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ABSTRACT

Targeting the Subtleties:
Strategies for Reducing Interpersonal Discrimination
by

Sarah Singletary

Recent research suggests that displays of discrimination have changed from expressions that were once very overt in nature to expressions that are more subtle and involve interpersonal behaviors (Hebl, Foster, Mannix, Dovidio, 2002). Unlike formal discrimination, there is little to no legislation that protects stigmatized individuals from interpersonal discrimination; hence, research on strategies for remediating interpersonal discrimination is becoming increasingly important. The current research examines three strategies (compensation, acknowledgment, and individuating information) that attempt to reduce the interpersonal discrimination that gay men and lesbians receive in a job applicant setting. Results show that employing a remediation strategy involving compensation or acknowledgment reduces the interpersonal discrimination that stigmatized individuals receive when applying for jobs.
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There is no doubt that over the past 40 years, the display of prejudice and discrimination against stigmatized groups has changed in American society. This is true in the case of women, gay men and lesbians, African-American individuals, and members of many other minority groups. For instance, only 4% of White-Americans viewed interracial marriages as acceptable in 1958 compared with 73% that now view it as acceptable (Astor, 1997). Similarly, 80% of White-Americans reported in 1958 that they would move away if an African-American moved into their neighborhoods, compared with only 18% who now say they would move away (Astor, 1997). Mirroring these improvements, only 21% of middle managers were women in 1970, while currently there are over 58% (International Labor Office [ILO], 2004). Furthermore, 50 years ago, virtually no gay men or lesbian women reported being “out” in the workplace, whereas approximately 23% of gay men and lesbian women are estimated to disclose their orientation in the workplace (Levine & Leonard, 1984).

Given these substantial numbers, can we assume that prejudice and discrimination are no longer problems? Although there appears to be reductions in these constructs, recent and mounting evidence suggests that they continue to be major issues in contemporary society. However, displays of prejudice and discrimination may be changing. That is, the overt prejudice and explicit discrimination once commonly displayed in the past, seems to have been overwhelmingly replaced by more subtle and covert displays (e.g., Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; McConohay, 1983; Snyder, Kleck, Strenta, Mentzer, 1974).
Whereas a great deal of research has examined the changing nature of prejudicial attitudes (for a review see Fiske, 1998), much less research has focused on the display of behaviors particularly within the contexts of dynamic ongoing social interactions (see Hebl & Dovidio, 2005). The purpose of the current research is to examine the ways in which discriminatory behaviors are manifested in a naturalistic setting. In addition, this research attempts to identify three potential strategies aimed at reducing such discriminatory behaviors and test the effectiveness of each strategy. I begin by discussing research pertaining to prejudice and discrimination. I will also review much of the research suggesting that the nature of such constructs is changing. Then, I discuss the repercussions of such constructs, particularly that of discrimination, which has only recently been the target of research. Then, I discuss the importance of strategies to reduce discrimination, and finally, introduce three potential strategies for remediating contemporary discrimination.

*The Changing Nature of Prejudice and Discrimination*

Prejudice refers to the negative attitudes directed toward individuals as a result of their membership in some social group (Schneider, 2004). Whereas, discrimination refers to the biased, and often, unprovoked and derogatory behaviors directed at outgroup members (Dovidio, Brigham, Johnson, Gaertner, 1996). In the past, displays of prejudice and discrimination have been very overt, and thus easily identifiable. For example, visible signs in windows read, “We cater to white trade only,” “Jews not welcome,” and sometimes employment ads indicated that “Blacks need not apply.” Additional evidence collected from the social distance scales, such as those mentioned previously, indicated people were readily willing to refuse to live in the same neighborhood or be friends with
individuals from outgroups. As a whole, individuals were relatively comfortable overtly expressing their disdain toward members of stigmatized groups.

Over the past few decades, the display of overt forms of prejudice and discrimination has decreased. A number of factors have led to this change. First, laws and ordinances have been enacted that prevent traditional manifestations of these constructs. For instance, during the 1960s, the civil rights movement led to the passage of laws that prohibited discrimination against many minority groups. In particular, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made it illegal to discriminate on the basis of race, sex, national origin, and religion. Although national laws have not been passed to protect members of all stigmatized groups (e.g., obese individuals, gay males and lesbians), state laws, city ordinances, and organizational policies have been initiated as a significant step toward this progress. While only one state (i.e., Michigan) has a law protecting people on the basis of weight, county and city mandates against such discrimination are being passed at increasing rates (e.g., San Lorenzo, CA; San Francisco, CA; Washington, D.C.). Similarly, thirteen states have passed laws prohibiting discrimination based upon sexual orientation in public and private employment sectors (NOLO, 2004). Additionally, a number of cities (e.g., Albany; Washington, D.C.; Houston) have passed mayoral ordinances prohibiting such discrimination. Thus, an increasing number of legal mandates may be responsible for regulating the reduced displays of overt forms of prejudice and discrimination.

Second, social desirability pressures may be altering the course by which prejudice and discrimination are exhibited. Social desirability occurs when individuals attempt to present themselves in favorable ways (Holtgraves, 2004). Current social norms
discourage the expression of overt biases, and thus lead people to adopt explicit attitudes and behaviors that are non-prejudicial and non-discriminatory. Individuals may conform to social norms primarily to avoid being seen as biased and thus are able to escape the negative outcomes associated with being labeled as racist or otherwise discriminatory (Crandall, Eshleman, O’Brien, 2002; Plant & Devine, 1998). Societal norms are changing and now suggest that many biased behaviors are simply unfair and no longer acceptable. People respond to these norms by responding in socially desirable ways, or else they suffer repercussions that range from social to monetary in nature. That is, it is now stigmatizing itself to be considered a racist, sexist, or person who otherwise discriminates. To avoid such problems, people may conform to the socially desirable norms of suppressing prejudice and discrimination.

Third, while some research suggests that the display of traditional prejudice and discrimination has decreased due to external factors, other research suggests that such changes reflect authentic attitude change. That is, there is mounting evidence that suggests more people today genuinely believe in the principles of equality (Plant & Devine, 1998). Such individuals do not perpetuate the existence of negative stereotypes, attitudes, and behaviors directed toward outgroups or stigmatized others. Thus, fewer reports of discrimination are, to some extent, potentially due to the fact that people truly have begun to change their behaviors to be in line with their more egalitarian beliefs.

In sum, legislation, pressures to be politically correct, social norms, and increases in egalitarian beliefs, all seem to contribute to a decline in the display of overtly negative attitudes and behaviors (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; McConahay, 1983; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995). The lack of overt indicators of prejudice and discrimination
should not imply that stigmatized individuals are no longer the recipients of any negative attitudes or differential treatment. Unfortunately, research indicates that stigmatized individuals now encounter more subtle, covert forms of prejudice and discrimination (Beal, O’Neal, Ong, & Rusher, 2000; Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh, & Vaslow, 2000; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay, 1983). The majority of research identifying such a transition in the display of biases has focused on attitudinal and prejudice research. Much less has focused on behavioral or discrimination research. While I will review both of these literatures in some detail, I will focus on biased behaviors and attempt to remediate their more covert displays.

Prejudice. Prejudice is one of the most heavily researched social psychological constructs of the last century (see Fiske, 1998 for review). Early research on prejudice consisted mainly of self-report surveys in which individuals disclosed their opinions about minority group members. The sum of the studies show that participants openly reported their disdain and feelings of antipathy about stigmatized individuals; however, research conducted both during and after the 1970s has continuously revealed a decline in overtness (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1981; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000) but a steady amount of more covert forms of prejudice. These more covert forms include symbolic, aversive, and modern racism (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay, 1986) and sexism (Swim, Aiken, Hall, & Hunter, 1995). Measures of modern racism (i.e., Modern Racism Scale, Symbolic Racism Scale 2000) have been developed to specifically assess contemporary and covert racial attitudes by posing questions about governmental policies that impacted stigmatized groups (e.g., affirmative action, busing). On this scale,
participants might justifiably respond negatively on a single item, but consistently responding negatively suggests underlying prejudice.

Similarly, aversive racism posits that individuals may genuinely possess egalitarian beliefs but simultaneously have subconsciously internalized prejudicial beliefs about minorities (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Rawles & Garzon, 2004; Swim et al., 1995). Thus, there is a mismatch between a person's explicit and implicit attitudes towards prejudice and this discrepancy leads to feelings of ambiguity toward stigmatized individuals. Previous research on modern and aversive racism has found that individuals will not react with prejudice when social norms clearly dictate how an individual should respond, but will influence reactions with prejudice when norms for appropriate responses do not exist or when alternative justifications can be utilized to explain behavior (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Hodson, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2002).

In addition to explicit self-report measures, prejudice researchers have developed other tools for assessing prejudicial attitudes implicitly (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). For instance, the implicit associations test (IAT) is one of the most popular measures of implicit prejudice (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995) and it assesses implicit or unconscious attitudes by examining response latencies to paired associations. A number of studies involving the IAT, and/or other implicit measures of prejudice have provided evidence for the continued existence of prejudice in implicit attitudes (McConnell & Leibold, 2001; Son Hing, Li, & Zanna, 2001). In sum, research suggests that traditional attitudes have been replaced by reduced expressions of overtly negative attitudes, but that prejudice—as measured more implicitly—continues to be prevalent in American society.
Discrimination. As with prejudice, the manifestations of discrimination also have changed. In the past, stigmatized individuals reported very overt discrimination across a variety of contexts (i.e., employment, voting rights, access to transportation and education). For example, Shoney's, a major American restaurant company, was sued for differentially selecting African-American employees for specific positions (Brief et al., 2000). Similarly, Price Waterhouse Cooper received scrutiny after refusing to promote a well-deserving employee solely on the basis of her gender (EEOC, 2004). Instances of overt discrimination such as these have drastically decreased over the previous forty years (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000), but the total eradication of biases has not. Mirroring that of prejudice, instances of discrimination have become more subtle.

While there is consensus that discrimination has changed, few studies have focused on measuring this change (cf., Dovidio & Gaertner, 1981; Snyder, Kleck, Strenta, Mentzer, 1974; Word, Zanna, Cooper, 1976). Of those that have, one involves a classic study examining the stigma of disability. Snyder and colleagues (1974) found that individuals preferred avoiding an interaction with a disabled individual, but only when the attribution to discrimination could not be detected. That is, when participants are given alternatives -- in this case viewing a movie with a stigmatized individual, or viewing a dissimilar movie -- participants will differentially select to view the movie that a stigmatized individual has not chosen to watch. Thus, rather than being perceived as prejudiced, the participant can argue that the decision was a result of personal movie preferences.

A recent body of research distinguishes between two primary forms of discrimination-- formal and interpersonal (Hebl, Foster, Mannix, Dovidio, 2002; Hebl,
Kazama, Singletary, & Glick, 2004; King, Shapiro, Hebl, Singletary, & Turner, in press). Formal Discrimination refers to behaviors that are prevented by law or organizational policy. For instance, such discrimination involves differentially hiring, promoting, selecting, firing, or terminating. Following, organizations cannot pay or otherwise reward differentially—as all of these behaviors are legally mandated.

Indeed, there is evidence that overt discrimination has in fact decreased (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000). However, Hebl and colleagues (2002) propose that prejudice is now being manifested through interpersonal behaviors (i.e., whether or not they are rude, prematurely terminate interactions, give dirty looks to others). Interpersonal discrimination refers to discrimination that is not illegal and may consist of verbal, nonverbal, and paraverbal behaviors displayed within an interaction (Hebl et al., 2002). Such behaviors are not mandated and may be more interpersonal in nature. Prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behaviors now emerge subtly in an ongoing social interaction. Thus, biases that people possess may influence the way in which a prejudiced person interacts with stigmatized individuals. Instances of such discrimination might involve decreases in friendliness, eye contact, smiling, and interaction length, as well as increases in hostility, rudeness, and negative looks (Hebl et al., 2002).

A series of recent studies (Hebl et al., 2002; Hebl et al, 2004; King et al., in press) found little evidence of formal discrimination but a great deal of evidence for interpersonal discrimination. Specifically, confederates posing as either gay, pregnant, or obese did not experience formal biases (i.e., they were allowed to complete job applications, they were greeted, they were offered assistance, they were called back for job interviews or received job offers) but they consistently experienced differences in the
interpersonal treatment they received from store personnel when compared to control
confederates. So, for instance, employers engaged in interactions in which they
terminated interactions sooner, showed decreased eye contact, and increased hostility in
interactions with pregnant versus nonpregnant job applicants (Hebl et al., 2004).
Moreover, customer service personnel engaged in interactions in which they also
terminated interactions sooner, displayed decreased amounts of eye contact, and were
less helpful to obese customers compared to normal weight counterparts. In sum, these
studies provide evidence for the decline of overt forms of discrimination but a steady
demonstration of more subtle, interpersonal discrimination.

Repercussions of the Changing Nature of Prejudice and Discrimination. While
the decrease in overt forms of discrimination is promising, the display of more covert
forms of discrimination is disturbing. That is, a growing body of research has shown that
more subtle and interpersonal discrimination also has deleterious outcomes for its
victims. Research by Martel, Lane, and Willis (1996) show that seemingly small and
subtle behavioral differences may have enormous impact when compounded over time.
Thus, small interpersonal differences or what seem like “molehills” of discrimination can
become “mountains” of disparity over time and experiences (see Valian, 2000). Although
organizations may avoid being penalized for acts involving interpersonal discrimination,
greater impacts may occur as individuals experience the compounding of biased
treatment. Some research has examined the impacts; however, one important study that
demonstrated the detrimental effects that interpersonal discrimination can have on
individuals (in this case, job applicants) is a seminal study by Word, Zanna, and Cooper
(1974). This study found evidence for the negative outcomes that occur as a result of
receiving nonverbal discrimination. Specifically, the authors trained “confederate interviewers” to mimic the nonverbal behavior that interviewers displayed (as identified in an earlier study) when interacting with a stigmatized individual (in this case, African-American). In half of the conditions, confederate interviewers either mimicked the negative nonverbal with European-Americans or responded normally. When European-American interviewees received nonverbal behaviors that were identical to that displayed towards stigmatized individuals, the interviewees mirrored the nonverbal behaviors they received and as a consequence were rated more negatively. Thus, receiving differential treatment may result in a vicious cycle in which stigmatized individuals reciprocate negative non-verbal behaviors which can in turn become the basis for assertions about deficits in performance, competency, and personality (Snyder & Haugen, 1995). Given such potentially critical consequences, it is necessary to consider strategies by which interpersonal discrimination may be reduced or avoided, which is the focus of this thesis.

Remediating Interpersonal Discrimination

Because there is no legislation that governs interpersonal discrimination, both organizations and stigmatized individuals themselves may need to find ways to reduce the prevalence of negative interactions. However, research that has sought to investigate methods by which to remediate discriminatory behaviors is scarce. One exception by King and colleagues (in press) examined strategies to combat the differential treatment that obese individuals experience in a customer service context by utilizing Crandall and Eshleman’s (2003) Justification-Suppression Model of Prejudice. Specifically, when obese customers presented themselves as “working to control their appearance” (i.e., dieting and exercising), obese shoppers reported experiencing similar interpersonal
treatment to that of non-obese confederates. However, when obese customers presented themselves as “not working to control one’s appearance,” they provided others with a justification for expressing prejudice, and salespersons responded negatively. That is, sales personnel were more openly hostile, less friendly, and had shorter interactions with obese customers than with normal weight customers. Most interesting is that this difference disappeared when obese individuals engaged in behaviors that removed the justification for prejudice. This study is important in that it shows that stigmatized individuals, in this case obese individuals, can actively engage in behaviors that strategically reduce the discrimination targeted at them.

It is important to examine other potential strategies that might remediate interpersonal discrimination. Lalonde and Cameron (1994) posit that, “actions taken by the victims of discrimination are most likely to bring about change in the status for the stigmatized groups to which they belong” (p. 257). In the current research, I test three different strategies that stigmatized individuals might adopt in an effort to reduce interpersonal discrimination. These strategies include acknowledgment, individuating information, and compensation. I will next discuss each of these strategies in greater detail.

**Strategies for Remediation**

**Acknowledgment.** There is evidence that some non-stigmatized individuals may simply be uncomfortable interacting with a stigmatized other (Hebl, Tickle, & Heatherton, 2000). One possible strategy for combating interpersonal discrimination may be acknowledgment, which refers to openly addressing one’s sigma. For instance, one might say, “As you can see, I’m physically disabled.” Previous research has shown that
acknowledging one's stigma during a conversation can result in improved interaction outcomes (Hebl & Kleck, 2000; Hebl & Skorinko, 2004). For instance, in one of the earliest known studies on acknowledgment, Davis (1961) found that when an individual made explicit statements about his or her physical disability, others were less likely to view the disabled individual with disdain, pity, and contempt.

More recent research has examined acknowledgments with respect to the stigmas of disability and obesity and found that a number of factors increase the likelihood of this strategy being successful (Hebl & Kleck, 2002; Hebl & Skorinko, 2004). For instance, Hebl and Kleck (2002) found that those who were able to acknowledge the uncontrollability aspect of their stigmas were perceived and treated more favorably than those who acknowledged the controllability aspect. Similarly, additional research suggests that acknowledgments are most successful when some time -- although not too much -- passes in the interaction (Hebl & Skorinko, 2004; King, Reilly, Hebl, & Griffith, 2006). Research by Hebl and Kleck (2002) revealed that acknowledgments were fully mediated by attributions that perceivers made to stigmatized targets being well-adjusted and happy. Thus, it seems that acknowledgments are effective strategies to the extent that they lead perceivers to view targets as not creating their problems but also not being restrained emotionally by them. So, too, it is possible that acknowledgments ease interactions because they address, and do not ignore, underlying tension and discomfort in an interaction (see Hebl, Tickle, & Heatherton, 2000). However it is unclear exactly how this strategy influences more subtle types of discrimination and this study will address this.
Individuating Information. A second strategy for potentially reducing interpersonal discrimination involves providing perceivers with individuating information. That is, biased beliefs about stigmatized groups may perpetuate the belief that differential treatment is justified. In order to combat this possible occurrence, individuals might avert negative outcomes by presenting individuating information (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Kaiser & Miller, 2001; Kunda & Sherman-Williams, 1993). Giving individuating information has been defined as divulging information that enables others to create impressions that are inconsistent with the negative stereotypes about a particular group (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). For instance, a woman seeking a management position might mention the leadership experience that she obtained on a previous job. There is evidence that utilizing individuating information can reduce stereotyping, particularly when perceivers have the cognitive resources and motivation necessary to specifically attend to targets (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; see also Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999 for a review). Using a strategy that involves individuating information allows one to be seen as a unique person, rather than solely a member of a specific category (i.e., a woman, a Black person). Individuating information consists of divulging information that is directly relates to the individual who is engaging in the strategy. That is, it is not ambiguous, instead the information reveals something about the individual making the verbalizations (i.e., characteristics, accomplishments, goals, activities).

Previous research (see Fiske et al., 1999) has found that individuating information is an effective means for reducing reliance upon stereotypes; however, no research has examined whether or not individuating information can be an effective mechanism for reducing interpersonal discrimination. Thus, the current research attempts to examine the
extent to which disclosing individuating information might reduce contemporary forms of discrimination.

Compensation. A third strategy that may be effective in reducing interpersonal discrimination is compensation. Compensation has been defined as a form of action that attempts to make amends for a deficiency in one’s personal characteristics or status (Backman & Dixon, 1992). More recently, Miller and Myers (1998) characterized compensation as attempts that stigmatized individuals make to avert the negative impacts of prejudice. There are two forms of compensatory strategies. First, primary compensation consists of direct attempts to circumvent the negative outcomes of prejudice and discrimination from being displayed. For example, research examining heavyweight women found that when heavyweight women are instructed to have a good social interaction and believe that they can be seen, they behave in ways that enable others to rate them as being more socially adept than when they did not know they are visible (Miller, Rothblum, Felicio, & Bland, 1995). Thus, heavyweight women thwarted the negative effects of prejudice by enacting a more likeable role. Primary compensatory behaviors seem to work because they arrest perceivers’ initially negative expectations and facilitate liking which may in turn lead to more positive interactions. Second, secondary compensatory strategies are employed when prejudice and/or discrimination cannot be averted. Secondary compensatory techniques consist of self-protective factors such as changing desired goals. For instance, after a heavyweight individual has a poor interaction with a potential employer, he or she might re-evaluate the importance of that interview. That is, rather than lose self-esteem as a result of engaging in a negative
interaction, the stigmatized individual might decide that the job is not really ideal. The current research focuses on examining primary compensation strategies.

Compensatory techniques may be particularly useful for stigmatized individuals with visible stigmas because they realize that others react negatively to them and compensatory behaviors may block others' negative reactions and result in smoother interactions, being viewed more favorably, as well as being liked and accepted (Eagly, Makhijani, Klonsky, 1992; Miller & Myers, 1998). A few studies have shown empirical support for the effectiveness of the compensation strategy (Dion & Stein, 1978; Miller, Rothblum, Felicio, & Bland, 1995). For example, research has revealed that unattractive boys compensate for their lack of looks and may use more forceful behaviors than attractive boys in an attempt to gain desired outcomes, in this case persuading other individuals to eat bad tasting food (Dion & Stein, 1978). Although Miller and her colleagues have demonstrated some ability for compensation to alter interpersonal behaviors, this strategy has not been used to examine the possible reduction of interpersonal discrimination with other stigmas. The current research attempts to answer this question by examining the extent to which compensation is an effective mechanism for reducing interpersonal discrimination.

The Current Research

The current research examines the extent to which the three aforementioned strategies potentially reduce interpersonal discrimination. Furthermore, this study examines how these strategies influence the stigma of homosexuality. Unfortunately, gay men and lesbians are not protected by many laws and there is little research, as a whole, conducted on this very stigmatized group of individuals.
There is a particular lack of empirical research that examines the work experiences of gay men and lesbians. This is surprising given that there are estimates that gay men and lesbian women make up approximately 4-17% of the workforce (Gonseorik & Weinrich, 1991). As the numbers of gay men and lesbians in the workforce increase, so too does the need for organizations to develop an inclusive culture that is both accepting and supportive of gay and lesbian incumbents (Ragins & Cotton, 2001). In fact, many organizations are beginning to do so by implementing gay male and lesbian friendly policies. For instance, the Human Rights Campaign reported that 72% of Fortune 500 companies include sexual orientation in anti-discrimination policies (Human Rights Campaign [HRC], 2004). Although these initial strides attempt to ensure employment equity for gay men and lesbians, discrimination still exists. A recent study conducted by the HRC foundation (2000), found that 68% of gay men and 58% of lesbian women reported that they either witnessed or were the victims of anti-homosexual discrimination that occurred as hiring biases, poor evaluations, decreases in pay and promotability, or an uncomfortable work environments. Much of this discrimination, not surprisingly was interpersonal in nature and so it is particularly difficult to combat and a particularly relevant target for the current research.

In one study examining manifestations of discrimination in the workplace, Hebl et al. (2002) examined the display of formal and interpersonal discrimination that employers displayed toward applicants depicted as either gay or assumed heterosexual. Specifically, confederates portrayed as gay did not experience any incidences of formal discrimination (i.e., they were allowed to complete a job application, they were hired at the same rate as their counterparts); however, confederate applicants did report differences in the
interpersonal treatment they received (i.e., decreased interaction time, greater interpersonal distance, increased amounts of hostile behavior). These perceptions were also validated by independent raters who listened to audiotapes of the interactions and who were naïve as to which conditions participants were in. Thus, the experience of interpersonal discrimination was not simply the perception of the stigmatized targets. This study provides initial evidence for the strong display of interpersonal discrimination directed at gay and lesbian employees.

The current research attempts to further examine the interpersonal treatment that gay men and lesbians receive when applying for jobs. In an extension of previous research by Hebl et al., (2002), I will identify the extent to which gay men and lesbians can adopt strategies that successfully combat the interpersonal discrimination that they receive. Specifically, using a methodology identical to that utilized by Hebl et al., (2002), I expect to replicate these earlier findings while simultaneously extending this research by examining three potential strategies (i.e., acknowledgment, compensation, and individuating information) for reducing interpersonal discrimination. I specifically anticipate that:

_Hypothesis 1:_ Confederates portrayed as gay will not experience formal discrimination.

_Hypothesis 2:_ Confederates portrayed as gay will receive greater amounts of interpersonal discrimination than will their heterosexual counterparts.

_Hypothesis 3:_ Confederates portrayed as gay will report fewer instances of interpersonal discrimination when they acknowledge their stigma than when they do not.
Hypothesis 4: Confederates portrayed as gay will report fewer instances of interpersonal discrimination when they divulge individuating information than when they do not.

Hypothesis 5: Confederates portrayed as gay will report fewer instances of interpersonal discrimination when they use compensatory techniques than when they do not.

Methods

Confederates and Coders

In the current study, we employed “applicant” confederates, “observer” confederates, and independent coders. Specifically, eight undergraduate research assistants (five female and three male) served as job applicant confederates. Six additional undergraduate research assistants (four female and two male) served as observer confederates in the current research. And finally, two undergraduate researchers (all female), who were unaware of the nature of the study served as independent coders who listened to audio taped recordings of the interactions. All confederates and coders remained blind to the hypotheses of the study until its conclusion.

Participating Stores

The study was conducted in 131 stores located in five shopping malls of a major metropolitan area. Because the confederate’s role was to interact with a prospective employer in an attempt to gain employment, only stores that were actively hiring were included in the current study. Thus, a research assistant called a total of 200 stores in the three weeks preceding the study and ensured that all participating stores were hiring. Of
the 200 stores contacted, 156 were hiring. Of the 156 stores that were hiring, we visited 131 of them.

Materials

In order to standardize physical appearance, confederates wore jeans and a matching pullover jacket. In the pocket of the jacket, participants carried mini-cassette recorders that they used to audiotape the conversations, which could later be rated by the independent coders.

Because the nature of this study involves some deception (e.g., audio taped conversations, potential inaccurate portrayal of sexuality), we took great care in considering the ethics of this study and in ensuring participants' safety. To do this, we engaged in several behaviors. First, we contacted university lawyers and members of the institutional review board for feedback regarding proper procedure. Second, we maintained the anonymity of stores by referring to them as numbers in all our coding materials. Third, we had every confederate undergo a series of training sessions. During training, participants in the study were told that they would be participating in a study that assessed current employment practices and that they would be asked to wear a hat that might potentially portray them as being stigmatized or nonstigmatized. Specifically, confederates were told that the hat might contain one of several phrases including, "Texan and Proud" or "Gay and Proud." After being informed about the possibility of being stigmatized one of the confederates asked to be excluded, those who chose to remain in the study read and signed consent forms.

Training. Over the course of two training sessions, confederates spent a considerable amount of time memorizing and practicing a script with the experimenter.
During this time the experimenter and applicant confederates used role plays to rehearse the script. This was done to make sure that confederates were comfortable enacting the role, as well as to familiarize confederates with a range of potential reactions they might receive from store personnel. During training, confederate applicants also received instructions on how to hold the hats so that prior to entering stores they could not see the specific wording contained on each hat and hence, remained blind to the condition in which they participated.

Training for observers focused on standardizing their interactions. Also, special attention was given to the goal of entering the store and brushing off requests for assistance, as well as attempting to avoid looking suspicious. Additionally, observers were informed that they would need to wear a watch to note the total interaction time. Observers were also told to maintain confidentiality regarding the trials and store identities in which they participated. In addition, observers were instructed not to reveal the wording of the hats to the applicant confederates at any time.

Independent raters participated in a single training session with the experimenter. The raters listened to five audio taped interactions and rated the recordings on a number of dimensions (to be discussed in detail below). During the five trials, the experimenter answered any questions that arose, and made sure that independent raters understood each dimension.

Procedure

Each of the applicant and observer pairs was assigned to enter 16 stores. The experimenter assigned a stigmatized hat in half of the trials and a nonstigmatized hat in the other half, though the particular order was randomly assigned and the applicants were
not told what hats or how many they would be wearing. At the start of each trial, the experimenter directed observers to a target store, gave applicants the appropriate hat, ensured that the applicant knew which strategy to enact, and finally directed the applicant to the appropriate store. After receiving the proper hat, store, and condition assignment, the applicants walked in the direction of the assigned location, put on the hat prior to entering the store, and began taping their interaction on the mini-cassette recorder immediately prior to entering each store.

The confederate “applicants” enacted a script based on that used in the Hebl et al. (2002) study. Essentially, the applicant entered a store and asked to speak with the manager or someone with hiring capabilities and then began to ask a rehearsed set of questions.

*Manipulations*

1) *Stigma.* The confederate’s stigma was manipulated mirroring the methodology described by Hebl and colleagues (2002), in which confederates wore a non-stigmatized hat containing the words “Texan and Proud” or a stigmatized hat containing the words “Gay and Proud.”

2) *Remediation Strategy.* Confederates participated in a control and three different remediation conditions, each of which is described in detail. As a between subjects manipulation, each confederate entered four stores enacting any single given strategy.

Based upon previous research we developed three statements that were presumed to be indicative of each remediation strategy. We pretested the statements with 25 undergraduate students (see Appendix A for pretest). The pretest consisted of questions assessing the extent to which the statements represented each of the strategies. In
addition, the statements were rated on other dimensions including the extent to which the statements were: 1) perceived positively 2) how comfortable individuals would be interacting with a person who made such a statement and 3) how awkward it would be to interact with an individual who made such a statement 4) how awkward the statement wording of the strategy was. For each statement, students were asked to respond on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = “Not at all”; 7 = “Very much”). Statements that were rated as most representative of the particular strategy, not representative of other strategies, rated high on positivity and comfort, and low on awkwardness were selected for inclusion in the study (see Appendix A for pretest and Appendix B for the complete script). We describe the specific items we chose next.

A) Acknowledgment Condition. In the acknowledgment condition, the applicants followed a standardized script but also included the following statement, “I don’t usually wear relaxed hats like this, but this is a good reflection of who I am when I’m not working.” This statement was developed based upon previous research by Hebl and Kleck (2002) and was rated as being most reflective of acknowledgment ($M = 5.56$, $SD = 1.54$; See Table 1 for means and standard deviations).

B) Individuating Information Condition. In the individuating information condition, applicants followed the standardized script but all divulged two additional pieces of information. First, confederates stated, “I’m a student at Rice University.” Second, the confederates mentioned a prior family-related commitment that prohibited the confederate from working certain hours by stating, “I’m sorry but I can’t work on Wednesday mornings because I take my grandmother to dialyses.” These statements were developed based upon Fiske and Neuberg’s (1990) Continuum Model of Impression
Formation. We developed a number of statements that students rated in pre-tests. However, the particular statements we chose were rated as being most indicative of individuating information reflective of individuating information ($M = 5.21, SD = 1.79$).

C) Compensation Condition. In the compensation condition, applicants were instructed to make several statements, including, “That sounds like something right up my alley!” and “I’m excited about the possibility of working here.” In addition, applicants were instructed to make modifications to their non-verbal behavior as well. Based upon previous research (Miller et al., 1995; Miller & Myers, 1998), we decided to manipulate both verbal and non-verbal behaviors to maximally enable confederates as potentially being viewed as more likeable, positive, and socially adept. More specifically, confederates were asked to maintain greater amounts of eye contact, nodding, and smiling than they did in the other conditions, and were told to keep these expressions consistent regardless of others’ reactions. During training, confederate applicants were instructed to enact the script in an upbeat manner, smile throughout the entire interaction, as well as maintain eye contact with store personnel when enacting the script and when store personnel answered questions. Also, confederates were told that they should appear to be both interested and excited about potential employment. In sum, confederates were instructed to compensate by looking directly at store personnel, smile throughout the entire conversation, and appear to be genuinely excited about potential employment. This behavior, coupled with the statements, was rated as being most reflective of compensation ($M = 4.36, SD = 1.94$).
D) Control Condition. In this condition applicants were instructed to simply follow the revised script (Hebl et al., 2002). That is, applicants entered each store and asked three standard questions.

Measures

Formal discrimination.

Formal discrimination was measured with three dichotomous “yes” and “no” items that included whether applicants were: a) told a job was available, b) allowed to complete a job application and c) called back for an interview.

Interpersonal discrimination.

Interpersonal discrimination was measured from the perspective of the applicants (perceived negativity), observer (observed negativity) and independent raters (coded negativity). I will describe each of these measures in detail.

Perceived Negativity. To assess interpersonal discrimination, confederate “applicants” rated 13 dimensions of the interaction which are in line with the methodology set forth by Hebl and colleagues (2002). More specifically, applicants used seven-point Likert-type (1 = “not at all”; 7 = “very much”) scales to assess the extent to which sales personnel exhibited the following behaviors: a) smiling b) friendliness c) enthusiasm d) eagerness to end the interaction e) rudeness f) staring at the applicant’s hat g) standoffishness h) comfort i) making eye contact j) awkward k) nodding l) nervous and m) hostility. A principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation revealed a single factor (Eigenvalue = 7.59; factor loadings ranging from .50 to .91) accounting for 58.34% of the variance (see Appendix C for questionnaire). Hence we created a Perceived Negativity composite, alpha = .94.
*Observed Negativity.* To further assess interpersonal discrimination, confederate observers completed surveys rating the extent to which they observed bias in the interactions. Specifically, observers rated the behavior of the store personnel on seven dimensions on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = “not at all”; 7 = “very much”) consisting of: a) hostility b) rudeness c) eye contact d) eagerness to the end the interaction prematurely e) friendliness f) nodding and g) attention to the confederate. A principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation resulted in a single factor (Eigenvalue = 3.72; factor loadings ranging from .66 to .87) accounting for 53.11% of the variance (see Appendix D for questionnaire). Hence we created an Observed Negativity composite, alpha = .84.

*Interaction Length.* Observers used a watch to determine the total time in which the confederate applicant conversed with store personnel.

*Coded Negativity.* Independent coders assessed interpersonal discrimination by listening to the recorded conversations. Interpersonal discrimination was measured with five items using a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = “not at all”; 7 “very much”) which assessed the extent to which personnel displayed: a) friendliness b) eagerness to end the conversation prematurely d) hostility e) rudeness and f) overall negativity in the interaction. When analyzing coded negativity, a total of 32 stores were eliminated due to incomplete data from audiotapes. In 9 of these cases, confederates forgot to record the interaction, and in 23 of these cases, the tape recorder simply malfunctioned or the interaction was inaudible. As a result only 99 of the 131 interactions were available for coding. A principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation revealed a single factor (Eigenvalue = 3.06; factor loadings ranging from .74 to .87) accounting for 61.10%
of the variance (see Appendix E for questionnaire). Hence we created a Coded Negativity composite, alpha = .83. Interrater agreement indicated significant levels of agreement amongst the independent raters, \( r_{wg} = .85 \).

**Consistency**

**Ratings of consistency.** Observers provided ratings of the extent to which the confederate applicant behaved in a consistent manner using a single item on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = “Not at all”; 7 = “Very Much; see Appendix D).

**Results**

Because it was essential that confederate “applicants” behaved consistently while in each condition, preliminary analyses were conducted to determine the extent to which confederate job applicants behaved consistently across conditions. Ratings of consistency were provided by observers and yielded the following results, \( F(4,118) = .35, p = .85 \). These results indicate that there were no differences in consistency across conditions. In sum, confederate applicants were rated as behaving consistently in each trial of a given strategy. For example, when enacting a script involving acknowledgment, confederates were rated as behaving consistently across each of the trials in the acknowledgment condition. Also, correlations among the various perspectives (applicant, observer, and independent coder) were calculated (see Table 1). These correlations indicate that there is a considerable amount of overlap amongst the perspectives.

**Analysis of Formal Discrimination**

To test Hypothesis 1, which proposed that the stigma of homosexuality does not lead to differences in formal discrimination, I conducted a MANOVA on the measures of formal discrimination and obtained nonsignificant results, \( F(12, 339) = .89, p = .56, \)
\( \eta^2 = .03 \). An examination of the ANOVAs did not reveal any significant differences between nonstigmatized and stigmatized applicants with respect to job availability, \( F(4, 113) = .36, p = .84 \), permission to complete a job application, \( F(4, 113) = 1.17, p = .36 \), or job callback, \( F(4, 113) = .85, p = .50 \). We next conducted chi-square tests to gain further insight into the results. Specifically, we found that stigmatized individuals in the control condition were informed that jobs were available on 20 out of 25 occasions (80%); similarly, nonstigmatized individuals were also told that stores were hiring in 18 out of 24 interactions (75%), \( \chi^2(1) = .18, p = .68 \). When asked, stigmatized individuals were allowed to complete an application on 21 out of 23 occasions (91%), while nonstigmatized individuals were allowed to complete an application on 21 out of 22 occasions (95%), \( \chi^2(1) = .31, p = .56 \). Lastly, stigmatized individuals (4 out of 25 occasions; 16%) and nonstigmatized (5 out of 25 occasions; 20%) individuals were equally likely to receive call backs for job interviews. In sum, there were no differences in the formal discrimination displayed toward stigmatized versus nonstigmatized individuals \( \chi^2(1) = .14, p = .72 \). Each of these results supports Hypothesis 1 and directly replicates recent findings by Hebl et al. (2002).

We next examined the remediation strategies to determine whether utilizing a strategy had an impact upon formal measures of discrimination. In the control condition, stigmatized individuals were told that stores were hiring on 20 out of 25 occasions (80%), allowed to complete an application on 21 out of 23 occasions (91%), and were called back for jobs on 4 out of 25 occasions (16%). When utilizing a strategy of acknowledgment, applicants were told that stores were hiring in 22 out of 25 occasions (88%), \( \chi^2(1) = .58, p = .45 \). Similarly, when utilizing a strategy of acknowledgment,
applicants were allowed to complete an application on 24 out of 26 occasions (92%),
\(X^2(1) = .02, p = .89\). In addition, when applicants utilized a strategy of acknowledgment
they were called back for jobs on 2 out of 26 occasions (8%), \(X^2(1) = .81, p = .37\). When
applicants gave additional information about themselves they were told that stores were
hiring in 20 out of 26 occasions (77%), \(X^2(1) = .07, p = .79\), allowed to complete an
application on 22 out of 26 occasions (85%), \(X^2(1) = .50, p = .48\), and called back for
interviews in 2 out of 26 interactions (8%), \(X^2(1) = 1.07, p = .30\). Lastly, when
applicants utilized a strategy of compensation, they were told that stores were hiring on
21 out of 26 occasions (81%), \(X^2(1) = .00, p = .99\), allowed to complete an application
on 26 out of 26 occasions (100%), \(X^2(1) = .01, p = .94\), and called back for interviews 5
out of 26 interactions (19%), \(X^2(1) = .09, p = .76\). Thus, were no differences in
likelihood of hire, ability to complete a job application, and job callbacks for stigmatized
individuals regardless of whether or not they utilized a remediation strategy.

*Analysis of Interpersonal Discrimination*

*Analysis of Perceived Negativity.* To partially test *Hypothesis 2,* which predicted
greater amounts of interpersonal discrimination in interactions with stigmatized than
those involving non-stigmatized individuals, we performed an ANOVA on Perceived
Negativity. A significant differedence emerged, \(F(4,119) = 2.58, p = .04, \eta^2 = .08\), and
follow-up analyses of the simple contrasts revealed that stigmatized applicants reported
greater amounts of interpersonal discrimination (\(M = 3.66\)) than did nonstigmatized job
applicants (\(M = 2.74; p < .01\)). To gain a better understanding of the individual items that
were driving the composite, post hoc multiple comparisons were examined. Specifically,
stigmatized applicants reported interactions that contained greater amounts of
standoffishness, awkwardness, rudeness, hostility, and a desire to end the interaction prematurely than did nonstigmatized applicants. In addition, when interacting with stigmatized individuals, store personnel were less friendly, enthusiastic, and comfortable than when interacting with nonstigmatized job applicants (see Table 3 for means and standard deviations). Thus, Hypothesis 2 was supported and fully replicated Hebl et al., (2002).

*Analysis of Observed Negativity.* To further substantiate the evidence provided by confederate applicants, we next tested Hypothesis 2 from the perspective of observers. Specifically, we conducted a MANOVA on Observed Negativity and Interaction Length, and a significant difference emerged, $F(8, 242) = 2.22, p = .03, \eta^2 = .07$. An ANOVA on Observed Negativity revealed a marginally significant effect of strategy $F(4,121) = 2.24, p = .07, \eta^2 = .07$, and follow-up analyses revealed greater amounts of Observed Negativity for stigmatized ($M = 3.10$) compared to non-stigmatized applicants ($M = 2.45; p = .03$). To again gain some insight into the individual items driving the composite result, I conducted post hoc t-tests on the individual items comprising the composite. These t-tests revealed that interactions involving stigmatized individuals consisted of decreases in nodding and friendliness, and increases in hostility and attempts to end the interaction prematurely compared to interactions involving nonstigmatized job applicants (see Table 4 for means and standard deviations of the individual items).

Though observers reported viewing interactions that contained greater amounts of negativity when the applicant was in the stigmatized condition, there was no evidence that in the control condition one's stigma led to differences in the amount of time store personnel spent talking to confederate applicants. Though the ANOVA on Interaction
Length was significant, $F(4, 121) = 3.05, p = .02, \eta^2 = .09$, an examination of the simple contrasts revealed, however, that although nonstigmatized individuals tended to have longer interactions ($M = 89.88$ seconds) than stigmatized confederates ($M = 67.66$ seconds; $p = .36$), the length of these interactions did not significantly differ from one another. Thus, ratings by observers provide partial support for Hypothesis 2, and partially replicate recent research by Hebl and colleagues (2002).

*Analysis of Coded Negativity.* Independent raters listened to audio taped conversations to further test Hypothesis 2. An ANOVA on Coded Negativity was significant, $F(4, 94) = 4.50, p < .01, \eta^2 = .16$, and follow up analyses of the simple contrasts reveal that coders perceived greater amounts of interpersonal discrimination in interactions involving stigmatized ($M = 3.18$) compared to nonstigmatized ($M = 2.16, p < .001$) applicants. Consistent with our previous analyses, we examined the individual items driving the composite and found that independent raters reported that stigmatized individuals engaged in interactions characterized by attempts to end the interaction prematurely, hostility, rudeness, and less friendliness than nonstigmatized applicants (see Table 5 for means and standard deviations). This finding also supports Hypothesis 2 and fully replicates Hebl et al., (2002).

*Remediating Interpersonal Discrimination*

*Perceived Discrimination (by Applicants).* To test the extent to which remediation strategies were effective in reducing interpersonal discrimination, we conducted an ANOVA on the dependent variable of Perceived Negativity. The overall ANOVA was significant $F(4,119) = 2.58, p = .04, \eta^2 = .08$. To test Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5, we conducted simple contrasts on the ANOVA (See Table 2 for means and standard
deviations). Multiple comparisons revealed that both acknowledgment ($M = 2.88, p = .02$) and compensation ($M = 2.92, p = .03$) were significantly different from the stigmatized control ($M = 3.66$). That is, when utilizing a remediation strategy involving compensation or acknowledgment, stigmatized applicants perceived the interactions to be significantly less negative than when they did not utilize a strategy. When using a strategy of acknowledgment, applicants reported that store personnel were more comfortable, friendly, attentive, exhibited greater amounts of smiling, and were less standoffish than when in the control condition (see Table 3 for means and standard deviations). Similarly, when confederate applicants utilized a strategy of compensation, store personnel were less rude, hostile, awkward, made fewer attempts to prematurely end the conversation, and were more comfortable, enthusiastic, and friendly than in the stigmatized control condition (see Table 3 for means and standard deviations). Thus, results provide evidence supporting both Hypothesis 3 and 5. However, results did not provide support for Hypothesis 4. More specifically, the use of individuating information did not significantly reduce perceptions of negativity when in the stigmatized condition ($M = 3.32, p = .30$). Though many of the means for the individual items were in the expected direction, only two of the items reached significance. That is, when applicants used a strategy of individuating information, store personnel were more enthusiastic and less awkward than when in the stigmatized control condition (see Table 3 for means and standard deviations of the individual items rated by applicants).

**Observed Negativity (by Observers).** To determine whether or not observers viewed the proposed strategies for remediation as effective mechanisms with which to reduce interpersonal discrimination, we conducted simple contrasts on the ANOVA for
Observed Negativity (see Table 2 for means and standard deviations). An analysis of the simple contrasts revealed that compared to a stigmatized control condition ($M = 3.10$), when applicants utilized a compensatory strategy, observers reported viewing interactions that contained significantly lower amounts of negativity ($M = 2.31, p < .01$). An examination of the individual items revealed that when utilizing a strategy of compensation, store personnel made fewer attempts to prematurely end the interaction, nodded more, and were more interested in the applicant as a potential employee than when no remediation strategy was used (see Table 4 for means and standard deviations of the individual items). Thus, observers provided evidence in further support of Hypothesis 5. Utilizing a strategy of acknowledgment also appeared to be a mechanism with which to reduce interpersonal discrimination ($M = 2.57, p = .07$); however, the results were marginal and did not reach conventional levels of significance. Thus, observers provided partial support for Hypothesis 3. When examining the individual items, observers reported that when applicants utilized a strategy of acknowledgment store personnel made fewer attempts to prematurely end the interaction and were more friendly than when in the stigmatized control condition (see Table 4 for means and standard deviations of the individual items). As in the case of the applicants, reports by observers did not identify individuating information as an effective strategy for reducing interpersonal discrimination ($M = 2.77, p = .25$). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported (see Table 4 for means and standard deviations of the individual items rated by observers).

*Coded Negativity (by Independent Raters).* To examine Hypothesis 3, 4, and 5, we conducted simple contrasts on the ANOVA of Coded Negativity. An examination of the multiple comparisons of Coded Negativity revealed that compared to the stigmatized
control ($M = 3.18$), when stigmatized individuals utilized a strategy of acknowledgment ($M = 2.31$, $p = .001$), interactions were rated as containing fewer amounts of interpersonal discrimination. This result supports Hypothesis 3. An examination of the individual items revealed that, when stigmatized individuals used a strategy of acknowledgment, store personnel were less hostile, rude, made fewer attempts to prematurely end the interaction, and were more friendly than the stigmatized control condition (see Table 5 for means and standard deviations). Similarly, compared to the stigmatized control condition, when stigmatized individuals divulged individuating information ($M = 2.56$, $p = .02$), independent coders rated the conversation as less negative, this finding supports Hypothesis 4. Follow-up analyses of the individual items revealed that store personnel were friendlier and made fewer attempts to prematurely end the conversation when stigmatized individuals divulged individuating information (see Table 5 for means and standard deviations). And finally, compared to the stigmatized control condition, when applicants utilized a strategy of compensation ($M = 2.37$, $p < .01$), interactions were rated as containing significantly fewer amounts of interpersonal discrimination. An examination of the individual items revealed that when stigmatized applicants utilized a strategy of compensation, store personnel exhibited decreased amounts of hostility, made fewer attempts to prematurely end the conversation, and were rated as being more friendly compared to the stigmatized control condition (see Table 5 for means and standard deviations of the individual items). Thus, results obtained from the independent raters fully support Hypothesis 3, 4, and 5.

Discussion
The current study provides evidence for the continued existence of subtle forms of discrimination in today's society. More specifically, although individuals presenting themselves as stigmatized did not report receiving overt forms of discrimination, there were differences in the interpersonal treatment that stigmatized and nonstigmatized individuals received. In particular, when in the control condition and not enacting any particular remediation strategy, interactions between store personnel and stigmatized individuals (compared with nonstigmatized individuals) were marked by increased instances of negativity in the form of greater amounts of hostility, rudeness, an eagerness to prematurely terminate the interaction, as well as decreased friendliness. These results directly replicate findings by Hebl et al. (2002). It is important to note that this pattern was congruently noted by the confederate applicants themselves, the observers watching the interactions, and the independent coders who listened to audiotapes and were blind to study condition. However, unlike Hebl et al. (2002), the current research did not find a significant difference with respect to interaction length between stigmatized and nonstigmatized applicants in the control conditions.

The current study is the first known study that examines the effectiveness of acknowledgment, individuating information, and compensation as remediation strategies in a naturalistic setting. Previous research has been restricted to laboratory settings that rely on students as research participants. Thus, the current research maintains a high degree of external validity and offers insight into the types of behaviors these strategies naturally elicit. Additionally, this study reveals that there are indeed strategies that stigmatized individuals can utilize to reduce interpersonal discrimination. Confederate job applicants, observers, and independent raters unanimously agreed that utilizing a
strategy of compensation resulted in treatment that was equitable to the level received by the nonstigmatized individuals. Recall that our operationalization of compensation consisted of having confederates behave in a positive, agreeable manner by smiling and giving more eye contact. There are a number of reasons that this strategy may have been particularly effective. For instance, it is possible that employers reacted favorably to the way in which they were favorably treated. Previous research examining mimicry and emotional contagion provide evidence indicating that individuals often unconsciously mirror the facial expressions and are able to adopt the emotions of others (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994). It may be the case that store personnel in our study were simply mimicking the emotions and expressions exhibited by our confederates. This “contagion” explains the increased displays of positive interpersonal behaviors (i.e., smiling, nodding, friendliness) that resulted from utilizing a strategy of compensation. Additionally, the use of a compensatory strategy could have acted as a suppression mechanism (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). That is, the presence of compensatory techniques (e.g., smiling, direct eye contact, nodding, excitement) prevented store personnel from expressing any disdain they felt towards the stigmatized group.

There was mixed support for the effectiveness of acknowledgment as a mechanism for reducing interpersonal discrimination. That is, although both applicants and independent raters indicated that utilizing a strategy of acknowledgment lead to a significant reduction in interpersonal discrimination, reports from observers did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance. However, means of the individual items were in the expected direction. Thus, there was some evidence to support the effectiveness of acknowledgment as a mechanism for reducing contemporary
discrimination. We believe that acknowledging might serve as a releasing mechanism for the discomfort found in interactions (Hebl et al., 2000). This is evidenced by reports from stigmatized applicants which indicate that when utilizing a strategy of acknowledgment sales personnel appeared to be significantly more comfortable. Additionally, applicants, observers, and independent raters all reported that store personnel were friendlier when confederate applicants utilized a strategy of acknowledgment than when no strategy was implemented. In sum, we have some support from each perspective for the effectiveness of acknowledgment as a tool for reducing the negative interpersonal interactions that stigmatized individuals receive.

Though compensation and acknowledgment appeared to be useful mechanisms for reducing interpersonal discrimination, the current study did not find much converging evidence to support the presentation of individuating information as a successful strategy. That is, applicants and observers reported no differences across conditions as a result of implementing the strategy involving individuating information. Interestingly, however, independent raters did report decreased amounts of interpersonal discrimination when utilizing this strategy. These findings may be attributable to several factors. We will next discuss three of these factors in some detail. First, our lack of convergence may be attributable to the way we conceptualized individuating information. The current research defined individuation broadly. Recall, our operationalization involved the disclosure information about the confederate's enrollment status at a prestigious university, as well as some additional caretaking responsibilities. Perhaps the specific type of individuating information used in our study was ineffective. Utilizing individuating information that is relevant information for the job might yield different results. For example, disclosing
pertinent information about previous work experiences may have been more useful individuating information (i.e., working in another retail establishment). Second, it may be the case that store personnel exhibited negative nonverbal behavior. Third, previous research on individuation has found that counter-stereotypical information can reduce the display of prejudice (see Fiske, Lin, & Neuberg, 1999 for a review). Thus, changing the nature of the individuating information may result in a reduction of interpersonal discrimination. Future research that specifically considers the content of the individuation could reveal considerable insight into whether or not individuating information is an effective strategy for reducing interpersonal discrimination.

In sum, there is evidence that the interpersonal discrimination that stigmatized individuals receive can be reduced. However, our results reveal that there may not be uniform agreement about which strategy is best from the different perspectives of the applicants, observers, and independent raters. That is, while applicants, observers, and independent raters did provide converging evidence that supports compensation as an effective strategy for reducing interpersonal discrimination, there was not uniform consensus regarding the extent to which acknowledgment and individuating information were effective strategies. That is, though applicants and independent raters reported that acknowledgment reduces interpersonal discrimination, reports from observers did not reach statistical significance. Similarly, ratings made by applicants and observers, who were actually present during the interaction, did not provide evidence for the effectiveness of individuating information, whereas data obtained from independent coders support its utility as a strategy for remediating interpersonal discrimination. Thus,
whether or not a given strategy is effective may vary, to some extent, based on whose perspective is being considered.

A lack of convergence for individuating information could be attributable to coders making ratings solely on the basis of auditory information. Our manipulations were by and large verbal statements. However, in the acknowledgment and compensation conditions, confederate applicants made changes to their nonverbal behavior as well (i.e., smiling, eye contact, pointing at a hat). Given that independent raters made their ratings solely on the basis of audiotapes, they were unable to view the body language and facial expressions of the store personnel. These visual cues could have provided very useful information that may or may not have led to different results. High correlations between applicants and observers (who were privy to verbal and nonverbal information), and low correlations between independent coders and both applicants and observers provide some support for this notion. Thus, if independent coders were able to code nonverbal behaviors as well, correlations may have been similar.

Implications. The current research provides evidence which supports the effectiveness of remediation strategies. Previous research supports the notion that individuals naturally compensate. For example, recent research by Kaiser and Miller (2001) find that when female students are told that a potential grader is sexist, they compensate for the potential bias by differentiating themselves from feminine stereotypes. Thus, the current research provides evidence that these and other behaviors are effective for reducing the negative interpersonal treatment that they might otherwise receive. Much of the previous research examining prejudice and discrimination has focused on examining discrimination in laboratory settings. This research, however,
examines the strategies of acknowledgment, individuating information, and compensation in a naturalistic setting.

Additionally, the current study informs previous research on compensation by clearly defining the construct of compensation. That is, in this study, confederates compensated by presenting themselves as positive, enthusiastic, and likeable individuals. Previous research examining compensation has found that, under certain conditions, stigmatized individuals change their behaviors when interacting with nonstigmatized individuals. For example, Miller et al., (1995) found that overweight women behave differently when they can be seen in an effort to have a positive social interaction. Similarly, women who believe their essays will be graded by a sexist rater distance themselves from traditional gender stereotypes (Kaiser & Miller, 2001). However, this previous research has failed to explicitly define what it means to compensate. The current study is one of the first known studies to specifically attempt to operationalize compensation.

The current research also extends previous research on acknowledgment by explicitly examining the effectiveness of acknowledgment for reducing interpersonal discrimination during a social interaction. Previous research examining acknowledgments or “coming out” in the workplace has often consisted of self-report surveys or presenting hypothetical situations and then assessing attitudes (i.e., Hebl & Griffith, 2002; King et al., 2006). The current study extends previous research by examining the actual behaviors that store personnel display while interacting with stigmatized job applicants, as well as how verbally acknowledging one’s stigma reduces subtle discrimination.
Finally, this study also informs previous research on individuating information. Previous research has examined the extent to which individuating information prevents individuals from being categorized solely on the basis of group membership (see Fiske et al., 1999). However, to our knowledge, no research has examined the extent to which individuating information is an effective strategy for reducing discrimination in an ongoing social interaction. The current research addresses this gap by examining the extent to which divulging additional information about one’s self reduces the inequitable treatment that stigmatized individuals receive in a job applicant context.

These results also have implications for organizational training initiatives. Although there was no evidence of overt discrimination, there was in fact evidence of interpersonal discrimination, which can have equally negative effects (Snyder et al., 1979). Recent research by Shapiro, King, and Quinones (in press) found that trainees who were thought to be stigmatized reported more negative interactions (i.e., less motivating, rushed to end interactions, more hostile) than those who were not perceived as being stigmatized. These negative interpersonal interactions resulted in decreased performance levels for trainees whose trainers did not adjust their behavior over time. Thus, negative interpersonal treatment can potentially create self-fulfilling prophecies. Strides should be taken to make incumbents (i.e., trainers, managers, coworkers) aware of these subtleties, and organizations should institute training aimed at reducing these more subtle displays. Rather than make stigmatized individuals bear the burden of reducing interpersonal discrimination, organizations should take a proactive role in trying to reduce all forms of discrimination, not just those that are sanctioned by law.
Limitations. One limitation of our study is that developing an effective remediation strategy may depend upon a variety of factors. Strategies that are effective for one stigma may not be effective for others. Research by Dion and Stein (1978) found that in order to effectively achieve desired goals, different groups might need to employ different strategies to obtain desired outcomes. Thus, because our study only investigated the stigma of homosexuality, we cannot say for certain that our findings would generalize and be effective in reducing the interpersonal discrimination that other stigmatized groups (i.e., African-Americans, women, obese individuals) receive. For instance, acknowledging one’s race or gender might not be a useful tool for reducing interpersonal discrimination. In fact, it is possible that doing so might have deleterious impacts. Additional research must be conducted to address the extent to which strategies are effective for reducing interpersonal discrimination across a variety of stigmas.

An additional limitation is that the current research was conducted in retail stores located throughout shopping malls. It is unclear how one might implement these strategies in different job domains (i.e., professional jobs). For instance, rather than casually inquire about employment and job duties, most job applicants typically submit resumes online and wait to receive to receive subsequent correspondence. Typically the first contact that an individual has with an organization might be during an actual interview rather than during the application process. It is unclear how these strategies can be utilized in a separate context.

The current research is also limited in that we did not examine how long the effects of utilizing a remediation strategy last. That is, we are unsure whether or not the strategies must be utilized continuously, or if a single instance is enough to reduce
interpersonal discrimination. In other words, what happens after these individuals enter the workplace? Must they continually engage in one or more of these strategies to receive equitable treatment? Future research should be directed at addressing these and other issues.

Though our manipulations were pre-tested by undergraduates, the content of statements may be a potential limitation to our study. For instance, stating that one cannot work on Wednesday mornings because of a previous commitment might be viewed negatively in a job applicant setting. Thus, we are unsure whether or not store personnel would attend to the information provided about caretaking responsibilities (i.e., take my grandmother to dialysis), or simply focus on the applicant’s inability to work at a certain time. Future research might examine not only the content of the individuating information (i.e., counter stereotypical, relevance, valence), but the amount of individuating information stigmatized individuals provide (i.e., student status, prior commitments).

In addition, we are limited in our ability to determine whether or not these reductions in interpersonal discrimination will also reduce underlying prejudice. That is, we do not know whether or not biased individuals will change their opinions of all members of a given stigmatized group, or whether individuals will simply sub-type the stigmatized individual that utilizes a remediation strategy. Future research might examine how these effects transfer to other members of a given stigmatized group, or if these strategies are only effective for the stigmatized individual that is actually making the verbalizations.
Future research might also examine the mechanisms behind these remediation strategies. That is, are non-stigmatized individuals truly more comfortable engaging in an interaction when a stigmatized individual utilizes a strategy of acknowledgment? Are stigmatized individuals more likeable and viewed as more socially adept when they compensate? Future research that addresses these issues and provides further insight into why a given remediation strategy is effective would be extremely useful for understanding the present strategies we examined as well as for the development of additional remediation strategies that are effective.

Conclusion

The current research adds to the literature on prejudice and discrimination reduction by examining strategies that stigmatized individuals can utilize to reduce contemporary manifestations of discrimination. While overt forms of discrimination have decreased, more research needs to be conducted to find methods that decrease the incidence of contemporary discrimination, which is marked by subtlety. Though on the surface, more subtle forms of discrimination appear to be less damaging, previous research has shown that interpersonal discrimination does have pernicious effects (e.g., Shapiro et al., in press; Word, Zanna, Cooper, 1974). Thus, it is important to equip stigmatized individuals with tools that avert its occurrence. Indeed, developing strategies that stigmatized individuals can adopt to reduce discrimination is perhaps controversial and provocative, as it places the responsibility of reducing discrimination upon the victim. Nonetheless, the current research is a first step at identifying strategies that stigmatized individuals -- in this case gay men and lesbians -- can use to reduce interpersonal discrimination.
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### Table 1.

| Means and Standard Deviations of Potential Remediation Verbalizations. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|                                  | Acknowledgment      | Compensation        | Individuating       | Positivity          | Comfortable         | Awkward             |
| As you can see I'm comfortable with my identity | 3.87 (1.99)         | 4.00 (2.16)         | 4.72 (1.32)         | 5.28 (1.22)         | 3.84 (1.86)         |
| This is a good reflection of who I really am          | 5.56 (1.54)         | 3.47 (1.74)         | 4.00 (1.52)         | 4.53 (1.74)         | 5.05 (1.61)         | 2.79 (1.75)         |
| I am very open about my life                           | 3.47 (1.61)         | 3.21 (1.32)         | 3.84 (1.98)         | 4.79 (1.72)         | 4.84 (1.98)         | 3.47 (2.01)         |
| This job sounds like it would be a lot of fun         | 3.63 (2.24)         | 2.89 (1.49)         | 5.72 (1.53)         | 5.58 (1.43)         | 2.58 (1.77)         | 2.32 (1.70)         |
| I really think I would be good at this job            | 2.42 (1.89)         | 4.11 (2.21)         | 3.89 (2.11)         | 5.58 (1.61)         | 2.47 (1.61)         | 2.23 (1.63)         |
| This job sounds like it would be right up my alley    | 2.95 (2.17)         | 4.37 (1.95)         | 4.05 (1.87)         | 5.84 (1.38)         | 6.00 (1.15)         | 2.23 (1.20)         |
| My schedule is generally flexible but I'd really like to be able to attend church on Sunday mornings. | 3.17 (2.20)         | 2.79 (1.78)         | 5.32 (1.57)         | 5.26 (1.28)         | 5.94 (0.87)         | 2.11 (1.33)         |
| I hate to miss church is it okay if I work later on Sundays | 3.21 (2.12)         | 3.00 (1.61)         | 4.79 (2.04)         | 4.11 (1.85)         | 4.74 (1.82)         | 2.89 (1.56)         |
| I visit my little brother on Mondays                  | 2.95 (1.78)         | 3.32 (1.83)         | 4.68 (2.16)         | 4.89 (1.63)         | 4.84 (1.92)         | 2.47 (1.58)         |
| Take my grandmother to dialysis                       | 2.42 (1.38)         | 3.63 (1.64)         | 5.21 (1.78)         | 4.72 (1.93)         | 4.11 (1.77)         | 2.37 (1.77)         |
| This cross is stuck...my Godfather gave it to me for my Baptism | 2.95 (2.17)         | 4.37 (1.95)         | 4.05 (1.87)         | 5.84 (1.38)         | 6.00 (1.15)         | 2.23 (1.20)         |

**Note:** Ratings were made on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = “Not at All”; 7 = “Very Much”)}
Table 2.

**Correlations table involving perceptions of interpersonal discrimination amongst applicants, observers, and independent coders.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Applicants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Observers</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Independent coders</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "**" = $p$ is significant at the .01 level; "*" = $p$ is equal to .10.
Table 3.

Means and Standard Deviations of Perceptions of Negativity Reported by Applicants, Observers, and Independent Raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Observers</th>
<th>Independent Rater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stigmatized Control</td>
<td>3.66&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.19)</td>
<td>3.10&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.12)</td>
<td>3.18&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstigmatized Control</td>
<td>2.74&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (1.04)</td>
<td>2.45&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (0.75)</td>
<td>2.16&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (0.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgment</td>
<td>2.88&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (0.95)</td>
<td>2.57&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; (0.98)</td>
<td>2.31&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (0.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>2.92&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (1.25)</td>
<td>2.31&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (1.08)</td>
<td>2.37&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (0.76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuating Information</td>
<td>3.32&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.36)</td>
<td>2.77&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (0.90)</td>
<td>2.56&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (0.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note: Standard deviations in parentheses. Differing subscripts within a column indicate that the items are significantly different from one another (<sub>b*</sub> = p < .05; <sub>b</sub> = p < .10)**
Table 4.

Means and Standard Deviations of Variables Reported by Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stigmatized Control</th>
<th>Non-stigmatized Control</th>
<th>Acknowledgment</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
<th>Individuating Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smiling</td>
<td>3.36_b (1.41)</td>
<td>4.08_b (1.41)</td>
<td>4.19_b (1.41)</td>
<td>4.27_b (1.66)</td>
<td>3.50_a (1.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>4.00_a (1.29)</td>
<td>5.04_b (1.34)</td>
<td>4.88_b (1.11)</td>
<td>4.68_b (1.52)</td>
<td>4.52_a (1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>4.60_a (1.58)</td>
<td>5.44_b (1.00)</td>
<td>5.00_a (1.23)</td>
<td>4.81_a (1.74)</td>
<td>4.68_a (1.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standoffishness</td>
<td>3.16_a (1.68)</td>
<td>2.20_b (1.38)</td>
<td>2.20_b (1.36)</td>
<td>2.60_a (2.05)</td>
<td>2.56_a (1.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudeness</td>
<td>2.64_a (1.82)</td>
<td>1.92_b (1.35)</td>
<td>2.04_a (1.03)</td>
<td>1.81_b (1.23)</td>
<td>2.32_a (1.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>2.60_a (1.68)</td>
<td>4.28_b (1.62)</td>
<td>4.19_b (1.36)</td>
<td>4.27_b (1.78)</td>
<td>4.54_b (1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Interaction</td>
<td>3.56_a (2.02)</td>
<td>2.50_b (1.62)</td>
<td>3.12_a (1.70)</td>
<td>2.46_b (1.82)</td>
<td>2.93_a (1.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodding</td>
<td>3.08_a (1.35)</td>
<td>4.28_b (1.67)</td>
<td>4.12_b (1.66)</td>
<td>4.08_b (2.02)</td>
<td>3.64_a (1.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>4.12_a (1.36)</td>
<td>5.12_b (1.24)</td>
<td>5.08_b (1.09)</td>
<td>5.00_b (1.36)</td>
<td>4.32_a (1.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awkward</td>
<td>3.88_a (1.92)</td>
<td>2.64_b (1.60)</td>
<td>2.77_b (1.42)</td>
<td>3.12_b (1.75)</td>
<td>2.89_b (1.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend</td>
<td>3.76_a (1.74)</td>
<td>4.80_b (1.38)</td>
<td>4.69_b (1.32)</td>
<td>4.54_a (1.98)</td>
<td>4.50_a (1.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>2.24_a (1.69)</td>
<td>1.48_b (1.00)</td>
<td>1.77_a (1.07)</td>
<td>2.00_a (1.61)</td>
<td>1.58_b (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>2.60_a (1.66)</td>
<td>2.28_a (1.31)</td>
<td>2.12_a (1.05)</td>
<td>2.68_a (2.06)</td>
<td>2.74_a (1.72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ratings were made on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = Not at all; 7 = Very Much).

Standard deviations contained inside parentheses. Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ ($b^* = p < .05; _b = p < .10$).
Table 5.

Means and Standard Deviations of Variables Reported by Observers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stigmatized Control</th>
<th>Non-stigmatized Control</th>
<th>Acknowledgment</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
<th>Individuating Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nodding</td>
<td>2.91&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.50)</td>
<td>3.80&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; (1.58)</td>
<td>3.58&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.75)</td>
<td>3.88&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;* (1.42)</td>
<td>3.19&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudeness</td>
<td>2.26&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.66)</td>
<td>1.60&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (0.91)</td>
<td>2.15&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.54)</td>
<td>1.83&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.44)</td>
<td>1.81&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>1.61&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.37)</td>
<td>1.16&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; (0.47)</td>
<td>1.65&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.23)</td>
<td>1.26&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (0.53)</td>
<td>1.38&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Interaction</td>
<td>3.96&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (2.45)</td>
<td>2.84&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;* (1.43)</td>
<td>2.38&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;* (1.30)</td>
<td>2.42&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;* (1.90)</td>
<td>2.78&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;* (1.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>3.17&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.40)</td>
<td>3.64&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.32)</td>
<td>3.78&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.58)</td>
<td>4.08&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; (1.67)</td>
<td>3.08&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>3.96&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.49)</td>
<td>4.64&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.25)</td>
<td>4.65&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; (1.44)</td>
<td>4.54&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.47)</td>
<td>4.15&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend</td>
<td>4.13&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.66)</td>
<td>4.52&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (0.96)</td>
<td>4.54&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.58)</td>
<td>4.46&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.42)</td>
<td>4.23&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Ratings were made on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = Not at all; 7 = Very Much).

Standard deviations contained inside parentheses. Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ (<sub>b</sub>* = p < .05; <sub>b</sub> = p < .10).
Table 6.

**Means and Standard Deviations of Variables Reported by Independent Raters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stigmatized Control</th>
<th>Non-stigmatized Control</th>
<th>Acknowledgment</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
<th>Individuating Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End Interaction</td>
<td>4.10&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.48)</td>
<td>2.25&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (1.44)</td>
<td>2.43&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (1.16)</td>
<td>2.95&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (1.45)</td>
<td>2.65&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>2.37&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.34)</td>
<td>1.56&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (0.76)</td>
<td>1.72&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (0.82)</td>
<td>1.64&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (0.61)</td>
<td>1.85&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; (0.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudeness</td>
<td>2.50&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.29)</td>
<td>1.56&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (0.82)</td>
<td>1.66&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (0.71)</td>
<td>2.00&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (0.78)</td>
<td>2.03&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negativity</td>
<td>2.63&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.22)</td>
<td>2.08&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.31)</td>
<td>2.58&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.03)</td>
<td>2.05&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; (0.71)</td>
<td>2.50&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>3.68&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.70)</td>
<td>5.30&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (1.63)</td>
<td>4.64&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (1.32)</td>
<td>5.45&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (1.36)</td>
<td>4.81&lt;sub&gt;b*&lt;/sub&gt; (1.56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Ratings were made on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = Not at all; 7 = Very Much). Standard deviations contained inside parentheses. Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ (<sup>b*</sup> = p < .05; <sup>b</sup> = p < .10).*
Appendix A: Pre-Test

I want you to consider the following scenario. Imagine that some college student is going into a store to apply for jobs. The student is wearing relaxed casual clothing: jeans, a spring jacket, and a hat. On the hat, is printed the words “Gay and Proud.” While this may strike you as odd and inappropriate, please consider that the place in which the student is seeking employment is used to seeing college students wearing all sorts of liberal paraphernalia so it doesn’t strike the employer as particularly odd.

Now, given this scenario, we want you to consider different sorts of verbalizations that the student makes. We would then like you to rate them on a number of dimensions. Please use the following scale when completing the ratings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While reading the following verbalizations, I’d like you to consider three definitions. You may refer back to them.

**Acknowledgment**: Acknowledgment has been defined as addressing one’s stigma.

**Compensation**: Compensation has been defined as taking additional steps to overcome one’s impairment. This can take the form of being very friendly, positive, or agreeable when having a conversation with another individual.

**Individuating Information**: Individuating information has been defined as divulging additional information about oneself.

Read the following passages and then answer the questions based upon the definitions you have just read.

1) Imagine that the student says a number of things to the employer. Near the beginning of the interaction, the student also says:

“As you can see, I’m really comfortable with my identity.”

1. To what extent does this statement represent acknowledgment? ____
2. To what extent does this statement represent compensation? ____
3. To what extent does this statement represent individuating information? ____
4. How positive would you rate this passage? ____
5. How comfortable would you be interacting with a person that made this statement? ____
6. To what extent would you rate this phrase as being awkward? ____
7. To what extent is this wording awkward? ____
8. If you can think of a better way to word this, write it here ____________________________

2) Imagine that the student says a number of things to the employer. Near the beginning of the interaction, the student also says:

“This is a good reflection of who I really am.”

9. To what extent does this statement represent acknowledgment? ____
10. To what extent does this statement represent compensation? ____
11. To what extent does this statement represent individuating information? ____
12. How positive would you rate this passage? ____
13. How comfortable would you be interacting with a person that made this statement? ____
14. To what extent would you rate this saying as being awkward? ____
15. To what extent is this wording awkward? ____
16. If you can think of a better way to word this, write it here ____________________________

3) Imagine that the student says a number of things to the employer. Near the beginning of the interaction, the student also says:

“I am very open about life.”
17. To what extent does this statement represent acknowledgment?
18. To what extent does this statement represent compensation?
19. To what extent does this statement represent individuating information?
20. How positive would you rate this passage?
21. How comfortable would you be interacting with a person that made this statement?
22. To what extent would you rate this saying as being awkward?
23. To what extent is this wording awkward?
24. If you can think of a better way to word this, write it here

-------------

4) Imagine the student says a number of things to the employer. Near the beginning of the interaction, the student also says:

“This job sounds like it would be a lot of fun!”

25. To what extent does this statement represent acknowledgment?
26. To what extent does this statement represent compensation?
27. To what extent does this statement represent individuating information?
28. How positive would you rate this passage?
29. How comfortable would you be interacting with a person that made this statement?
30. To what extent would you rate this saying as being awkward?
31. To what extent is this wording awkward?
32. If you can think of a better way to word this, write it here

-------------

5) Imagine the student says a number of things to the employer. Near the beginning of the interaction, the student also says:

“I really think I would be good at this job! It seems like it would be a great experience!”

33. To what extent does this statement represent acknowledgment?
34. To what extent does this statement represent compensation?
35. To what extent does this statement represent individuating information?
36. How positive would you rate this passage?
37. How comfortable would you be interacting with a person that made this statement?
38. To what extent would you rate this saying as being awkward?
39. To what extent is this wording awkward?
40. If you can think of a better way to word this, write it here

-------------

6) Imagine the student says a number of things to the employer. Near the beginning of the interaction, the student also says:

“This job sounds like it would be right up my alley! I am excited about the possibility of working here!”

41. To what extent does this statement represent acknowledgment?
42. To what extent does this statement represent compensation?
43. To what extent does this statement represent individuating information?
44. How positive would you rate this passage?
45. How comfortable would you be interacting with a person that made this statement?
46. To what extent would you rate this saying as being awkward?
47. To what extent is this wording awkward?
48. If you can think of a better way to word this, write it here

-------------

7) Imagine the student says a number of things to the employer. Near the beginning of the interaction, the student also says:
“My schedule is generally flexible but I’d really like to be able to attend church on Sunday mornings, do you think I could come in after 11:00 on Sundays?”

49. To what extent does this statement represent acknowledgment? ______
50. To what extent does this statement represent compensation? ______
51. To what extent does this statement represent individuating information? ______
52. How positive would you rate this passage? ______
53. How comfortable would you be interacting with a person that made this statement? ______
54. To what extent would you rate this saying as being awkward? ______
55. To what extent is the wording awkward? ______
56. If you can think of a better way to word this, write it here _______________________

8) Imagine the student says a number of things to the employer. Near the beginning of the interaction, the student also says:

“Would it be okay for me to work later on Sundays? I really hate to miss church!”

57. To what extent does this statement represent acknowledgment? ______
58. To what extent does this statement represent compensation? ______
59. To what extent does this statement represent individuating information? ______
60. How positive would you rate this passage? ______
61. How comfortable would you be interacting with a person that made this statement? ______
62. To what extent would you rate this saying as being awkward? ______
63. To what extent is the wording awkward? ______
64. If you can think of a better way to word this, write it here _______________________

9) Imagine the student says a number of things to the employer. Near the beginning of the interaction, the student also says:

“Oh, just a second, this cross is stuck in my shirt and I have to untangle it. Sorry – it’s really special because my Godfather gave it to me for my Baptism.”

65. To what extent does this statement represent acknowledgment? ______
66. To what extent does this statement represent compensation? ______
67. To what extent does this statement represent individuating information? ______
68. How positive would you rate this passage? ______
69. How comfortable would you be interacting with a person that made this statement? ______
70. To what extent would you rate this saying as being awkward? ______
71. To what extent is the wording awkward? ______
72. If you can think of a better way to word this, write it here _______________________

10) Imagine the student says a number of things to the employer. Near the beginning of the interaction, the student also says:

“I may have difficulty working on Monday afternoons because I meet with my little brother. I joined Big Brothers about a year ago and really love it.”

73. To what extent does this statement represent acknowledgment? ______
74. To what extent does this statement represent compensation? ______
75. To what extent does this statement represent individuating information? ______
76. How positive would you rate this passage? ______
77. How comfortable would you be interacting with a person that made this statement? ______
78. To what extent would you rate this saying as being awkward? ______
79. To what extent is the wording awkward? ______
80. If you can think of a better way to word this, write it here _______________________
11) Imagine the student says a number of things to the employer. Near the beginning of the interaction, the student also says:

"I may have a hard time working on Wednesday mornings because I take my grandmother to dialysis."

81. To what extent does this statement represent acknowledgment? 
82. To what extent does this statement represent compensation? 
83. To what extent does this statement represent individuating information? 
84. How positive would you rate this passage? 
85. How comfortable would you be interacting with a person that made this statement? 
86. To what extent would you rate this saying as being awkward? 
87. To what extent is the wording awkward? 
88. If you can think of a better way to word this, write it here.
Appendix B: Script

Instructions for Confederates

***Prior to participating in the present study, you will need to memorize this script in its entirety. It is extremely important that you have memorized the script and are comfortable speaking the words, and sound natural when doing so.

****You will be evaluated on how similarly you act in the conditions. You should not deviate from the script by asking additional questions or directing the conversation. Thus, feel free to answer any additional questions that are asked of you but try to maintain consistency in the degree of your answers, the length of your side of the conversation, and the disposition that you feel toward those with whom you interact. You should remain consistent; thus, if you are upbeat in one session, you should be upbeat in all sessions. This is referred to as your "normal self."
Approximately two minutes after the observer enters the store, you will walk into the store and ask to speak with the manager or the person that is responsible for making hiring decisions.

Script

Control Condition
Basic Script Questions:
1. Are you currently hiring?
2. What sorts of things would I be doing if I worked here?
   (Note: Look interested)
3. Can I fill out a job application, anyway?

****Remember to act like your normal self in this condition!!!

Acknowledgment Condition
1. Hi, I'm looking for a summer job and wanted to ask you a couple of questions. But first, I just want to apologize for my appearance today. I usually dress up a little bit more and I don't always wear relaxed hats like this. I didn't plan on coming when I got dressed this morning and this is a good reflection of who I really am... especially when I'm not working.

****You will follow this verbalization with the three basic questions that you should ask in each trial. They are listed below.
2. Anyhow, are you hiring? (Will you be hiring people soon?)
3. What sorts of things would I do if I worked here?
4. Can I fill out an application?

****Remember to act like your normal self in this condition!!!

Individuating Information Condition
1. Hi! I'm here because I'm a student at Rice University and I'm looking for a part time job for this summer and I wanted to ask you a couple of questions.
2. Are you hiring? (Will you be hiring people soon?)
3. What sorts of things would I do if I worked here? (Note: Look interested)
4. Can I fill out an application?
5. Ya know, I may have a hard time working on Wednesday mornings because I take my grandmother to dialysis.

****Remember to act like your normal self in this condition

Compensation Condition
The following condition is somewhat different than the other three conditions. You will need to memorize statements throughout the interaction. In addition to the statements that you will make, you should also be very pleasant, friendly, and agreeable when in this condition. In other words, you should speak these verbalizations with exaggerated positivity. That is, try to imagine that the person you are speaking with might not like you, and make an attempt to compensate with positive nonverbal (i.e., positive tone, smiling, eye contact, but no touching).

1. Hi, how are you? It sure is a nice day outside! Or maybe it just seems like it because I'm having such a good day! I'm actually looking for a summer job and wanted to ask you a couple of questions.
2. Are you hiring? (Will you be hiring people soon?)
3. What sorts of things would I do if I worked here? (Look interested)
4. That's interesting, sounds like something right up my alley! I feel like I could do a good job and that's certainly interesting work.
5. Can I fill out an application?
6. I'm really excited about the possibility of working here! Thank you, have a good day!

****Remember to make your statements with exaggerated positivity

After leaving the store, immediately proceed to the designated location to complete a survey about the interaction you just had.

****Remember, you should in no way appear to be associated with the observer
**Appendix C: Applicant Questionnaire**

1. Condition: Compensation Individuating Information Acknowledgment Control

2. Did you speak with a store manager?  Y   N

   If not, with whom did you speak?  

3. What was the gender of the person with whom you spoke?  M   F

4. Did the individual:

   ___ indicate jobs were available   ___ indicate jobs were not available

5. Did you notice any “help wanted” signs posted for this store?  Y   N

6. Were you allowed to complete an application?  Y   N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. How far away from you did the person stand?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How friendly was the person?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much eye contact did the person make with you?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To what extent did the person try to end the interaction prematurely?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To what extent did the person behave rudely toward you?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To what extent did the person smile at you?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To what extent was the person helpful?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To what extent did the person purse their lips during your conversation?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To what extent did the person's brow furrow, in a negative manner, during your conversation?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How interested was the person in you as a potential candidate?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. To what extent was the person hostile toward you?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How crowded was the store?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. To what extent was the person comfortable interacting with you?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To what extent was the interaction awkward?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. To what extent did the person nod at you or make other affirmative gestures?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. To what extent was the person nervous?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. With how much enthusiasm did the person greet you?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. To what extent was the person paying attention to you?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. To what extent was the person standoffish?</td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Did you remember to start recording the interaction?  Y   N
### Appendix D: Observer Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. With how much <strong>enthusiasm</strong> did the store personnel greet the applicant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How far away from the applicant did the manager <strong>stand</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How <strong>friendly</strong> was the manager?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How much <strong>eye contact</strong> did the manager make with the applicant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent did the manager try to <strong>end the interaction</strong> prematurely?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent did the manager behave <strong>rudely</strong> toward the applicant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To what extent did the manager <strong>smile</strong> at the applicant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To what extent was the manager <strong>helpful</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To what extent did the manager <strong>purse his or her lips</strong> during the conversation with the applicant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To what extent did the manager’s <strong>brow furrow</strong> during the conversation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How <strong>interested</strong> was the manager in the applicant as a potential candidate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To what extent was the manager <strong>hostile</strong> towards the applicant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How <strong>crowded</strong> was the store?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To what extent was the manager <strong>comfortable</strong> interacting with the applicant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To what extent was the interaction <strong>awkward</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. To what extent did the manager <strong>nod</strong> at the applicant or make other affirmative gestures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. To what extent did the manager appear to be <strong>interested</strong> in the applicant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. To what extent was the manager <strong>paying attention</strong> to the applicant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Compared to similar conditions, how <strong>consistent was the behavior of the applicant</strong> in this trial?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. How long was the interaction?  ________________ Seconds

Comments:

_______________________________
Appendix E: Independent Rater Questionnaire

Confederate: ____________________          Trial #: __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. To what extent does the manager try to end the conversation prematurely?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. How friendly was the manager to the applicant?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. How hostile was the manager to the applicant?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. How helpful was the manager?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. How rude was the manager?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. To what extent was the interaction awkward?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. How interested was the manager in the applicant?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. To what extent was the interaction negative?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. How easy was it to code this tape?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: __________________________________________

__________________________________________________
Figure 1.

Ratings of Interpersonal Discrimination from Applicants, Observers, and Independent Raters