\underline{M} = .66$, $\underline{SD} = .47$). Benevolence, as rated by applicants, was marginally dependent on store type ($\underline{F}(1, 84) = 3.70$, $p = .06$). Applicants rated employees in non-clothing stores as being higher on benevolence ($\underline{M} = 3.42$, $\underline{SD} = 1.13$) than employees in clothing stores ($\underline{M} = 2.87$, $\underline{SD} = 1.36$).

Furthermore, the observers rated benevolent and hostile factors significantly different depending on whether they encountered a male or female manager (hostility $\underline{F}(1, 82) = 4.06$, $p = .05$; benevolence $\underline{F}(1, 82) = 6.68$, $p = .01$). Observers viewed female managers as more benevolent (female: $\underline{M} = 3.65$, $\underline{SD} = 1.18$; male: $\underline{M} = 2.85$, $\underline{SD} = .97$) and less hostile than male managers (female: $\underline{M} = .74$, $\underline{SD} = .49$; male: $\underline{M} = 1.01$, $\underline{SD} = .45$). In sum, confederates encountered 17 male managers and 67 female managers. Manager gender was correlated with store type such that applicants were more likely to encounter male managers in non-clothing and accessory stores and female managers in clothing and accessory stores ($\underline{r} = -.34$, $p = .001$). Due to these differences, we decided to use store type and manager gender as covariates.

Initially, we classified stores as either women's clothing and accessories, men's clothing and accessories, both men's and women's clothing and accessories and variety-gifts, to allow us to account for differences that may exist by store type. Difficulty finding stores that were hiring and catered solely to men resulted in the removal of this group from the analysis. Stores were randomly assigned to one of the three remaining types of stores. When analyzing the data,

it seemed most meaningful to dichotomize stores into those that sold clothing and accessories and those that did not.

When we attempted to covary out store type, we found that the assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes was violated for applicants ($F(6, 154) = 2.83, p = .01$), observers ($F(6, 152) = 2.28, p = .04$) and was marginal for condition blind coders ($F(6, 122) = 2.10, p = .06$). This violation necessitated that store type be treated as an independent variable (Tbachnck & Fidell, 2001). Manager gender was also analyzed for violations of the homogeneity of regression slopes, and was determined to be homogeneous. Manager gender was therefore considered as a covariate.

Analysis of Formal Measures of Discrimination

We first tested whether formal discrimination, as measured by job callbacks, would vary by condition and store type when manager gender was controlled. We also examined whether levels of formal discrimination toward pregnant applicants would be impacted by an acknowledgment statement.

Job callback data. Job callbacks were analyzed using a logistic regression with job callbacks as the outcome variable, condition and store type as the predictor variables, and manager gender as a covariate. Analysis was performed on the 82 stores in which confederate job applicants filled out applications. Not included in this analysis were the three stores in which applicants completed interactions with employees, but could not fill out an application because the store did not currently have any applications available. Although this may have been a way for stores to discourage unwanted

applicants, we chose to exclude these trials from our analysis. Also excluded was the store that employed fewer than 15 employees because instances of formal discrimination in this store would be legal.

The overall model for the logistic regression was statistically significant, suggesting that the interaction of condition and store type does indicate whether or not applicants receive job callbacks, $X^2(9, N = 92) = 19.67, p = .02$ (see Table 5 for number of callbacks by condition and store type).

Table 5

Number of Job Callbacks by Condition and Store Type

Store type	Condition			
	Non-Pregnant	Pregnant Control	Previous Experience	Childcare
Clothing	5	6	3	0
Non-clothing	5	3	0	2

Specifically, in the Non-pregnant condition applicants in clothing and non-clothing stores received an equal number of callbacks. In the Pregnancy Control condition and the Previous Experience condition applicants in clothing stores received more callbacks than applicants in non-clothing stores. In the Childcare condition however, applicants in non-clothing stores received more callbacks than applicants in clothing stores. Despite the overall significance for the model, none of these specific differences in callbacks was statistically significant. The variance accounted for by the overall model as measured by the Cox and Snell R square, was .22. This finding suggests that the interaction of condition and store type did affect the rates at which applicants received job callbacks, but that it was

the general pattern rather than a specific level of the interaction that was driving the results.

Analysis of Interpersonal Measures of Discrimination

Second, we examined whether interpersonal discrimination, as measured by the perceptions of applicants, observers, and coders, would vary by condition and store type when manager gender was controlled. Specifically, we were looking to identify differences in the interaction of condition and store type between the non-pregnant condition and the pregnant conditions, and between the pregnant control condition and the pregnant acknowledgment conditions.

Applicant perceptions. Applicant evaluations of employee interpersonal discrimination were analyzed by a 2 X 4 combined Multiple Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) using the Wilks' lambda criterion. Pregnancy condition of the applicant (Non-Pregnant, Pregnant Control, Previous Experience, and Childcare) and store type (clothing and accessories or non-clothing) acted as the independent variables and the two factors of applicant perceived hostility and benevolence served as the dependent variables. Manager gender was a covariate. Eighty-five trials were included in the applicant data (21 Non-Pregnant, 22 Pregnant Control, 21 Previous Experience, and 21 Childcare). Excluded from the data was one trial in which the applicant failed to code manager gender.

Exploration of the omnibus MANCOVA found that there was an interaction between condition and store type, $F(6, 150) = 2.66$, $p = 0.02$, $\eta^2 = .10$ (see Table 5 for means). Follow up univariate tests indicated that this interaction was

significant for the hostility factor ($F(3, 76) = 3.91, p = 0.01, \eta^2 = .13$), but not for the benevolence factor ($F(3, 76) = 1.39, p = .25, \eta^2 = 0.52$). As shown in Figure 4, employees in neither the clothing nor the non-clothing stores demonstrated hostility toward the non-pregnant applicants (clothing stores: $M = .31, SD = .45$; non-clothing stores: $M = .27, SD = .79$).

Figure 4

Tukey HSD tests revealed that employees in clothing stores displayed slightly more hostility towards pregnant applicants ($M = 1.13, SD = .80$), while employees in non-clothing stores displayed significantly more hostility ($M = 1.50, SD = 1.41$). For non-clothing stores, however, acknowledging the pregnancy reduced employee hostility (Previous Experience: $M = .58, SD = .75$; Childcare: $M = .17, SD = .30$) while in clothing stores acknowledging the pregnancy increased hostility (Previous Experience: $M = 1.48, SD = 1.03$; Childcare: $M = 1.72, SD = 1.12$). Tukey post hoc tests found that the types of stores were significantly

different for the Childcare condition. Thus, pregnant applicants who acknowledged their pregnancies and mentioned having reliable and flexible childcare received significantly less interpersonal discrimination in non-clothing stores than clothing stores. In the non-clothing stores employees demonstrated significantly more hostility to the applicants in the Pregnant Control condition than to the applicants in the Childcare condition (see Table 3 for means). Results also found that employees in the clothing condition demonstrated significantly more hostility to applicants in the remediation conditions compared to applicants in the non-pregnant condition (see Table 3 for means).

A significant main effect was also found for condition, $F(6, 150) = 3.07$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .11$. Univariate tests revealed that the main effect for condition was significant for the hostility factor ($F(3, 76) = 4.37$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .15$) but not the benevolence factor, $F(3, 76) = 1.82$, $p = .15$, $\eta^2 = .07$. As Figure 5 shows, and Tukey HSD tests confirm, applicants in the non-pregnant condition were treated with significantly less hostility ($M = .29$, $SD = 1.94$) than applicants in all three of the pregnant conditions (Pregnant Control: $M = 1.31$, $SD = 1.94$; Previous Experience: $M = 1.03$, $SD = 2.10$; Childcare: $M = .94$, $SD = 2.40$).

Figure 5

There were no significant differences, however, for any of the pregnant conditions.

Furthermore, a significant effect was found for store type, $F(2, 75) = 3.14$, $p = .05$, $\eta^2 = .08$. Univariate analyses showed that this effect was significant for the hostile factor, $F(1, 76) = 5.07$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2 = .06$, and marginal for the benevolence factor, $F(1, 76) = 3.15$, $p = .08$, $\eta^2 = .04$. Clothing stores demonstrated significantly more hostility ($M = 1.16$, $SD = 1.29$) than non-clothing stores ($M = .63$, $SD = 1.66$) and less benevolence ($M = 2.92$, $SD = 1.66$) than non-clothing stores ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 2.21$). There was no effect of manager gender $F(2, 75) = .43$, $p = .65$, $\eta^2 = .10$.

Overall, these results suggest interpersonal discrimination towards job applicants is affected by the interaction of condition and store type. Specifically, a pregnant job applicant who acknowledges her condition and offers a statement

of remediation that focuses on having reliable and flexible childcare is reacted to with greater hostility in clothing stores than in non-clothing stores.

Observer perceptions. Applicant evaluations of employee interpersonal discrimination were analyzed by a 2X4 combined MANCOVA using the Wilks' lambda criterion. Pregnancy condition (Non-Pregnant, Pregnant Control, Previous Experience, and Childcare) and store type (clothing and non-clothing) acted as independent variables and the two factors of observer perceived hostility and benevolence served as the dependent variables. Eighty-four stores were included in the analysis (21 in the Non-Pregnant condition, 21 in the Pregnant Control condition, 21 in the Previous Experience condition, and 21 in the Childcare condition). Excluded from the data were one trial in which the observer failed to enter the same store that the applicant did, and one trial in which the applicant forgot to record the manager gender.

Results indicated that the interaction between condition and store type was significant, $F(6, 148) = 2.27$, $p = .04$, $\eta^2 = .08$ (see Table 5 for means). Univariate analyses revealed that this interaction was not significant at the univariate level for either the hostility factor ($F(3, 75) = 1.70$, $p = .18$) or the benevolence factor ($F(3, 75) = .68$, $p = .56$). As shown in Figure 8 however, observer rated hostility demonstrates a similar trend to the applicant rated hostility. In this trend, observers perceive low levels of hostility in both types of stores when the applicant is in the Non-Pregnant condition and high levels of hostility in both types of stores when the applicant is in the Pregnant Control

condition. In the acknowledgment conditions, hostility decrease for non-clothing stores, but remains the same for clothing stores.

Results also revealed a significant effect of condition, $F(6, 148) = 2.12$, $p = .05$, $\eta^2 = .08$. This effect was marginal for the hostility factor ($F(3, 75) = 2.45$, $p = .07$, $\eta^2 = .09$) and non-significant for the benevolence factor ($F(3, 75) = .57$, $p = .64$). As Figure 9 shows, the marginal effect of hostility demonstrated the same trend as applicant perceptions of hostility, where hostility is lowest in the Non-Pregnant condition and increases in the pregnant conditions.

There was a significant effect of store type, $F(2, 74) = 4.26$, $p = 0.02$, $\eta^2 = .10$. Univariate analyses revealed that this effect was significant for observer hostility ($F(1, 75) = 8.56$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .10$) and marginal for observer benevolence ($F(1, 75) = 3.78$, $p = 0.06$). Specifically, clothing stores were more hostile toward applicants than non-clothing stores (clothing: $M = .91$, $SD = .59$; non-clothing: $M = .58$, $SD = .78$) and clothing stores were less benevolent than non-clothing stores (clothing: $M = 3.31$, $SD = 1.50$; non-clothing: $M = 3.87$, $SD = 2.02$).

Manager gender was also significant ($F(2, 74) = 5.28$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .13$) for both observer benevolence ($F(1, 75) = 7.73$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .09$) and observer hostile ($F(1, 75) = 10.26$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .12$). Specifically, female employees were seen as being more benevolent ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 1.18$) and less hostile ($M = .74$, $SD = .49$) than male employees (benevolence: $M = 2.85$, $SD = .97$; hostility: $M = 1.01$, $SD = .45$).

Overall, these results suggest that the observers were seeing the same patterns of interpersonal discrimination as the applicants. Although trends in the

hostility data are not significant, they present a similar picture of employee interpersonal discrimination as the applicant data. Moreover, the findings suggest that store type influences reactions to acknowledgment and remediation statements made by pregnant job applicants.

Coder perceptions. Applicant evaluations of employee interpersonal discrimination were analyzed by a 2 X 4 MANCOVA using manager gender as a covariate. Pregnancy condition of the applicant (Non-Pregnant, Pregnant Control, Previous Experience, and Childcare) and store type (clothing or non-clothing) acted as the independent variables and the two factors of coder perceived hostility and benevolence served as the dependent variables. A total of 47 trials were included in the data (14 Non-Pregnant, 12 Pregnant Control, 10 Previous Experience, 11 Childcare). In all of the trials coders were blind to the condition of the applicant.

Results indicated that there was no interaction between condition and store type ($F(6, 78) = 1, p = .43, \eta^2 = .07$), and no main effect for condition ($F(6, 78) = .73, p = .63, \eta^2 = .05$). There was, however, a marginal effect for store type, $F(2, 39) = 2.85, p = .07, \eta^2 = .13$. Further univariate analysis revealed that the effect for store type was significant for the hostility factor ($F(1, 40) = 5.75, p = .02$), but not the benevolence factor ($F(1, 40) = .01, p = .91$). Means showed that clothing stores were perceived as being more hostile to job applicants than non-clothing stores (clothing: $M = 3.22, SD = .81$; non-clothing: $M = 1.64, SD = 1.09$). Additionally, there was no effect of manager gender, $F(2, 39) = 1.47, p = .24$.

In sum, the exploratory results suggest that the interaction between store type and condition affects discrimination against pregnant job applicants. Specifically, in non-clothing stores when pregnant applicants acknowledge their condition and attempt to remediate concerns about childcare, the amount of interpersonal discrimination demonstrated by employees is significantly less than the amount of discrimination shown to the applicants in the Pregnant Control condition. In some stores therefore, acknowledgment may be an effective means of decreasing discrimination.

Discussion

Using a field study methodology, we investigated potential formal and interpersonal discrimination against pregnant women in hiring situations as well as how such discrimination might be remediated. Our findings support the importance of examining discrimination at both formal and interpersonal levels as proposed by Hebl et al. (in press). Similar to the patterns of discrimination against homosexual job applicants found by Hebl et al. (in press), the current research indicates that store employees were limiting some types of formal discrimination, but not interpersonal discrimination against pregnant job applicants. Thus, although pregnant applicants received job callbacks at approximately the same rates as non-pregnant applicants, they were targets of more hostile and less benevolent verbal, non-verbal and paraverbal reactions from store employees. Importantly however, some expressions of formal discrimination were documented, suggesting that equal treatment is not universal, and may be manifested through inappropriate statements and

questions, inaccurate information regarding job availability, and inappropriate comments when the applicant is not present. Such manifestations might be successful in reducing formal discrimination that is easily enforceable (e.g., rate of job callbacks), but may not be as effective at curtailing discrimination that is harder to enforce (e.g., statements to coworkers). Discriminatory attitudes therefore, are being displayed in ways that circumvent legal repercussions.

Interestingly, the patterns of interpersonal discrimination towards pregnant applicants evidenced in this study could be characterized as hostile sexism (openly negative sexism; Glick & Fiske, 1996; 1999). Compared to non-pregnant applicants, pregnant applicants were treated with more hostility and less benevolence. For example, the pregnant applicants were smiled and nodded at less often and frowned at more than non-pregnant applicants. They were treated in manners that, compared to non-pregnant applicants, were less friendly, less helpful, and more rude. Employees also made less eye contact, more attempts to end the conversation early, and stood farther away from the pregnant applicants than non-pregnant applicants. These reactions are in line with previous findings demonstrating that pregnant women are treated in similar ways as individuals with other stigmas such as scars, obesity, and physical handicap (Davis & Lennon, 1983; Kleck & DeJong, 1981; Harris, Harris, & Bochner, 1982; Langer et al., 1976). Thus it appears that pregnancy may indeed be seen as “an aberration of the body” (Goffman, 1963). The second type of sexism proposed by Glick and Fiske (1996; 1999), benevolent sexism (characterized by subjectively positive expressions) was not demonstrated to be a significant form

of discrimination in the hiring interactions. Employees who demonstrated interpersonal discrimination, tended to treat pregnant applicants with hostility rather than benevolence.

Despite the fact that pregnant women are treated similarly to other stigmatized individuals, they did not achieve the same benefits from acknowledging their condition that other stigmatized groups do (Hebl & Kleck, 2001). Instead of mitigating the effect of their stigma, acknowledgment and attempts at remediation by pregnant employees increased formal discrimination and failed to lessen interpersonal discrimination. Thus, in contradiction to our hypotheses, acknowledgment hurt pregnant job applicants rather than helped them. Importantly however, the exploratory results found an exception to this overall trend.

The exploratory results suggest that characteristics of individual managers/clerks and companies affect the amount of discrimination pregnant applicants face. Specifically, acknowledging a pregnancy and making a remediation statement regarding childcare resulted in significantly less interpersonal discrimination in non-clothing stores than in clothing stores. Such results indicate that some types of companies may be more receptive to acknowledgment statements than others and may be more open to hiring pregnant women.

Previous research has suggested that appearance does play a role in how employers perceive an applicant's fit for a particular job (Heilman & Satuwatari, 1979; Riggio & Throckmorton, 1988; Zebrowitz, Tenenbaum, &

Goldstein, 1991). According to Zebrowitz et al., if an applicant's physical attributes correspond to the qualities necessary for the job, they are more likely to get the job. For example, "babyfaced or female (applicants) were favored for jobs requiring qualities of warmth and submission," (Zebrowitz et al., p.525). In line with this research, clothing and non-clothing stores may be selecting applicants based on store qualities that they want portrayed through their employees' appearance. Clothing stores may want to hire employees who convey images of being fashionable, sophisticated, and trendy. Non-clothing stores may want to convey images of maturity and competence. Pregnant women may be perceived as having qualities that align more closely with those desired by the non-clothing stores. When pregnant applicants are perceived as more viable candidates, potential employees may be more persuaded by statements of remediation. Thus, when the applicant fits the stereotypical image an employee for a particular store, managers/clerks may be more influenced by statements of remediation.

One possibility for the overall pattern of increased formal discrimination toward applicants in the remediation conditions is that there was something about these conditions that made store employees suspicious or uncomfortable. The remediation statement may have appeared awkward or out of the ordinary. This is unlikely however, given that the applicants and observers reported no significant differences in employee behavior between pregnancy conditions. If store employees had suspected something unusual, their non-verbal and verbal

behavior would have most likely varied from the Pregnant Control condition. Applicants and observers reported no indication of this.

Another possibility is that acknowledging a pregnancy and then mentioning either previous experience or childcare may have amplified the awareness of employees to potential difficulties associated with hiring a pregnant woman. Negative perceptions of pregnant job applicants may have been formed from the remediation statements despite the fact that the applicants were attempting to convey that they could overcome problems associated with combining pregnancy and work or childrearing and work. Wegner's (1994) theory of ironic processes of mental control proposes that attempting to not think of a topic intensifies thoughts of that topic rather than diminishing them. If this was in fact what was occurring, a pregnant woman who mentions that she has had previous experience combining work and pregnancy may evoke an image of a woman who is constantly in and out of the work force. Similarly, a pregnant women saying she can handle childcare may just make childcare problems more salient in the mind of the employer.

One additional possibility is that by acknowledging her pregnancy, the applicant reduced perceptions of her professionalism and made the store employee feel able to circumvent hiring laws without repercussions. When the pregnant woman did not acknowledge her pregnancy, the employees may have felt it was necessary to treat her in a very professional manner consistent with EEOC guidelines because they were unsure if she would prosecute them legally if hiring discrimination occurred. When the pregnant woman acknowledged the

pregnancy, however, this may have signaled to the employee that the pregnant woman was not acting in a professional manner and would not be bring about legal actions if she were discriminated against. As demonstrated by the patterns of formal and interpersonal discrimination against pregnant applicants, some employees do discriminate when they perceive few negative repercussions. These findings suggest that while acknowledgment may be a good strategy for other stigmatized groups, it is not a good strategy for pregnant women.

Implications

These results have theoretical implications for discrimination towards pregnant women in particular, as well as for discrimination towards stigmatized groups in general. The current research extends the pregnancy discrimination literature by providing further evidence that pregnancy is viewed as a stigma. Corroborating previous work (Davis & Lennon, 1983; Kleck & DeJong, 1981; Harris, Harris, & Bochner, 1982; Hebl et al. (in press); Langer et al., 1976) pregnancy appears to be responded to in similar ways as physical disability, obesity, and homosexuality. This work joins with that of Hebl et al. (in press) in suggesting that stigmatized groups face discrimination from multiple levels. Discrimination is not merely a phenomenon expressed through formal channels but also appears at an interpersonal level. The current study also extends the work of Glick and Fiske (1996; 1999) and demonstrates the predominance of hostile sexism in hiring situations involving pregnant women. Although Glick and Fiske argue that both benevolent and hostile sexism are expressed towards

women, in hiring situations involving pregnant women only hostile sexism is consistently documented.

Practically, these results suggest that despite EEOC laws, pregnancy discrimination is still occurring. When applying for jobs while pregnant, women need to be aware of the biases against them and should be knowledgeable of what constitutes pregnancy discrimination so that they are not formally discriminated against. In general, the best course of action would be for pregnant women not to acknowledge their pregnancies. Exceptions to this, however, might be effective when the pregnant woman is applying for a job where she fits the image of a stereotypical employee. Should this be the case, the pregnant woman should specifically address employers concerns revolving around childcare issues.

Limitations

Due to the field study methodology used in this research, there are several limitations of this study. First, the pregnancy prosthesis required significant adjusting and pinning, making it necessary to put the prosthesis on the applicant before entering the malls. Too much attention would have been attracted to the confederates had we attempted to put the prostheses on in the restrooms or the parking lot of the mall. Thus, all pregnant conditions were performed before the non-pregnant conditions. Although this constraint required our conditions to be in a non-random order, observers reported no differences in applicant behavior across conditions.

Second, both applicants and observers were aware of what condition applicants were in and thus, their perceptions may have been biased by this knowledge. Observer ratings, however, suggested that applicants behaved very consistently across trial, suggesting the differences were due to behaviors on the part of employees. Similarly, condition blind coders indicated that they could detect differences in employee behavior from listening to audio taped versions of the interactions. Specifically, they reported higher levels of stigmatization for the pregnant conditions versus the non-pregnant conditions and could accurately identify the non-pregnant applicants 80% of the time. Still, future research that uses videotapes rather than just audiotapes might allow for an even greater manipulation check on the part of applicants.

Third, this study was conducted using retail stores. Retail stores are, to some degree, a special population and these findings may not generalize to other work situations. In particular, compared to other types of work situations, retail stores tend to hire largely female staffs, have large numbers of part-time and temporary employees, have less time and money invested in training and benefits for employees, and have less competition for jobs. These qualities however, may make them more likely to hire pregnant job applicants than many other types of organizations, suggesting that our findings would be more exaggerated in other situations. First, retail stores typically have largely female staffs. Compared to a male dominated organization, retail stores may be more tolerant and have more experience with pregnant employees. Second, work in retail stores requires relatively little training, generating few up-front costs for

employers and requiring only a short time period before the employee is performing her job in the expected manner. Third, retail stores typically offer many part-time positions for which the company does not need to provide benefits. Pregnant employees in part-time positions would not incur a greater cost on the part of the company than a non-pregnant employee. Finally, competition for jobs in retail stores is relatively low. These factors suggest that retail stores may be more willing to hire pregnant employees than many other types of organizations.

Fourth, this study only assessed job callbacks, not actual job offers. It cannot be determined from this research whether pregnant and non-pregnant applicants would have received job offers at similar rates. While this would have been fascinating information to pursue, our desire to adhere to a standardize script across all confederate applicants necessitated that we examine only the initial stages of the hiring process.

Future Research

Future research is needed to further explore hiring interactions from the viewpoint of the store employee. It would be particularly interesting to assess manager perceptions of pregnant job applicants, as well as the extent to which they feel confined by legal mandates in their hiring practices. Such research may clarify why acknowledging a pregnancy is detrimental to a pregnant applicants chances of being called back for a job and may suggest more effective ways for applicants to remediate employer concerns.

Additionally, it would be important to investigate whether acknowledging a pregnancy and making a statement of remediation had detrimental affects to a pregnant women's chances of being hired at all stages of the hiring process, or if acknowledgment is only an ineffective strategy in the initial phases. Perhaps in an interview a potential employer would be more interested in the logistical aspects of working out how a pregnant woman could contribute effectively to the store. At this later stage of the hiring process the manager might be positively influenced by statements from the pregnant applicant about her ability to handle work and a pregnancy, or having young children.

Finally, research that examines other store and individual characteristics may further develop our understanding of patterns of discrimination. Interesting variables to consider would be the amount of diversity/discrimination training employees receive, the number of other applicants interested in the job, previous experiences working with pregnant employees, store climates, or organizational policies.

Conclusion

Overall, this study indicates the importance of examining discrimination at multiple levels in order to gain a complete picture of the biases individuals may be facing. Through examining discrimination at multiple levels, we demonstrated that pregnant job applicants face substantial interpersonal discrimination as well as some forms of formal discrimination. These findings suggest that discrimination is being translated to stigmatized individuals through complex patterns of behavior. Pregnancy discrimination cannot legally be overtly

demonstrated, but interpersonal behaviors are not as tightly controlled. Consequently, discrimination is being manifest through these less formal channels.

References

- Belgrave, F. Z., & Mills, J. (1981). Effect upon desire for social interaction with a physically disabled person of mentioning the disability in different contexts. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 11, 44-57.
- Bennett-Alexander, D. D., & Pincus, L. B. (1998). Employment law for business (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Bond, C. F., Jr., DiCandia, C. G., & MacKinnon, J. R. (1988). Response to violence in a psychiatric setting: The role of the patient's race. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14, 448-458.
- Bondenhausen, G., & Wyer, R. (1985). Effects of stereotypes on decision making and information-processing strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 267-282.
- Burden, D. S., & Googins, B. (1987). Balancing job and homelife study. Boston, MA: Boston University School of Social Work.
- Butler, D., & Geis, F. L. (1990). Nonverbal affect responses to male and female leaders: Implications for leadership evaluations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58 (1), 48-59.
- Clark, K., & Clark, M. (1947). Racial identification and preference in Negro children. In T. M. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology (pp. 169-178). New York: Holt.
- Clark, M. P. (1998). The impact of pregnancy on the work experience of employed pregnant women. Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 11-A. (University Microfilms No. 4196).

- Cleveland, J. N., Stockdale, M., & Murphy, K. R. (2000). Women and men in organizations: Sex and gender issues at work. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Corse, S. J. (1990). Pregnant managers and their subordinates: The effects of gender expectations on hierarchical relationships. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 26 (1), 25-47.
- Davis, L., & Lennon, S. (1983). Social stigma of pregnancy: Further evidence. Psychological Reports, 53, 997-998.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fernandez, J. P. (1986). Child care and corporate productivity. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). Social cognition (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Foster, J., & Hebl, M. (2002) Parental status and work discrimination: are mothers too feminine to make it in a man's world? Unpublished manuscript, Rice University.
- Franco, K., Evans, C. L., Best, A. P., Zrull, J. P., and Pizza, G. A. (1983). Conflicts associated with physicians' pregnancies. American Journal of Psychiatry, 140, 7, 902-904.
- Friedman, S. D., & Greenhaus, J. H., (2000). Work and family allies or enemies? What happens when business professionals confront life choices. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Gardin, S. K., & Richwald, G. A. (1986). Pregnancy and employment leave: Legal precedents and future policy. Journal of Public Health Policy, 7 (4), 458-469.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 491-512.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (1999). Sexism and other "isms": Interdependence, status, and the ambivalent content of stereotypes. In Swann, W. B., Langlois, J. H., &
- Gilbert, L. A. (Eds.), Sexism and stereotypes in modern society: The gender science of Janet Taylor Spence. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Googins, B. K (1991). Work/family conflicts: Private lives-public responses. New York: Auburn House.
- Gueutal, H. G., Luciano, J., & Michaels, C. A. (1995). Pregnancy in the workplace: Does pregnancy affect performance appraisal ratings? Journal of Business and Psychology, 10 (2), 155-167.
- Gueutal, H. G., & Taylor, E. M. (1991). Employee pregnancy: The impact on organizations, pregnant employees and co-workers. Journal of Business and Psychology, 5 (4), 459-476.
- Halpert, J. A., & Burg, J. H., (1997). Mixed messages: Co-worker responses to

- the pregnant employee. Journal of Business and Psychology, 12, 241-253.
- Halpert, J. A., Wilson, M. L., & Hickman, J. L. (1993). Pregnancy as a source of bias in performance appraisals. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14, 649-663.
- Harrell, J., & Ridley, C. (1975). Substitute child care, maternal employment and the quality of mother-child interaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37, 556-64.
- Harris, D. (1992). You're pregnant? You're out. Working Woman, August, 48-76.
- Harris, M. R., Harris, R. J., & Bochner, S. (1982). Fat four-eyed, and female: Stereotypes of obesity, glasses, and gender. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 12, 503-516.
- Hastorf, A. H., Wildfogel, J., & Cassman, T. (1979). Acknowledgment of handicap as a tactic in social interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1790-1797.
- Hebl, M. R., Foster, J. B., Mannix, L. M., & Dovidio, J. F. (in press). Formal and interpersonal discrimination: A field study understanding of applicant bias. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.
- Hebl, M., & Kleck, R. E. (2001). Acknowledging one's stigma in the interview setting: Strategy or liability? Journal of Applied Social Psychology (in press).
- Heilman, M. E., Saruwatari, L. R. (1979). When beauty is beastly: The effects of

appearance and sex on evaluations of job applicants for managerial and nonmanagerial jobs. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23, 360-372.

Hess-Stauthamer, J. C. (1985). The first pregnancy: An integrating principle in female psychology. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.

Hughes, K. A., (1991, Feb. 6). Pregnant professionals face pressures at work as attitudes toward them shift. Wall Street Journal, pp. B1, B5.

Kimmel, M. S. (2000). The Gendered Society. New York: The Oxford University Press.

Kleck, R. E., & DeJong, W., (1981), Adults' estimates of sociometric status of handicapped and nonhandicapped children. Psychological Reports, 49, 951-954.

Klerman, J. A., & Leibowitz, A. (1994). The work-employment distinction among new mothers. Journal of Human Resources, 29, 277-303.

Klerman, J. A., & Leibowitz, A. (1999). Job continuity among new mothers'. Demography, 36 (2), 145-155.

Kossek, E. E. (1990). Diversity in child care assistance needs: Employee problems, preferences, and work-related outcomes. Personnel Psychology, 43, 769-791.

Langer, E. J., Fiske, S., Taylor, S. E., & Chanowitz, B. (1976). Stigma, staring, and discomfort: A novel-stimulus hypothesis. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 12, 451-463.

Leibenluft, E. (1984). Staff responses to the pregnancy of a therapist on an

- inpatient unit. Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 35, 1033-1036.
- Lyness, K. S., Thompson, C. A., Francesco, A. M., & Judiesch, M. K. (1999).
Work and pregnancy: Individual and organizational factors influencing
organizational commitment, timing of maternity leave, and return to work.
Sex Roles, 41 (7-8), 485-508.
- Manese, W.R, (2000). Fair and effective employment testing: Administrative,
psychometric and legal issues for the human resources professional. New
York: Quorum Books.
- Mannix, L. M., (2001). Customer service bias against obese individuals: A field
investigation of retail service. Unpublished master's thesis, Rice
University, Houston.
- Mills, J., Belgrave, F. Z., & Boyer, K. M. (1984). Reducing avoidance of social
interaction with a physically disabled person by mentioning the disability
following a request for aid. Journal of Applied Psychology, 14, 1-11.
- Mott, F. L., & Shapiro, D. (1983). Complementarity of work and fertility among
young American mothers. Population Studies, 37, 239-252.
- Neal, M. B., Chapman, N. J., Ingersoll-Dayton, B., & Emlen, A. C., (1993)
Balancing work and caregiving for children, adults, and elders (pp.59-89).
Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Northcott, H., (1983). Who stays home? Working parents and sick children.
International Journal of Women's Studies, 6 (5), 387-394.
- Pattison, H., & Gross, H., (1996). Pregnancy, work and women's well-being: a
review. Work & Stress, 10 (1), 72-87.

- Porter, N., & Geis, F. (1981). Women and nonverbal leadership cues: When seeing is not believing. In C. Mayo & N. Henley (Eds.), Gender and nonverbal behavior. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Riggio, R. E., & Throckmorton, B. (1988). The relative effects of verbal and nonverbal behavior, appearance, and social skills on evaluations made in hiring interviews. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 18, 331-348.
- Rosenstein, J., & Hitt, M. A. (1986). Experimental research on race and sex discrimination: The record and the prospects. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 7 (3), 215-226.
- Schultz, J. B., & Henderson, C. (1985). Family satisfaction and job performance: Implications for career development. Journal of Career Development
- Scott, K. D., & McClellan, E. L. (1990). Gender differences in absenteeism. Public Personnel Management, 19 (2), 229-253.
- Shapiro, D., & Mott, F. L. (1994). Women's employment behavior: Long-term employment and earnings of women in relation to employment behavior surrounding the first birth. Journal of Human Resources 29 (2), 248-275.
- Sheppard, D. L. (1992). Organizations, power and sexuality: The image and self-image of women managers. In J. Hearn, D. L. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff, & G. Burrell (Eds.), The Sexuality of Organization. (pp. 139-157). London: Sage Publications.
- Slonaker, W. M., & Wendt, A. C. (1991). Pregnancy discrimination: An empirical analysis of a continuing problem. Labor Law Journal, 42, 343-356.

- Smith, J. A., (1999). Identity development during the transition to motherhood: an interpretative phenomenological analysis. Journal of reproductive and infant psychology, 17 (3), 281-299.
- Swiss, D. J. & Walker, J. P. (1993). Women and the work/family dilemma: How today's professional women are finding solutions. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Talyor, S. E., & Langer, E. J. (1977). Pregnancy: A social stigma? Sex Roles, 3, 27-35.
- Thompson, C. A., & Francesco, A. M. (1996). Valuing diversity: The case of pregnant working women in the United States. Equal Opportunities International, 15 (4), 1-9.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (2000). Fertility of American women: 1998. In Current Population Reports (Series P20, No. 526). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1997). Fertility, family planning, and women's health: New data from the 1995 National Survey of Family Growth. In Vital and Health Statistics (Series 23, No.19). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- VandenHeuvel, A., & Wooden, M. (1995). Do explanations of absenteeism differ for men and women? Human Relations, 48 (11), 1309-1329.
- Walton, M.D., Sachs, D., Ellington, R., Hazlewood, A., Griffin, S., & Bass, D. (1988). Physical stigma and the pregnancy role: Receiving help from strangers. Sex Roles, 18 (5-6), 323- 311.

Wegner, D. M. (1994). Ironic processes of mental control. Psychological Review, 10, 34-52.

Wolkind, S. & Zaijicek, E. (Eds.). (1981). Pregnancy: A psychological and social study. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Zbrowitz, L. A., Tenenbaum, D. R., & Goldstein, L. H. (1991). The impact of job applicants' facial maturity, gender, and academic achievement on hiring recommendations. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21, 525-548.

Appendix A: Script

The confederate is looking for a part-time job working about 20 hours a week. In the pregnant conditions she is 7 1/2 months pregnant.

Non-Pregnant and Pregnant Control Conditions

C: Hello, may I please speak to the manager or someone in charge of hiring?

When manager arrives or it is indicated that the manager is not available:

C: Hello, I am looking for a part-time job. Are there any jobs available?

(If no - Can I fill out an application and leave it on file?)

Can I fill out an application?

What would I be doing if I got a job here?

Do you think you will hire me?

Previous Experience Condition

C: Hello, may I please speak to the manager or someone in charge of hiring?

When the manager arrives:

C: Hello, I am looking for a part time job. As you can see I am pregnant, but I had success with my last pregnancy in also combining work and pregnancy.

Are there any jobs available?

(If no - Can I fill out an application and leave it on file?)

Can I fill out an application?

What would I be doing if I got a job here?

Do you think you will hire me?

Childcare Condition

C: Hello, may I please speak to the manager or someone in charge of hiring?

When the manager arrives:

C: Hello I am looking for a part time job. As you can see I am pregnant, but I have lined up reliable and flexible childcare.

Are there any jobs available?

(If no-can I fill out an application and leave it on file?)

Can I fill out an application?

What would I be doing if I got a job here?

Do you think you will hire me?

Appendix B: Person Perception Questionnaire

The purpose of this study is to examine how people form opinions of strangers. Please look at the attached photograph and answer the following questions. Try to answer all of the questions about this individual despite the limited information you have.

1.) How professional does this woman appear?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all						Very
Professional						Professional

2.) How attractive does this woman appear?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all						Very
Attractive						Attractive

3.) How educated does this woman appear?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all						Very
Educated						Educated

4.) How pregnant does this woman appear?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all						Very
Pregnant						Pregnant

5.) Please guess this woman's

Profession _____ Education Level _____

Salary _____ Month of Pregnancy _____

Age _____

Please give use any other reactions you have toward the woman in this picture:

Appendix C: Applicant Questionnaire

_____ Trial Number

1.) Did you get to speak to the manager? Y N
If not, with whom did you speak? _____

2.) Was the person you spoke to M or F?

3.) Did the person:

1	2	3
Indicate jobs were available	Indicate jobs were not available	Did not mention whether jobs were available or not

4.) Did you notice any "Help Wanted" signs posted in the store? Y N

5.) Did you fill out an application? Y N

6.) How far away from you did the person **stand**?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Far			Moderately Close			Very Close

7.) How **friendly** was the person?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all Friendly			Moderately Friendly			Very Friendly

8.) How much **eye contact** did the person make with you?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
None			Moderate			Very Much

9.) To what extent did the person try to **end the interaction** with you prematurely?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Much			Moderately			Not at all

10.) To what extent did the person behave **rudely** toward you?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Rude			Moderately			Not at all Rude

11.) To what extent did the person **smile** at you?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

12.) To what extent did the person **nod** during your conversation?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

13.) To what extent was the person **helpful**?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not Helpful			Moderately Helpful			Very Helpful

14.) To what extent was the person **over friendly** to you?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

15.) To what extent did the person's **mouth tighten** during your conversation?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

16.) To what extent did the person's **brow furrow** during your conversation?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

17.) How many **diminutive references** (i.e. sweetie, honey) did the person make toward you?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

18.) How much did the person **touch you** during the conversation?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Times						or more times

19.) How **interested** was the person in you as a potential candidate?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

20.) To what extent did the person **stare at your stomach**?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

21.) To what extent was the person **hostile** toward you?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

22.) How **nervous** was the person?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Much			Moderately			Not at all

24.) How **crowded** was the store?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not crowded			Moderately			Very Crowded

25.) How old did the person appear to be:

- a. college or younger
- b. 23-30
- c. 31-40
- d. 41-50
- e. over 50

26.) Was the person wearing a wedding ring?

yes no didn't notice

27.) Did the person mention having any children?

yes no

28.) Did the person mention having a spouse?

yes no

25.) Were you offered a job? Y N

Comments on the trial?

Appendix D: Observer Questionnaire

Trial Number						
1.) To what extent did the person smile at the applicant:						
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much
2.) To what extent did the person make eye contact with the applicant:						
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much
3.) How often did the person nod at the applicant:						
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much
4.) How helpful was the person to the applicant:						
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not helpful			Moderately			Very Helpful
5.) How friendly was the person to the applicant:						
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not Friendly			Moderately			Very Friendly
6.) How rude was the person to the applicant:						
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not Rude			Moderately			Very Rude
7.) To what extent did the person try to end the interaction prematurely with the applicant:						
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much
8.) How far did the person stand from the applicant:						
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Very far			Moderately			Very Close

9.) To what extent did the person's **mouth tighten** during the conversation with the applicant:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

10.) To what extent did the person's **brow furrow** during the conversation with the applicant:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

11.) How many **diminutive references** did the manager make to the applicant:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
None						or

12.) How many times did the person **touch** the applicant:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
None						or more

13.) How **nervous** was the person when talking to the applicant:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not nervous			Moderately			Very Nervous

14.) How **hostile** was the person to the applicant:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Hostile

15.) How **over friendly** was the person with the applicant:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

16.) How much did the person **stare** at the applicant's stomach:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

17.) To what extent did the applicant vary her behavior from previous trials?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

18.) Was the person wearing a wedding ring?

yes no didn't notice

19.) Any comments on this trial?

Appendix E: Coder Questionnaire

_____ Trial Number

Coder Name _____

1. To what extent does the manager make **diminutive references** (i.e. honey, dear, sweetie)?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

2. To what extent does the manager have a **positive affect**?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all Much			Moderately			Very

3. To what extent does the manager try to **end the conversation** prematurely?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Very Much			Moderately			Not at all

4. How **friendly** was the manager to the applicant?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all Friendly			Moderately Friendly			Very Friendly

5. How **hostile** was the manager to the applicant?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

6. How **helpful** was the manager?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

7. How **rude** was the manager?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

8. How **nervous** was the manager?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

9. How **overfriendly** was the manager?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

10. Do you think the manager will offer this person a job?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
No way			Maybe			Definitely

11. How **easy** was it to code this tape?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Easy			Medium			Hard

12. To what extent did the manager seem to **stigmatize** the individual?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

13. To what extent did the manager seem to treat the individual in **childlike** ways?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

14. To what extent did the manager treat the individual as **subservient** to him/her?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

15. How **interested** in the applicant was the manager?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all			Moderately			Very Much

16. Was information revealed about the pregnant or nonpregnant state of the applicant?

Yes No

17. Do you think that the applicant was pregnant?

Yes

No

Any comments on this trial?