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ABSTRACT

The differential impact of formal and interpersonal discrimination on job performance

By

Sarah LaTash Brionne Singletary

Previous research has examined a number of constructs that are associated with the experience of discrimination; however, previous studies are limited in three ways. First, most research has focused on determining the attitudinal outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intentions) associated with perceptions of discrimination. Second, previous research examines discrimination primarily as an outcome and not a predictor. Third, previous research has neglected to examine discrimination during an ongoing social interaction. This dissertation corrects for these limitations and extends previous research by examining the impact of formal and interpersonal discrimination (either in isolation or combined) on performance. Results reveal a number of attitudinal as well as behavioral outcomes resulting from discrimination. Specifically, the experience of interpersonal and combined (simultaneously experiencing both interpersonal and formal discrimination) discrimination resulted in impaired performance. In addition, experiencing any type of discrimination (interpersonal, formal, or combined) reduced intentions to engage in future acts of helping behavior, positive perceptions of the assessor, perceptions of interactional justice, and independent coders’ perceptions of participant effort on task. A number of theoretical and practical implications are discussed.
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Introduction

Jane and Julie are two women who are employed in corporate America. Jane works for a large advertising firm and her direct supervisor is male. Jane notices that he appears to be short with her, gives her dirty looks, hardly ever smiles while speaking to her, and generally seems to be rude during their interactions. Jane often contemplates whether this treatment might be due to the fact that she is a woman but she remains uncertain.

Julie also works in a large organization and, like Jane, her supervisor is also male. Unlike Jane, Julie is certain that her supervisor discriminates on the basis of gender. For example, she has often overheard him make a number of sexist jokes, say that he would never want a woman to be his direct supervisor, and tell a co-worker that he did not like working with women. In the previous examples, Jane’s interactions with her supervisor are characterized by subtle, interpersonal displays of discrimination whereas Julie’s experiences consist of more overt displays of discrimination.

The current research focuses on the consequences of these different types of discriminatory experiences in the workplace, and addresses whether one type might be more deleterious than another type to performance and other workplace behaviors. More specifically, this dissertation tries to determine whether subtle and overt discrimination have different effects on workplace outcomes? Moreover, is the treatment experienced by Jane more pernicious than the treatment that Julie experiences? Very little research has examined the impact that various types of discrimination have upon subsequent behaviors and even less research is focused on addressing such behaviors in an organizational context. This dissertation attempts to address this gap in the literature, by examining the effect that these two distinct forms of discrimination have upon performance and in
addition explores why I believe that the experience of subtle discrimination may be particularly damaging to performance.

_Why is it Important to Continue Studying Discrimination?_ The current research is important for a number of reasons. First, previous research primarily examines discrimination as an outcome and not as a predictor. Such research has identified individual difference variables that influence the likelihood of discriminating. For instance, previous studies reveal that individuals high on modern racism (McConahay, 1983), conceptualized as a measure of subtle prejudices, are more likely to discriminate than individuals who do not score highly on these measures, aversive racism (Gaertner & Dovido, 1986), racial ambivalence (Katz & Hass, 1988) and modern sexism (Swim, Aiken, Hall, & Hunter, 1995; Cameron, 2002; Barreto & Ellemers, 2005). In addition, research by Plant and Devine (1998) found that individuals high in external motivation to suppress prejudice (i.e., a trait measuring individuals’ compliance with nonprejudice as a result of political correctness) were more likely to discriminate than individuals with a high internal motivation to suppress (i.e., a trait measuring an individual’s desire to be nonprejudiced as a result egalitarian beliefs). In sum, past research has identified a number of individual difference characteristics and other variables that predict discrimination.

Second, much of the research on discrimination is correlational in nature. For example, previous self-report studies reveal positive correlations between targets who report being discriminated against and outcomes such as: a) major depression, b) low self-esteem, and c) psychological stress (Hudson Banks, Kohn-Wood, & Spenser, 2006; Jackson, Kubzansky, & Wright, 2006; Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz, & Owen,
2002). The problem with such research is that it is not clear if discrimination is caused by depression, lower self-esteem, and stress or if the depression, lower self-esteem, and stress caused an increase in perceptions of discrimination. Alternatively, a third variable (e.g., such as being a token) might cause increases in all of the other states. Clearly, experimental research is needed to identify the causal outcomes associated with discrimination.

Third, past research on discrimination surprisingly has not been situated in organizational contexts. The small amount of research that has been done in the workplace reveals that there seem to be a number of organizationally relevant attitudinal and behavioral outcomes associated with perceptions of discrimination (see Goldman et al., 2006 for a review). Specifically, previous research has found that a number of constructs are associated with the experience of discrimination. For example, a longitudinal examination of discrimination in the workplace found that perceived discrimination (as measured by self-reports) from coworkers, supervisors, or the organizations as a whole are negatively related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors for stigmatized individuals (Ensher et al., 2001). Similarly, Sanchez and Brock (1996) found that perceptions of discrimination were negatively related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and role ambiguity at work and in addition perceived discrimination was positively related to work tension. Likewise, in an examination of Protestant clergy, Foley, Hang-Yue, and Wang (2005) found that perceptions of discrimination were negatively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Thus, there is some evidence that perceptions of discrimination both overt (e.g., exposure to racial slurs, being passed over
for a promotion) and subtle (e.g., receiving more negative verbal and non-verbal behaviors) can have deleterious consequences for both recipients and organizations.

Fourth, a paucity of research examines discrimination during ongoing social interactions. Many studies examine discrimination using vignettes, diary studies, or self-report measure as such there is much less that focuses on discrimination during an actual interaction. As a result there have been calls for researchers to conduct research using more valid measure (see Hebl & Dovidio, 2005).

Fifth and lastly, very little research has examined outcomes associated with discrimination by considering that there may be very different types of discrimination. Clearly, past research has differentiated subtle from overt types of discrimination, but few studies have examined how (and differentially how) outcomes might be affected. The current research moves beyond previous studies by using experimental methodology to examine the extent to which the experience of formal and interpersonal discrimination in isolation, or in combination, during a social interaction impacts performance and other organizationally relevant outcomes. In exploring these relations, I begin by defining discrimination and discuss research on discrimination. Then, I describe experimental studies examining discrimination. I follow this by then presenting research on an individual difference variable that may moderate the influence of discrimination upon performance. And finally, I will present research on a mechanism that potentially explains why discrimination might negatively impact upon work-related outcomes.

Understanding Discrimination

Discrimination refers to the differential treatment given to an individual as a result of membership in a particular group (Dovidio, Brigham, Johnson, & Gaertner, 1996).
Thus, discrimination refers specifically to behaviors, positive or negative, given to people based solely upon membership in some group. In the current study, I focus on negative types of discrimination. In the past, overt expressions of discrimination were common. For instance, stigmatized individuals (e.g., Black individuals) were openly denied access in education, employment, transportation, and in other areas (e.g., housing, medical care). Social norms regarding egalitarianism, political correctness, and laws (i.e., Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964) has limited such overt expressions and as a result such expressions have declined markedly.

The United States' workforce is becoming increasingly diverse. Greater numbers of women, racial minorities, older workers, and disabled individuals are entering the workforce than ever before. As a result of increases in diversity, one might believe that diverse individuals no longer experience prejudiced-based differential treatment. Unfortunately, there is a growing body of evidence that supports the contrary. For instance, there are thousands of reported instances of discrimination every year. Specifically, in 2007 there were 82,792 complaints filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) filed by employees (EEOC, 2008). These complaints involved reports from members of all protected classes (e.g., women, disability, racially motivated discrimination, religion). Certainly the number of complaints filed with the EEOC is not a perfect indicator of discrimination, but a number of empirical studies reveal that discrimination continues to exist in workplace and non-workplace settings (Bertrand & Mullinathan, 2004; Davison & Burke, 2000; Hebl, Foster, Mannix, & Dovidio, 2002; Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Ferguson, 2001; Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, & Bylsma, 2003; Sechrist, Swim, & Mark 2003; for a review see Goldman, Gutek, Stein,
& Lewis, 2006). In sum, there is a large body of research that reveals that discrimination continues to plague stigmatized individuals. I will next discuss empirical studies examining manifestations of discrimination.

A number of studies provide empirical support for the presence of discrimination in hiring and other business-related contexts. For instance, a recent study by Bertrand and Mullianathan (2003) found that employers contact Black (versus White) and female (versus male) job applicants less often for follow-up interviews. Similarly, older workers are called back for phone interviews less than their younger counterparts (Lahey, 2005). In addition, Black small business owners are denied small business loans at twice the rate of Whites even when controlling for creditworthiness (Blanchflower, Levine, & Zimmerman, 2003). These examples are illegal; that is, federal legislation mandates that women, older workers, and ethnic minorities be called back for job interviews (or be given access to small business loans) at the same rate of their male, younger, and White counterparts. An interesting point to make here is that in each of these examples the recipients of discrimination may not readily detect such discrimination. That is, when applying for a job, one does not typically have access to the demographic characteristics or unique qualifications of other individuals that are applying for the same job. In sum, these recent studies reveal that legislation has not eliminated discrimination in hiring contexts.

Unlike the previous examples, individuals are often able to detect masked forms of illegal discrimination. This scenario occurred at Walgreen's that involved in a class action lawsuit because Black store managers believed they were disproportionately promoted in comparison to their White counterparts. Store managers received promotions
based upon store performance, but Walgreen's intentionally assigned Black store and pharmacy managers to low-income and low-performing stores in an attempt to prevent them from advancing in the organization (Levit, 2008). In this scenario, individuals might attribute the lack of advancement to an individual's inability to perform rather than discrimination. However, the disproportional assignment of Blacks to areas where high performance is unlikely (and subsequent promotions less likely) is indeed discriminatory. Similar instances of such ambiguous discrimination occurred in a number of other major companies as well (e.g., Denny's, Shoney's, Texaco). These examples illustrate how individuals may attempt to mask discrimination by finding alternative explanations for negative outcomes (i.e., failure to receive a promotion is a reflection of the manager's store performance rather than discrimination). Such acts of discrimination are potentially very costly to organizations (i.e., Walgreen's incurred expensive fines and penalties for their discriminatory practices).

In addition to these forms of differential treatment, recent research finds that discrimination also manifests itself more subtly. For instance, homosexual job applicants, pregnant job applicants, and obese customers all experience interpersonal interactions that are marked by more negative, yet subtle behaviors in comparison to their nonstigmatized counterparts (Hebl, et al, 2002; Hebl, King, Glick, Singletary, & Kazama, 2007; King, Shapiro, Hebl, Singletary, & Turner, 2006). For instance, homosexual job applicants report interactions characterized by both increased amounts of hostility, frowning, and interpersonal distance, as well as decreased amounts of eye contact, smiling, and friendliness than their assumed heterosexual counterparts (Hebl et al., 2002). Unlike the previous examples, this type of differential treatment is not illegal. There is no
legislation mandating the interpersonal treatment of job applicants, the number of words that should be spoken to employees, or how much smiling must be given to every job applicant, customer, or employee. Thus, recent research reveals that discrimination impacts stigmatized individuals in a variety of ways that range from having interactions that are characterized by increased amounts of negativity to being differentially called back for subsequent interviews. I will next discuss recent research that differentiates between these forms of discrimination.

Recent Conceptualization of Discrimination. Recently, researchers have distinguished between the traditional, overt (i.e., formal) and contemporary, subtle (i.e., interpersonal) forms of discrimination (Hebl et al., 2002). First, Hebl et al. (2002) use formal discrimination to describe behaviors that are generally illegal and prohibited by law. Such behaviors include differentially hiring, compensating, promoting, or terminating employees on the basis of a stigmatized status (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation). In addition, formal discrimination also includes the absence of behaviors that are specified within a job description or are required by the organization. For example, customer service personnel must offer assistance to their clientele if such assistance is requested. Likewise, physicians must answer the medical-related questions their patients ask of them. As there are serious consequences (e.g., lawsuits) for individuals and organizations that enact formal discrimination, many instances of formal discrimination have decreased. I will next discuss a more subtle form of discrimination.

Second, Hebl et al. (2002) use interpersonal discrimination to describe behaviors that are not mandated by law and consist of verbal (e.g., conversation length), nonverbal (e.g., eye contact, smiling), and paraverbal (e.g., rudeness, hostility) behaviors. Such
behaviors are not regulated by any legislation and often emerge during an interaction. For instance, Hebl et al. (2002) and Singletary and Hebl (in press) both found that perceived gay and lesbian job applicants (compared to assumed heterosexual applicants) received greater amounts of negative interpersonal treatment from store personnel in the form of decreased smiling, interaction length, and comfort, and increased displays of anxiety, nervousness, and hostility. Similar results were found for heavyweight women (King et al., 2006), pregnant women (Hebl et al., 2007), and ethnic minorities (Baron & Hebl, 2009).

Non-workplace studies reveal similar results. For instance, daily diary studies of Black students demonstrate the high incidence of subtle, interpersonal discrimination (Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, Bylsma, 2003). A previous study by Swim et al. (2003) asked Black college students to write about their daily experiences; results revealed that the most common discriminatory behaviors reported by participants consisted of glares from majority group members, or engaging in interactions in which individuals were rude or exhibited awkward behaviors (Swim et al., 2003). Thus, rather (or in addition to) than receiving overt forms of discrimination, stigmatized individuals might receive differential treatment in the form of subtle, interpersonal displays. In sum, a recent body of research (both in organizational and non work-related contexts) has found that the differential treatment individuals receive is characterized by subtle, yet negative interpersonal displays.

*Overview of Discrimination Research.* Now that we have a framework for understanding manifestations of discrimination, I will next present an overview of three themes pertaining to discrimination that have received significant research attention. The
purpose of this section is to give the reader an idea about the topics that have been
typically studied. Thus, the research that I will be presenting may or may not pertain to
the workplace. In particular, I will discuss: a) when discrimination is likely to occur, b)
who is likely to perceive discrimination, and c) when discrimination is likely to be
perceived by nonstigmatized and stigmatized individuals.

*When Does Discrimination Occur?* Snyder, Kleck, Strenta, and Mentzer (1974)
conducted one of the earliest studies designed to address the question of when
discriminatory behavior is likely to emerge by examining the stigma of disability. Snyder
et al. (1974) found that individuals preferred avoiding an interaction with a disabled
individual, but only when there was an alternative explanation for their behavior.
Specifically, when participants were given a choice -- in this case the opportunity to
watch a movie with a stigmatized individual, or watching a dissimilar movie alone --
participants differentially selected to view the movie that a stigmatized individual had not
chosen to watch. Thus, rather than being perceived as prejudiced, the participant could
give an alternative explanation for his or her choice (i.e., that the decision was a result of
personal movie preferences not the result of wanting to avoid the stigmatized individual);
however, it is important to note that movies were counterbalanced. Thus, early research
revealed that individuals were likely to discriminate when nondiscriminatory
justifications for their behavior were available.

Since the time of this seminal research, researchers have focused on identifying
organizational contexts that increase the likelihood of discrimination. Specifically, a
number of studies examine the extent to which compliance behaviors are related to actual
discrimination. For instance Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh, and Vaslow (2000) asked
participants to assume the role of a hiring manager and manipulated information pertaining to the organization’s climate for diversity. Participants were given information from a supervisor either explicitly stating that it was necessary to hire a White individual for a high level position given that the majority of the company was White and as a result an ethnic minority individual might have to overcome obstacles related to his or her race (climate for racial bias) or no such statement (climate for equality). When participants experienced a climate for racial bias, they were more likely to select a White individual for the position compared to when they were in a climate for equality. Thus, there is some evidence that individuals are likely to discriminate when given a business justification for their actions.

Results in a more recent study replicated and extended Brief et al. (2000) by examining the extent to which implicit attitudes interacted with organizational climate to predict whether or not individuals were likely to discriminate (Ziegert & Hanges, 2005). Specifically, implicitly racist attitudes interacted with a climate for organizational inequality to predict discrimination. Likewise a very recent study examining compliance behaviors found similar results. In this study, the researchers were interested in examining organizational commitment as a predictor of compliance behaviors (Peterson & Dietz, 2008). Results revealed that individuals who were highly committed to the organization were more likely to follow a discriminatory directive from a supervisor than individuals who were not highly committed to the organization. Thus, there is some evidence that situational variables (in this case organizational climate) may influence the extent to which individuals are likely to discriminate.
Additional research examined the influence of other contextual variables that are linked to differential treatment. Specifically, recent research by Diekman and Hirisey (2007) found that individuals are likely to discriminate against older individuals but that the tendency to do so varies according to specific organizational characteristics. For instance, older workers were less likely to be selected for positions in dynamic organizational contexts (i.e., the organization rewards innovation and is consistently referred to as ground breaking) compared to stable companies (i.e., stable even in the face of current economic climate). There were no differences in hireability for younger applicants as a function of organizational characteristics. Thus, this study provides support for the influence of contextual variables on discrimination.

Additional research has examined the influence of both individual difference variables of perceivers and contextual information to determine when discrimination is likely to occur. A study by Stewart and Perlow (2001) examined race-related discrimination and did not find any instances of formal discrimination. That is, assumed Black and White applicants were equally likely to be hired for positions. However, individuals with negative attitudes toward Blacks were more confident in their hiring recommendations when evaluating a Black applicant for a low status job (i.e., janitor) compared to high status jobs (i.e., architect) or when evaluating White applicants for high status jobs compared to low status jobs (Stewart & Perlow, 2001). In this study, discrimination manifested itself in subtle ways in that individuals were more comfortable recommending individuals for stereotypical positions than non-stereotypical ones. In sum, these studies reveal that there are a number of contextual variables that influence when individuals are likely to discriminate.
Who is Likely to Perceive Discrimination? Previous research reveals that when discriminatory actions are overt in nature both stigmatized and nonstigmatized individuals are likely to perceive the action as being discriminatory. However, individual difference variables influence perceptions of discrimination when differential treatment of an ambiguous nature. A number of studies in non work-related contexts examined several psychological phenomena related to perceptions of discrimination. For instance, previous research reveals that individuals with low self-esteem are more likely to perceive discrimination than individuals with high self-esteem (Cassidy, 2002). Research examining the relation between self-esteem and discrimination has generally been correlational in nature. Thus, it is not clear whether or not high self-esteem causes individuals to be more likely to perceive discrimination or if experiencing discrimination protects self-esteem by giving individuals an external attribution for negative outcomes. Previous research also reveals that individuals with a high need for approval are more likely to perceive discrimination than individuals who are low on this trait (Cassidy, O’Conner, Howe, & Warden, 2005).

In addition to self-esteem and need for approval, a number of other individual difference characteristics have been examined. For instance, individuals that highly identify with their stigmatized group are more likely to perceive discrimination than those who are less identified (Operario & Fiske, 2001). An examination of subtle sexism directed towards women found similar results. Specifically, women who highly identified with their gender were more likely to attribute subtle displays of negativity to sexism compared to women who were not highly identified (Swim, Mallet, Russo-Devosa, & Stangor 2005). Similarly, individuals high in stigma consciousness are more likely to
perceive discrimination than those low in stigma consciousness (Pinel, 1999). In sum, there are a number of psychological constructs (e.g., self-esteem, stigma consciousness) that are related to perceptions of discrimination.

*When is Discrimination Likely to be Perceived?* In addition to examining individual difference characteristics associated with perceptions of discrimination, a number of studies have identified situations during which stigmatized individuals are likely to perceive discrimination using both work and non-workplace contexts. I will next discuss some of this research in detail. For instance, previous research by Elkins and Phillips (1999) examined perceptions of sex discrimination claims for the perspective of jury members. Participants (men and women) in this study read short vignettes pertaining to discrimination against women in a fictitious organization. Results reveal that female participants were more likely to attribute negative treatment to sexism than men. A follow-up study that examined actual evidence presented to jurors during a sex discrimination trial revealed identical results. In the follow-up study, attributions to discrimination varied as a function of gender with women being more likely to attribute negative treatment to discrimination than men. More recent research by Elkins, Phillips, and Konopaske (2002) replicated earlier results. In a series of studies, the researches found that, attributions to sex discrimination varied as a function of gender (Study 1, Study 2, and Study 3). In addition, the researchers examined a potential mechanism of the relation and found that the relation was mediated by perceived threat (Study 2). Specifically, women are more likely to receive negative treatment as a result of their sex, and thus are likely to identify with women who report experiencing discrimination based on their sex. Similar effects were found for men when the context was changed (Study 3).
That is, when litigation was related to child custody, men were more likely to make discrimination attributions than women. This is a scenario that men may perceive to be threatening, as women are more likely to be awarded custody of children than men. Thus, there is some evidence that stigmatized individuals are more likely to perceive discrimination than non-stigmatized individuals in threatening situations (and vice versa).

Very recent research by Avery, McKay and Wilson (2008) found that women are more likely to perceive sex-based discrimination than men, and that ethnic minorities (i.e., Blacks, Latinos) are more likely to perceive race-based discrimination than Whites. In addition, their study revealed that the demographic composition of the organization (e.g., number of minority co-workers, race of their supervisor) influenced the extent to which individuals perceived discrimination. Specifically, ethnic minorities who reported having a same-race supervisor perceived less discrimination than ethnic minorities who reported having a supervisor of a different race. Thus, there is evidence that there are contextual variables that are likely to predict when individuals are likely to perceive discrimination.

To reiterate, in this section I have reviewed some of the most commonly studied themes in discrimination research. First, situational factors influence an individual’s likelihood of discrimination. Second, individual difference variables influence perceptions of discrimination. And third, nonstigmatized and stigmatized individuals differ when making attributions to discrimination. In sum, previous research provides individuals with a better understanding of discrimination and such information can be utilized for remediating differential treatment.
Much of the research mentioned thus far has been correlational in nature and as a result, it is impossible to ascertain any directional relations between discrimination and other constructs. Thus, it is imperative that more research be conducted that utilizes experimental designs to address this limitation. Furthermore when considering research on discrimination that has been conducted to examine organizational constructs, most of the studies have typically examined attitudinal variables (e.g., commitment, turnover intentions, satisfaction) associated with the experience of biased behaviors. In addition, very little research examines actual behavioral outcomes associated with discrimination (c.f., King et al., 2006; Shapiro, King, & Quinones, 2007). Of particular relevance to the current study is the paucity of research examining the extent to which discrimination (both overt and subtle) impacts work performance. Given that stigmatized individuals receive inequitable treatment, it is somewhat alarming that there is a lack of research that considers the affect of discrimination upon recipients in workplace contexts. I will next review a number of experimental studies examining discrimination.

*Experimental Studies on Discrimination.* A growing body of research that manipulates actual experiences of discrimination recently emerged. Such research has mostly been conducted in laboratory settings. For instance, Richeson and colleagues conducted a series of studies examining actual interactions between ethnic minorities (i.e., Blacks, Hispanics) and majority group members (i.e., White individuals). Results reveal that when individuals are placed in situations where they must interact with an individual of a different race—in this case Black and White participants—they (both White and Black participants) show reduced performance on a subsequent Stroop Color Naming Task (Richeson & Shelton, 2003; Richeson, Trawalter, & Shelton, 2005).
Richeson and colleagues posit that interracial interactions require more effortful regulation than interactions involving individuals of the same racial background. Thus, simply engaging in mixed interactions can tax valuable cognitive resources and lead to resource depletion.

In addition to cognitive resource depletion, previous research also finds that mixed interactions (those involving stigmatized and nonstigmatized individuals) may be associated with other negative outcomes. In a laboratory study, Shelton and Richeson (2006) asked White participants to either try to have a good interaction or attempt to appear non-prejudiced. Both individuals who were told to try and appear non-prejudiced, as well as those who truly harbored racially motivated biases (as measured by a racism scale) exhibited negative, interpersonal displays when interacting with stigmatized individuals. Specifically, results reveal that the interactions are characterized by increased amounts of anxiety (as reported by the non-stigmatized participants). Similarly, stigmatized individuals report their interaction partners as less comfortable engaging in the conversations. Thus, it appears that stigmatized individuals are able to perceive the "unnaturalness" of the interaction on the part of the nonstigmatized individual (by picking upon the subtle cues) and may not only enjoy the interaction less, but may also potentially perceive these nonverbal displays as being discriminatory in nature (Operario & Fiske, 2001). Thus, attempts to appear as nonprejudiced may lead to perceptions of interpersonal discrimination and result in negative consequences (i.e., poor interaction).

In sum, laboratory studies have found that mixed interactions involving both nonstigmatized and stigmatized individuals tax valuable cognitive resources on the part of both nonstigmatized and stigmatized individuals. It is important to note that in these
studies, perceptions of discrimination were being measured during an ongoing social interaction. However, Shelton and colleagues focus primarily on perceptions of differential treatment during an interaction and many of the studies do not explicitly manipulate discrimination.

A recent study examined the organizational consequences of interpersonal discrimination. King et al. (2006) examined the inequitable treatment given to obese and average weight shoppers and the organizational consequences of discrimination. Specifically, individuals reporting more negative treatment in the form of interpersonal discrimination from store personnel were less likely to return to the store, spent less money than anticipated, and also were less likely to recommend the store to friends compared to individuals who did not experience negative differential treatment. Thus, there is some evidence that when individuals experience discrimination (even if the behavior is subtle in nature) there are deleterious outcomes for organizations. Specifically, interpersonal discrimination exhibited by store personnel has negatively impacts an organization’s bottom-line profitability. King et al. (2006) used an experimental design; however, the experimental component of the study focused on examining the context in which discrimination was likely occur (i.e., the influence of weight on interpersonal treatment), and not on the outcomes of discrimination. When examining the outcomes associated with the experience of discrimination (i.e., the bottom-line consequences of discrimination), King et al. (2006) used a correlational design (i.e., surveyed women who were actually shopping).

Of particular relevance to the current research is the extent to which different types of discrimination impact work-related outcomes in general and performance
specifically. Very recent research has examined the influence of discrimination on performance. However, previous studies primarily examined performance on cognitive tasks. I will next discuss experimental studies involving discrimination and performance in greater detail.

*Discrimination and Performance.* A recent study examined the natural behaviors that trainers exhibited toward their trainees (Shapiro, King, & Quinones, 2007). Shapiro et al. (2007) examined responses of trainers who believed trainees were obese (stigmatized) or average weight (nonstigmatized). Results reveal that when trainers perceived trainees as being overweight, they had lower expectations for trainee performance and the trainers acted in ways that confirmed their low expectations (i.e., gave fewer directives regarding the task). These lowered expectations were subsequently related to decreases in actual trainee performance. Specifically, differential treatment resulted in a self-fulfilling prophecy for trainees. Thus, there is some evidence that stigmatized individuals receive differential treatment which results in decreased performance in training settings compared to nonstigmatized individuals. It is worth noting, that Shapiro et al. (2007) were not specifically examining interpersonal discrimination.

Similarly, Adams, Garcia, Purdie-Vaughns, and Steele (2006) examined the impact of perceived discrimination upon subsequent performance in an educational context. Adams et al. (2006) examined the extent to which the experience of discrimination impacts subsequent performance on tasks involving logic and working memory. Specifically, Adams et al. (2006) found that female participants, who were told their "confederate" instructor might be prejudiced, performed worse on a subsequent
logic test than women who were not given such information. The threat of sexism, however, had no effect on the subsequent performance of men. Adams et al. (2006) posit that sexist attitudes directed against women pose systemic threats to a woman’s identity. That is, sexism against women traditionally has been linked to a number of negative outcomes for women (e.g., being assigned to devalued positions) and an overall perception of women’s inferiority. Men, however, do not face such devalued threats to their identity as a result of sexism. Adams et al. (2006) provide some support for the notion that perceived prejudice impairs subsequent performance. Specifically, when women suspect that they will be interacting with a person who is prejudiced, they perform worse on a subsequent task. In sum, there is some evidence that discrimination (either actual or expected) negatively impacts an individual’s performance (in both training and test taking situations). Adams et al. (2006) were not specifically examining discrimination. That is, the researchers did not manipulate the actual treatment given to participants by confederates. Specifically, participants interacted with a confederate who enacted a uniform script across trials. Thus, this study provides a framework for understanding how a target’s belief that a person is biased, even without behavioral confirmation, influences the target’s ability to performance subsequent tasks.

A small, yet growing body of research tries to determine whether or not overt and subtle forms of discrimination have differential impacts upon subsequent performance (Dardenne, Dumont, & Bollier, 2007; Salvatore & Shelton, 2007). Such research reveals that overt and ambiguous forms of discrimination differentially impact an individual’s ability to complete subsequent tasks. Specifically, for stigmatized individuals subtle forms of discrimination have more deleterious consequences upon consequent task
completion than the experience of overt forms of discrimination. For example, recent research by Dardenne, Dumont, and Bollier (2007) found that presenting women with statements involving benevolent sexism (e.g., paternalistic behaviors implying that men must help women to learn tasks), compared to hostile (e.g., statements implying that women are not good leaders) or no sexism, was related to impaired performance on a subsequent task involving working memory. Benevolent sexism may be reflective of more subtle forms of discrimination. For instance, suggestions that women need help from men is not overtly discriminatory in nature, instead it is ambiguous. That is, one may not easily discern between whether or not such statements are suggestive of women's inability to do a task without the help of a man, or if the person is genuinely offering assistance that would be offered to all new employees (regardless of sex). In sum, Dardenne, Dumont, and Bollier (2007) reveal that the consequences of bias may vary as a function of the type of bias exhibited. A limitation of this study, as is the case in previous studies, is that the researchers were not explicitly examining discrimination.

Additional research by Salvatore and Shelton (2007) has also tried to disentangle the differential effects of overt and ambiguous forms of discrimination on subsequent performance. In this study, participants read hiring recommendations that were overtly, ambiguously, or not at all motivated by prejudice. After reading the recommendation, participants completed what Salvatore and Shelton (2007) refer to as a cognitive task (i.e., Stroop color-naming task). Results reveal that there were no differences in cognitive impairment when the recommendation was not at all biased for both Black and White participants. However when the recommendation was either overtly or ambiguously biased, subsequent performance varied as a function of participant race. Specifically,
when the recommendation was obviously biased, White (compared to Black) participants performed worse on the task. Conversely, when the recommendation was ambiguously biased, Black (compared to White) participants performed worse on a Stroop Color naming task. The authors posit that performance decrements for White participants were potentially due to unfamiliarity with encountering blatant prejudice, whereas performance decrements for Black participants were a result of attributional ambiguity or uncertainty. Specifically, Black participants used resources in an attempt to discern the underlying motive behind the recommendation. More specifically, Black participants suffered performance decrements as a result of trying to determine whether or not the recommendation was driven by prejudice. Thus, it appears that for stigmatized individuals (in these cases women and Black participants), the experience of subtle forms of discrimination may be more detrimental to performance than more overt, obvious forms of discrimination as a result of attributional ambiguity. I will next discuss research on attributional ambiguity in some detail.

Attributional Ambiguity. One potential explanation for decreases in performance as a result of experiencing interpersonal discrimination is attributional ambiguity. Previous research revealed that that members of stigmatized groups experience considerable ambiguity with respect to the motivation behind others’ behavior toward them (Crocker & Major, 1989; Major, Feinstein, Crocker, 1994; Berry Mendes, Major, McCoy, & Blascovich, 2008). For instance, in a laboratory experiment, Berry Mendes et al., (2006) asked participants to make a speech about why they would make a good friend and after giving the speech, participants were either socially rejected (i.e., they were told that the confederate “evaluator” was not interested in being friends or roommates with
the participant) or socially accepted (i.e., they were told that the confederate "evaluator" was moderately interested in developing a friendship or potentially being roommates with the participant) by an evaluator of either the same or different race. In conditions where the participant and evaluator were of the same race both White and Black participants responded negatively to social rejection and positively toward social acceptance. An interesting pattern emerged in conditions where the evaluator was of a different race. When social rejection was experienced by a different race evaluator, both White and Black participants reported greater amounts of anger and more negative physiological responses (i.e., increased blood pressure) than when the evaluator was of the same race. Thus, social rejection from a different race evaluator is more upsetting than rejection from an individual of the same race.

Most interesting is the pattern that emerged in response to social acceptance from a different race evaluator. Black and White participants responded differently to social acceptance from a different race evaluator. Specifically, White participants responded positively to social acceptance from a different race evaluator, whereas Black participants were suspicious of the social acceptance and exhibited less positive emotions when receiving social acceptance from a different race evaluator. The authors attributed the findings to attributional ambiguity. When given negative information from a different race evaluator, individuals can attribute the behavior to prejudice. Conversely, when given moderately positive information from a different race evaluator, stigmatized individuals may wonder about the underlying motive of the moderately positive ratings. That is, individuals may wonder if the evaluator is really not interested in becoming a
friend and is instead adhering to social norms of acceptance and non-bias, or if the evaluator is really interested in potentially developing a friendship.

Attributional ambiguity occurs because individuals have an alternative explanation for the cause of someone’s behavior. Specifically, Crocker and Major (1989) posit that when individuals experience negative outcomes they may attribute the outcome to either prejudice based upon their membership in a particular group or as a result of their own personal actions or deserving. For instance, when stigmatized individuals receive a poor grade on a written assignment from a nonstigmatized grader, they might attribute the grade to either their own poor performance on the writing assignment or to the prejudicial attitudes of the grader. Similarly, social rejection from a different race evaluator may be the result of one’s own performance on a task or may arise as a result of prejudice or social norms. Thus, when participants believe a person is prejudiced, they are able to discount the negative feedback as being motivated by prejudice and not their own abilities. In a discriminatory context, when differential treatment is overtly negative in nature, individuals are easily able to label such experiences as being motivated by prejudice. Conversely, when discrimination is subtle in nature, individuals must determine the cause (i.e., attribution) of the behavior. Thus, individuals are likely to expend cognitive resources in an attempt to determine an attribution for negative treatment.

Previous research on attributional ambiguity focused mostly on the self-protective factors of attributional ambiguity (Crocker & Major, 1989; Major, Kaiser, & McCoy, 2003). For instance, when receiving negative feedback from a different race evaluator stigmatized individuals can protect their self-esteem by attributing an undesirable grade
to prejudice rather than to their own abilities. Rather than focus on the benefits of attributional ambiguity, this dissertation examines the cognitive costs that may be associated with experiencing ambiguity. That is, the rationalization that must take place to categorize another individual's behavior may potentially tax cognitive resources that may lead to detriments in performance. For instance, a stigmatized individual may wonder if the reason for a lack of being hired was the result of prejudice or is there an alternative explanation (i.e., a more qualified applicant obtained the position). In order to determine the attribution behind the behavior, stigmatized individuals must spend energy to determine the true motive.

The current research extends previous recent research by specifically examining the extent to which the actual experience of formal and interpersonal discrimination influence subsequent task performance. Previous research examines the extent to which overt and ambiguous forms of discrimination impact subsequent performance, however, studies have not examined actual discrimination. Instead previous studies used vignettes (or manipulated the type of information given to participants in an attempt to induce perceptions of discrimination rather than manipulate actual discrimination). In addition, to my knowledge, previous research has not examined the extent to which formal and interpersonal types of discrimination impact performance or the cumulative effect of experiencing combined discrimination (i.e., both formal and interpersonal simultaneously). In addition, the current study extends previous research by examining the extent to which formal and interpersonal discrimination influence performance in a job-related context (e.g., managerial in-basket task). Previous research focused on
examining performance on tasks that are not reflective of tasks that individuals typically perform on the job. The current research seeks to address this limitation.

Based upon previous research (e.g., Salvatore & Shelton, 2007), I predict that subtle, interpersonal discrimination may be particularly detrimental to performance because individuals use resources in attempts to make attributions regarding the nature of another person’s behaviors. Thus, in line with previous research, I hypothesize that subtle, interpersonal discrimination negatively impacts subsequent performance to a greater extent than overt forms of discrimination (Adams et al., 2006; Dardenne et al., 2007; Salvatore & Shelton, 2007).

*Hypothesis 1a:* The experience of interpersonal discrimination will impair performance. That is, women receiving interpersonal discrimination will perform worse than women in the control group.

Overt forms of discrimination are not cognitively taxing because individuals can readily attribute the motives for the behavior to prejudice. For example, when overhearing a sexist statement individuals do not utilize resources in trying to understand the underlying cause of someone’s behavior. Thus, when individuals receive either formal, overt forms of behaviors, as well as both formal and subtle, interpersonal forms of behaviors, they are able to automatically associate the behaviors with prejudice and do not need to use resources to try to discern the cause of the behaviors.

*Hypothesis 1b:* The experience of interpersonal discrimination will impair performance to a greater extent than formal discrimination. That is, women receiving interpersonal discrimination will perform worse than women who receive formal discrimination.
Hypothesis 1c: The experience of subtle discrimination will impair performance to a greater extent than the simultaneous experience of both interpersonal and formal discrimination. That is, women receiving interpersonal discrimination will perform worse than women who receive combined (interpersonal and formal).

Understanding the Relation between Discrimination and Job Performance.

There are many potential factors that might influence the relation between discrimination and job performance. As a result it is important to examine constructs that may lend additional insight into why this relation occurs. One such construct may be related to the extent to which an individual is likely to be impacted by the negative consequences of discrimination. For instance, experiencing discrimination at work might deplete valuable cognitive resources, alter an individual’s mood, decrease an individual’s desire to work hard, and may also influence an individual’s perceptions of the organization or job. Specifically, discrimination may be debilitating to performance because individuals become so engrossed in the experience that they are unable to attend to anything else (i.e., they experience depletion). Alternatively, discrimination might serve as a motivating or de-motivating factor. It is plausible that for some, receiving discrimination will induce a "desire" to overcome the obstacle and for others discrimination may decrease one’s motivation to continue completing requisite job tasks. In addition, there may be some individual difference variables that alter the impact of discrimination. Each of these constructs may influence the relation between discrimination and job performance.

In addition, relations between discrimination and subsequent performance may potentially be explained by a number of other constructs. An additional focus of the
current study is in examining the extent to which various cognitive resource depletion and in-group identity impact the relation between the experience of discrimination and subsequent performance. Understanding the mechanisms that influence this relation enables researchers to identify groups of individuals that may be particularly likely to be impacted by the experience of discrimination. In addition, this information can be useful for developing interventions that may potentially be tailored for specific groups of individuals. I will next discuss in-group identity, self-regulation, and ego depletion in greater detail.

*Individual differences, discrimination, and performance*

*Individual differences and discrimination*. One particularly relevant individual difference variable that may be related to discrimination is in-group identity. Over the past decade a number of studies examine the impact of in-group identity upon perceptions of discrimination, as well as the consequences associated with being the recipient of prejudicial displays (Kobrynowicz & Branscombe, 1997; Major Quinton, & Schmader, 2002; Operario & Fiske, 2001). Research by Operario and Fiske (2001) found that African American students who identified strongly with their racial group were more likely to perceive ambiguous behaviors exhibited by a White student as discriminatory in nature compared to those who did not identify as strongly with being a Black individual. Research examining women’s perceptions of discrimination found similar results. Specifically, women who highly identified with their gender were more likely to perceive subtle forms of sexism as being discriminatory in nature compared to women who did not strongly identify with their gender (Kobrynowicz & Branscombe, 1997; Major, Quinton, & Schmader, 2003; Swim et al., 2001). Thus, individuals who highly identify with a
stigmatized status (i.e., race or gender) are more likely to perceive ambiguous behaviors as being motivated by prejudice than those who are not highly identified.

Though group identification predicted the extent to which ambiguous actions were perceived as being discriminatory, it is worth noting that group identification did not predict the extent to which more overt actions were seen as discriminatory in nature. That is, regardless of the extent to which individuals identified with their gender, women were equally likely to perceive an overtly sexist act as being discriminatory in nature. This is likely due to the obviously biased nature of overt displays of prejudice. In sum, there is some evidence that individuals differ in the extent to which they identify with their group which in turn impacts the extent to which ambiguous actions are perceived as being discriminatory in nature.

Additional research examining the extent to which being highly identified with one’s group has a positive or negative effect for individuals who experience prejudice reveals conflicting results. For instance, some studies have found evidence that when individuals highly identify with their marginalized group, they may experience more negative consequences as a result of prejudice and discrimination than those who are not as highly identified with their group. In a study examining emotional consequences of sexist statements, McCoy and Major (2003) found that following a negative evaluation by a sexist man, women who were more highly identified with being a woman reported being more depressed than women who were not highly identified with their gender. Since a greater portion of one’s esteem consists of being a member of a particular group (e.g., race, gender), when someone denigrates the group, individuals highly identifying with their group may internalize this occurrence more than someone who is not as highly
identified with their group. Thus, there is evidence that when individuals experience discrimination, being highly identified with one’s group may increase the negative individual level effects of the experience.

Additional research in the area reveals the opposite. Specifically, some researchers posit that being highly identified with one’s group serves as a buffer against the display of prejudicial biases (Crocker & Major, 1989). For example, research by Branscombe et al. (1999) found that African American college students who highly identified with their racial group experienced fewer amounts of depressed emotions after perceiving discrimination compared to those who were not as highly identified with their race. Researchers posit that being highly identified with one’s group strengthens one’s sense of belonging to the group and allows individuals to focus on positive aspects of the group (Twenge & Crocker, 2002). Thus, there is a line of research that finds support for the notion that being highly identified with one’s group serves as a buffer against the negative effects of prejudice. Since, previous research on gender identity has revealed conflicting results, I sought a similar, yet alternative individual difference variable that might explain the relations between discrimination and performance.

Another individual difference variable of particular interest is stigma consciousness. Stigma consciousness refers to a heightened awareness of one’s marginalized status and the potential for perceiving bias that is directed at group members (Pinel, 1999). Stigma consciousness is similar to group identity in that, “people high in stigma consciousness may feel a certain degree of connection to other members of their group” (Pinel, 1999: 115). However, being highly identified is not a necessary
condition for high stigma consciousness. Thus, stigma consciousness is a separate construct.

Stigma consciousness is the expectancy that one will be stereotyped or discriminated against as a result of membership in a stigmatized group (e.g., underrepresented minority, women, disabled). Much of the research examining stigma consciousness has examined stigma consciousness with respect to race. However, there are a number of studies that examine stigma consciousness with respect to gender. For instance, Pinel (2004) found that women high in stigma consciousness viewed negative evaluations from a male as discriminatory to a greater extent than women low in stigma consciousness. Similar effects have been found for race. Specifically, African Americans high in stigma consciousness perceive more discrimination in ambiguous situations than those low in stigma consciousness (Pinel, 1999). Results of a longitudinal study of non-faculty women working in a major university revealed that perceptions of discrimination, in this case operationalized as disrespect, mediated the relationship between stigma consciousness and turnover intentions (Pinel & Paulin, 2005). Specifically, individuals high in stigma consciousness were more likely to perceive disrespect that in turn was related to turnover intentions. In addition, turnover intentions predicted actual behaviors. Specifically, in a follow-up study two years after the initial study, participants’ intentions to leave the original predicted whether or not individuals were still working at the university. Thus, stigma consciousness may be related both turnover intentions and the extent to which individuals actually leave the organization.

Since previous results reveal that high stigma consciousness is associated with perceptions of discrimination, I anticipate that individuals that are high in stigma
consciousness are more likely to perceive ambiguous actions as being discriminatory in nature than those who are low in stigma consciousness. In addition, since individuals in high in stigma consciousness are more likely to attribute ambiguous behaviors as being discriminatory in nature, I predict that individuals high in stigma consciousness will perform better on job-related tasks than individuals who are low in stigma consciousness.

_Hypothesis 2a:_ When receiving interpersonal forms of discrimination, women high in stigma consciousness are more likely to perceive discrimination than those who are low in stigma consciousness.

_Hypothesis 2b:_ The relationship between interpersonal discrimination and job performance will be moderated by stigma consciousness, such that individuals who are high in stigma consciousness will perform better than those who are low in stigma consciousness.

**Attentional Resource Depletion (Ego Depletion), Discrimination, and Performance**

According to many theorists, individuals have a limited amount of resources (i.e., attention, energy) at any given point in time (Baumeister et al., 1998; Beal, Weiss, Barros, & MacDermid, 2005). Regulating one’s behavior (e.g., persisting toward a goal, focusing attention) requires the use of such resources and thus depletes personal resources. The term ego depletion (attentional resource depletion) refers to a temporary reduction in one’s ability or willingness to engage in subsequent activities that is caused by earlier acts of volition (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998). Research has supported this notion by finding that when individuals exert self-control they suffer later performance decrements. For instance, when individuals are asked to control their affective responses, they perform worse on a subsequent handgrip exercise (Muraven,
Tice, & Baumeister, 1998). Similarly, individuals that are asked to suppress their affective responses later complete fewer solvable anagrams than those who are not asked to suppress their natural responses (Baumeister et al., 1998). Thus, there is some evidence that regulating one's behavior—in this case affect—results in performance decrements on subsequent tasks. In organizations, individuals may need to devote resources toward task completion. This is particularly true in the case of novel or complex tasks (Kanfer, Ackerman, Murtha, Dugdale, & Nelson, 1994). When attention is focused on something other than the task at hand, subsequent task performance is impaired.

Recent research by Schmeichel, Vohs, and Baumeister (2003) examined the impact of resource depletion upon subsequent performance. In a series of studies, Schmeichel and colleagues (2003) found that self-regulation was related to decrements in performance, but only for tasks requiring central executive functioning (e.g., fluid intelligence). Specifically the researchers (Schmeichel, Vohs, & Baumeister, 2003) asked participants to watch a videotaped interview. Half of the participants were told to avoid looking at words that appeared on the bottom of the screen. The other half of the participants was not given this instruction. Afterwards, the participants were asked to complete measures of intellectual performance requiring active control and self-regulated thinking (i.e., GRE, CET) or automatic processing which involves retrieving information from memory (i.e., GMAT, memorizing a list of nonsense syllables). Participants who regulated their behavior performed worse on tasks that required active control—require executive functioning—compared to those who were not instructed to regulate their behavior. However, when tasks required more automatic processing (did not involve the central executive), neither group suffered performance decrements. Thus, there is some
evidence that the use of self-regulatory resources may be linked to poorer performance
but only for tasks that require the use of executive functioning for successful completion.
In sum, utilizing attentional resources (in the form of self-regulation) is related to
impaired performance on subsequent tasks that require use of the same resources.

Very recent research examines the extent to which prejudice and discrimination
can be depleting for stigmatized individuals. For instance, a recent study found that
simply making individuals aware of their stigmatized status diminished an individual’s
ability to control their behavior (Inzlicht, McKay, & Aronson, 2006). Specifically,
individuals who reported being highly sensitive to prejudice based on their stigma (in this
case their race) reported being less able to self-regulate (engage in effortful persistence
on undesirable tasks) than individuals who were not high in stigma sensitivity (Inzlicht et
al., 2006, Study 1). Similarly, priming race-based stereotypes about performance (e.g.,
telling Black participants that the experiment contained questions that measured
intelligence) was enough to impair performance on the Stroop Color Naming Test
(Inzlicht et al., 2006 Study 2). Likewise, telling female participants that the experiment
contained questions that were similar to those found on the mathematics portion of the
SAT impaired performance on a handgrip exercise (Inzlicht et al., 2006, Study 3). In
both of these instances no test was ever given. Thus, recent research reveals that making
one’s stigmatized status salient depletes attentional resources and in addition, that
individuals who naturally have a heightened awareness to stigma-based prejudice are less
able to regulate their behaviors than individuals who are less aware of their stigmatized
status.
There are several studies that examine the relations between resource depletion and prejudice during actual interactions. For instance, recent research examining interpersonal interactions explored the extent to which interpersonal interactions deplete self-regulatory resources. Richeson and Shelton (2003) found that White individuals who show high implicit bias perform worse on a Stroop color naming task after interacting with a Black compared to White interaction partner. These findings were replicated in a sample of Blacks participants (Richeson, Trawalter, & Shelton, 2005). Specifically, Black participants with high in-group favoritism performed worse on a Stroop color-naming task after interacting with White interaction partners. These findings suggest that when people interact with individuals whom they believe may harbor prejudice, or those whom they possess prejudices against, the resulting interactions require the use of self-regulatory resources (as measured by the Stroop color naming task). As a result, individuals perform worse on a subsequent task involving attentional resources thus indicating ego depletion. These findings may be applicable for other stigmas as well (e.g., gender, disability, sexual orientation). For example, it is plausible to predict that women who believe they are interacting with an individual that is prejudiced against women will utilize attentional resources (i.e., engage in self-regulatory behavior) and suffer later performance decrements on a subsequent task as a result of attentional resource depletion. That is, women who interact with individuals whom are believed to harbor sexist attitudes will have fewer attentional resources than women who do not have this belief. The decrease in regulatory resources will be related to decreased performance on a subsequent task that requires the use of such resources.
Whether performance decrements actually occur may vary according to the type of discrimination that individuals receive. For instance, when stigmatized individuals receive overt forms of discrimination, they are easily able to label such behaviors as discriminatory and do not have to engage in a lot of thought about why the action occurred (Salvatore & Shelton, 2007). Since the origin of the behavior is easily attributable to prejudice, individuals do not need to expend resources trying to discern the cause of the actions. However, when stigmatized individuals receive more subtle forms of discrimination, they may use resources as a result of thinking about why the treatment occurred. Because more subtle, covert forms of discrimination are ambiguous, recipients are likely to spend some time trying to determine whether the displays are indeed discriminatory in nature. Thus, in line with previous research, I hypothesize that individuals experiencing subtle forms of discrimination will have fewer attentional resources than individuals who do not experience discrimination, or that experience overt forms of discrimination.

_Hypothesis 3a:_ Individuals who experience interpersonal discrimination will have fewer attentional resources than individuals in the control condition.

_Hypothesis 3b:_ Individuals who experience interpersonal discrimination will have fewer attentional resources than individuals in the formal discrimination condition.

_Hypothesis 3c:_ Individuals who experience interpersonal discrimination will have fewer attentional resources than individuals who receive combined forms of discrimination.

Though individuals who experience interpersonal discrimination are likely to have fewer attentional resources than individuals who do not experience subtle biases, the
effects may depend upon the extent to which an individual is likely to try to discern the cause of such behavior. As mentioned earlier, one individual difference variable that may be helpful in understanding this relation is stigma consciousness. Because individuals that are highly stigma conscious are likely to categorize ambiguous behaviors as being discriminatory, highly stigma conscious individuals will not expend valuable resources in an attempt to discern the underlying cause of subtle negativity. Instead, they will attribute the behavior as being discriminatory. Conversely, those who are not highly stigma conscious may spend more time trying to figure out the cause of ambiguous behaviors and are thus likely to have fewer available resources to expend on subsequent tasks.

_Hypothesis 3d:_ The relation between interpersonal discrimination and attentional resources will be moderated by stigma consciousness, such that individuals that are highly stigma conscious will have more attentional resources than those who score lower in stigma conscious.

_Ego Depletion, Discrimination, and Performance._ As evidenced by earlier work, engaging in interactions in which one individual in the interaction is assumed to be prejudiced may be depleting for stigmatized individuals (Shelton, Richeson, & Trawalter 2005). In addition, engaging in such interactions may also impair an individual’s cognitive functioning. Perhaps when individuals are discriminated against, they may spend time ruminating or thinking about the discriminatory action. Researchers have posited that a number of factors may influence the relation between self-regulation and actual performance including attentional pull (Beal et al., 2005) Thus, the experience of discrimination may pull resources from the task at hand by redirecting attention towards the biased actions that were displayed. In the case of subtle discrimination, perceivers
may spend time trying to decipher the cause of the behavior. For instance, determining whether or not subtle displays such as rudeness or hostility are a result of an individual having a bad day, poor communication skills, or whether the behavior is truly a result of prejudice may tax cognitive resources. Overt displays, however, may have differential effects. For instance, individuals may be able to discount a person’s behavior as being prejudicial so they no longer have to consider the reasons behind the actions. Since no attentional resources are devoted to determining the underlying motive for the statements of behaviors, no decrements in performance result.

Though previous research examining interpersonal interactions was not conducted in organizations, it is plausible that these findings would be mirrored in organizational contexts as well. For example, stigmatized individuals may be motivated to have pleasant, or at a minimum neutral, interactions with their supervisors and co-workers. Thus, if a target believes that a fellow employee is potentially prejudiced against his or her group, he or she may respond in a number of ways. One potential response might involve avoiding interactions with that particular individual. When avoidance is not possible, the stigmatized individual may respond by attempting to have neutral interactions when avoidance is not possible. An alternative response might involve confronting the individual about their prejudices. In organizations, it may not be possible for targets to avoid interacting with individuals who they believe harbor prejudice against their respective groups. In addition, it may also be unlikely that targets will directly confront individuals about prejudice or discrimination. Thus, the likely response will involve attempts to have pleasant, and at a minimum neutral, interactions with such individuals. Engaging in such interactions may likely be something that targets truly do
not want to do. Thus, it is likely that engaging in pleasant or neutral interaction with individuals that exhibit prejudicial or discriminatory displays will require the use regulatory resources. Thus, I hypothesize that individuals that are discriminated against will perform worse on a subsequent task as a result of depletion.

_Hypothesis 3e:_ The relationship between the experience of interpersonal discrimination and performance will be mediated by attentional resource depletion.

Overview of the Current Study

The current research attempts to move beyond previous research studies by: a) using experimental methodology to move beyond correlational research, b) examining discrimination in a social interaction, c) examining discrimination in an organizational context, and d) examining both attitudinal and behavioral outcomes associated with the experience of interpersonal and formal discrimination in isolation or combination. In addition, the current study attempts to understand the mechanisms that may potentially explain why the experience of interpersonal discrimination has deleterious consequences for targets. Participants in the study completed an objective measure of performance as part of an in-basket exercise. In addition, participants completed a Stroop Color Naming Task, personality measure, and provided demographic information.

Method

_Participants_

_Sample._ A total of 119 undergraduate women aged 18 to 58 (\(M = 22.99; SD = 6.36\)) participated in the current study. The sample was very diverse, 15.1% Black, 29.4% Asian, 23.5% White, 20.2% Hispanic, 6.7% other, and 5% of participants did not provide information pertaining to their race or ethnicity. A majority of participants reported
having at least six months of work experience (76.5%) and 27.7% of participants reported having five or more years of work experience. All participants received course credit for their participation in the experiment. A total of 20 participants were removed from the analyses as a result of language barriers (N = 5), manipulation check failure (N = 13), or desire to be omitted from the videotaped data collection (N = 2). Thus the final sample is based upon a total of 99 participants.

_Independent Coders._ Three (one male and two female) undergraduates blind to the study’s hypotheses served as independent coders. Prior to rating the interactions, coders participated in a training session in which they practiced making ratings on videotaped data collected from an unrelated study and were allowed to ask clarifying questions. Coders were asked to rate interaction quality and work-behaviors during the in-basket task (e.g., diligence, motivation).

_Confederates_

_Experimenter._ Two female graduate students were trained to serve as experimenters. The primary roles of the experimenter were to: a) introduce the purpose of the experiment to the participant, b) distribute post-assessment tests, and c) conduct debriefing. The experimenter was not involved in the manipulation itself but was there to direct the participant and confederate (the latter of whom delivered the manipulation). The confederate experimenters underwent training during which they were responsible for memorizing a script and practiced conducting debriefing.

_Confederate Assessor._ Two males were trained to serve as test assessors. The primary roles of the assessor were to: a) enact the discrimination manipulations, b) administer the in-basket assessment, and c) record Stroop Color Naming Task (Stroop)
scores. Both assessors participated in two training sessions. During training, confederates were asked to memorize a standardized script, practice doing specific nonverbal behaviors, and were instructed to behave consistently across conditions (e.g., formal vs. interpersonal) and trials. The assessors wore business casual attire for each session, which consisted of a khaki pants, dress shirt, and/or tie.

**Recording Equipment**

The interactions were recorded on VHS tapes and captured participant responses. The laboratory in which the study was conducted had cameras placed in strategic locations so that the entire interaction could be videotaped to capture both participant verbal and nonverbal responses.

**Procedure**

The study took place in a university laboratory. Approximately ten minutes before the scheduled arrival of the participant, both the experimenter and assessor arrived at the laboratory to make sure that all recording equipment and other necessary materials (i.e., response booklets, computers) were in place. After turning on the equipment (i.e., recoding equipment, computers), the experimenter proceeded to the waiting area in anticipation of the participant’s arrival. After the participant arrived, she was asked to sign in and then proceed to a testing room where the experiment would be conducted (see Appendix A for script). The participant then was given an informed consent and asked to read through the document and sign a consent form if she chose to participate. While the participant was reading the consent form, the experimenter exited the testing room, and went to another room to turn on the recording equipment. Afterwards, the experimenter and assessor both returned to the testing room and the experimenter enacted a
standardized script designed to give an overview of the study, introduce the assessor, and allow the participant a chance to ask any questions. After completing the script, the experimenter departed the room.

The test assessor remained in the testing room and read a standardized script and engaged in verbal and nonverbal behaviors that varied according to condition (see Appendix B for script). After enacting the manipulation, the assessor asked the participant to complete the Stroop color-naming task and recorded the results (i.e., number incorrect, time congruent, and time incongruent) in the participant’s response booklet after the participant completed the trials. After recording the scores, the assessor gave the participant instructions for completing the in-basket task and then left the room.

Forty five minutes later, the assessor returned to the testing room and had the participant complete the Stroop task a second time, recorded the scores and then left the room. This was the last time that participants saw the assessor during the experiment. After the assessor exited the room, the experimenter entered the room and asked the participant to complete a computerized follow-up survey regarding the in-basket that contained three separate parts: task-related questions, assessor-related questions, and a personality inventory. After participants completed their responses, they went to a breakout room where they were debriefed by the experimenter and asked to complete a videotape release form. Afterwards, participants were thanked for their participation and dismissed.

Manipulations
Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: control (no
discrimination), formal discrimination, interpersonal discrimination, or combined
discrimination (i.e., both formal and interpersonal discrimination).

Development of Formal Discrimination Manipulation. To develop this
manipulation, I pre-tested a number of statements that indicated overt displays of sexism
that were adapted from research by Swim et al. (2001). These statements involved
traditional gender role prejudice and stereotyping, and a dislike of women in general (see
Table 1 for list of pre-tested statements, means and standard deviations) and were pre-
tested using a convenience sample of 44 individuals (e.g., undergraduates, individuals in
a coffee shop, online responses). Participants rated the extent to which the statements
were: a) sexist in nature, b) realistic, c) likely to be heard, and d) offensive. Statements
that were rated as being highly sexist, realistic, likely to be heard, and somewhat
offensive were selected for inclusion in the study.

Formal Discrimination. To manipulate formal discrimination participants
“accidentally” overheard a conversation between the experimenter and another individual
during which the assessor made explicitly discriminatory statements about women (see
Appendix B for Confederate Assessor script). Specifically, at the onset of the experiment,
the test assessor excused himself to make a quick phone call to update the organization
about the current status of the project and to ask a web address that was needed to
complete the assessment (i.e., the html address for the Stroop Color Naming Task).
Participants overheard one side of a brief telephone conversation between the test
assessor and another individual during which the assessor made a discriminatory
comment regarding the likelihood of hiring a woman for a consultant position. In
addition, participants heard the assessor make reference to the current status of the experiment. In the conditions that did not contain formal discrimination (i.e., interpersonal, control conditions), participants overheard neutral comments about the status of the experiment.

_Interpersonal Discrimination._ To manipulate interpersonal discrimination, I relied on behaviors identified in earlier work by Hebl et al. (2002). Specifically, the assessor enacted a number of negative nonverbal and paraverbal behaviors. More specifically, the negative treatment consisted of decreased amounts of eye contact, smiling, and increased amounts of rudeness, frowning and hostile tones compared to individuals that were not in this condition. In addition, the experimenter used negative, hostile tones when interacting with the participant. Such behaviors are ambiguous in nature and may not necessarily be attributed to discrimination. In the other conditions (i.e., control, formal discrimination only), the experimenter was instructed to behave as he normally would.

Task

_In-basket._ Participants completed an in-basket task that was developed to assess attention to detail, decision making, and communication skills (See Appendix C). The in-basket was pre-tested using 21 undergraduate students and revealed that in the absence of the manipulations, participants could reasonably finish a total of 15 items during a 45 minute time period. The in-basket involved having participants assume the role of Cameron Thomas, a mid-level consultant working for a medium-sized advertising firm, and in that role, they were responsible for addressing as many issues as they possibly could in 45 minutes. The in-basket consisted of 18 items that consisted of organizational correspondence that advertising consultants frequently encounter: a) scheduling issues, b)
client advertisements, c) client complaints, d) subordinate requests, and e) non-work related email messages. During the in-basket, participants were required to determine whether or not various organizational correspondences required a response. In addition, participants were asked to write out responses to the issues that were most pressing (e.g., client advertisements, scheduling meetings, responding to appropriate emails).

To increase the face validity of the in-basket (i.e., relevance to advertising), I created four in-basket items that pertained specifically to company advertisements and used them as a measure of objective performance. The rest of the items in the in-basket were filler tasks (i.e., junk mail, company picnic). Participants recorded their responses in a response booklet (see Appendix D).

**Measures**

*Objective Performance.* Objective performance on the in-basket was measured using the number of items that were answered correctly on four items in the in-basket. Three of these items measured a participant’s attention to detail by having participants count the number of a given word or object that appeared in an advertisement (see Appendix C item 3, item 6, item 11). The fourth item consisted of correctly identifying the advertisement that best represented an advertising brief (see Appendix C item 9). The items were rated on a dichotomy of “correct” and “incorrect.” I collapsed scores across the four items to create a composite score of the total number of items that participants correctly completed. Scores on the composite score, ranged from 0 (no correct items) to 4 (all items correct), alpha = .73.

*Helping Behaviors.* The current study measured helping behaviors using a modified version of Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994), which consisted of seven
items assessing the extent to which participants would: a) like to work with individuals who have attitudes that are similar to the assessors, b) be willing to enthusiastically report on their positive experience, c) be willing to promote and defend the assessor’s behaviors, d) be willing to help the assessor with personal matters, e) be willing to take part in another unrelated study, f) recommend friends who may assist the assessor in the future, and g) be willing help the assessor in the future, alpha = .89.

Attentional Resource Depletion. Participants quickly completed a computerized version of the Stroop Color Naming Test. Depletion was measured by creating a composite of the: a) amount of time participants spent on congruent items at Time 2, and b) amount of time participants spent on incongruent items at Time 2 (see Table 2 for correlations among all the components of the Stroop Color Naming Task).

Stigma Consciousness. Group identity was measured using an adapted version of the Stigma Consciousness Scale (Pinel, 1999). Items from the scale were modified to refer specifically to gender. A sample item, “When interacting with men, I feel like they interpret all my behaviors in terms of the fact that I am a woman.” Items were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale, (1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree), alpha = .70.

Formal Discrimination. Perceptions of formal discrimination were measured using a six-item scale based upon previous research (Hebl et al., 2002). Items were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = Not at all, 7 = Very Much). The items measured the extent to which the assessor: a) behaved in an unacceptable manner according to company policies, b) was explicitly negative because of the participant’s gender, c) was overtly discriminatory, d) behaved in a discriminatory manner, e) behaved in a way that is in conflict with current policies, and f) made inappropriate comments, alpha = .88.
Interpersonal Discrimination. Perceptions of interpersonal discrimination were measured using an eight-item scale based upon previous research by Hebl et al. (2002). The items measured the extent to which the assessor was: a) cold, b) rude, c) awkward, d) standoffish, e) comfortable, f) kind and considerate, h) courteous and respectful, and i) concerned about the participant’s rights. Items were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = Not at all, 7 = Very Much), alpha = .93.

Assessor Likeability. Participant perceptions of the assessor were measured using a three-item scale. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which the assessor: a) was competent, b) acted professionally, and c) was approachable. Items were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = Not at all, 7 = Very Much), alpha = .79.

Task Likeability. Perceptions of the task were measured using a three-item scale. Participants rated the extent to which the in-basket: a) was easy, b) was frustrating, and c) was enjoyable. Items were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale, (1 = Not at all, 7 = Very Much), alpha = .76.

Effort on Task. Participants reported on their perceived effort on the task using a seven-point Likert-type scale, (1 = Not at all, 7 = Very Much) indicating the extent to which they: a) worked hard, b) made an effort to do well, c) were motivated to do well, and d) put in a lot of effort, alpha = .81.

Interactional Justice. Participants completed a five-item measure of interactional justice (adapted from Moorman, 1991). Participants used a seven-point Likert-type scale, (1 = Not at all, 7 = Very Much), to rate the extent to which the assessor: a) treated them with kindness and consideration, b) considered their viewpoint, c) treated them with
courtesy and respect, d) was able to suppress personal biases, and e) showed a concern for their rights as a participant, alpha = .86.

**Negative Affect.** Participant affect was measured using the Negative Affective Thoughts Scale (Kanfer, Ackerman, Murtha, Dugsdale, & Nelson, 1994). Specifically, participants completed four items using a seven-point Likert type items (1 = Not at all, 7 = Very Much) to rate the extent to which they were: a) angry while working on the in-basket, b) thinking about how poorly they were performing while working on the in-basket, c) frustrated while working on the in-basket task, and d) mad as a result of working on the in-basket, alpha = .66.

**Coded Positivity.** Independent coders provided an assessment of overall positivity found in the interaction between the assessor and participants using a two-item scale. Independent coders used a seven point Likert-type scale, (1 = Not at all, 7 = Very Much) to rate the extent to which: a) the participant was listening to the assessor, and b) the interaction was smooth, alpha = .77. Intra-class correlation coefficients ranged from .60 to .80.

**Coded Work Behavior.** Independent coders provided an assessment of participant work ethic on the in-basket task using a four item scale. Independent coders used a seven point Likert-type scale, (1 = Not at all, 7 = Very Much) to rate the extent to which participants: a) were engaged on the task, b) worked diligently on the task, c) seemed interested in the task, d) appeared to be motivated on the task, alpha = .85. Intra-class correlation coefficients ranged from .68 to .74.

**Manipulation check of Formal Discrimination: Formal Biases.** Participants completed perceptions of overt discrimination. In rating these items, participants used a
seven-point Likert-type scale, (1 = Not at all, 7 = Very Much) to rate to extent to which
the assessor was: a) blatantly sexist, b) was biased c) expressed personal biases, and d)
behaved in a sexist manner, alpha = .94.

*Multiplication check of Interpersonal Discrimination: Assessor Decreased*

*Positivity.* Participants completed perceptions of positivity from the assessor. In rating
these items, participants used a seven-point Likert-type scale, (1 = Not at all, 7 = Very
Much) to rate the extent to which the assessor was: a) smiling, b) friendly, c) attentive,
and d) approachable, alpha = .88.

*Results*

*Formal Discrimination Manipulation Check.* I conducted a 2 (Interpersonal
Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2 (Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA
on perceptions of Formal Discrimination as a manipulation check on Formal
Discrimination. Results revealed a main effect of Formal Discrimination on perceptions
of gender based discrimination, $F(1, 95) = 79.90, p < .01, \eta^2 = .46$ (see Table 3 for means
and standard deviations) and nonsignificant effects of both Interpersonal Discrimination,
$F(1, 95) = .03, p = .87, \eta^2 = .00$, and a Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction,
$F(1, 95) = .73, p = .40, \eta^2 = .00$, on perceptions of gender based discrimination. Thus,
individuals in conditions during which Formal Discrimination was enacted perceived
more gender based discrimination thus indicating that the manipulation of formal
discrimination was accurately perceived.

*Interpersonal Discrimination Manipulation Check.* I next conducted a 2
(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2 (Formal Discrimination: Present,
Absent) ANOVA on Assessor Positivity as a manipulation check of Interpersonal
Discrimination. Results revealed a significant main effect of both Interpersonal Discrimination, $F(1, 95) = 10.55, p < .01, \eta^2 = .10$, and Formal Discrimination, $F(1, 95) = 5.14, p < .05, \eta^2 = .05$ (see Table 4 for means and standard deviations) and a nonsignificant Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction, $F(1, 95) = .21, p = .65, \eta^2 = .00$ on perceptions of Interpersonal Discrimination

Preliminary Analyses. Preliminary analyses revealed that perceptions of discrimination (both interpersonal and formal) were related to Assessor Likeability, Helping Behavior, Task Likeability, Stigma Consciousness, Interactional Justice, Coded Positivity, and Coded Work Behavior (see Table 5 for complete results). Specifically, perceptions of Interpersonal Discrimination were related to Formal Discrimination ($r = .56, p < .01$), Assessor Likeability ($r = -.80, p < .01$), Helping Behavior intentions ($r = -.73, p < .01$), Task Likeability ($r = -.17, p < .05$), Stigma Consciousness ($r = .14, p < .10$), Interactional Justice ($r = -.90, p < .01$), Coded Positivity ($r = -.17, p < .10$), and Coded Work Behavior on the in-basket ($r = -44, p < .01$). In addition, Formal Discrimination was related to Assessor Likeability ($r = -.58, p < .01$), Helping Behavior ($r = -.44, p < .01$), Interactional Justice ($r = -.61, p < .01$), Coded Positivity ($r = -.20, p < .01$), and Coded Work Behavior ($r = -.33, p < .01$). Thus, experiencing discrimination (i.e., Formal and Interpersonal) was related to a number of relevant outcomes.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that receiving Interpersonal Discrimination would impair performance on the in-basket task (see Table 6 for counts). In order to examine Hypothesis 1, I first conducted a 2 (Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2 (Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA on Objective Performance (see Table 7 for results). Results revealed a main effect of Interpersonal Discrimination on Objective
Performance, \( F(1, 95) = 9.71, p < .01, \eta^2 = .09 \), and nonsignificant effects of both Formal Discrimination, \( F(1, 95) = .08, p = .78, \eta^2 = .00 \), and an Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction, \( F(1, 95) = .05, p = .86, \eta^2 = .00 \) on Objective Performance. In sum and as expected, when individuals experienced Interpersonal Discrimination, they performed worse on an objective measure of performance. Conversely, the experience of Formal Discrimination did not impair performance. In sum, results support Hypotheses 1a and 1b but do not support Hypothesis 1c.

To gain a better understanding of the relationship between the experience of discrimination and performance, I conducted a 2(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA on the Number of items that were attempted in the in-basket (see Table 8 for complete results). An ANOVA on the number of items Attempted on the in-basket revealed a nonsignificant main effect of Interpersonal Discrimination, \( F(1, 95) = 3.77, p = .06, \eta^2 = .04 \). Results also revealed a nonsignificant effect of Formal Discrimination, \( F(1, 95) = .01, p = .91, \eta^2 = .00 \), as well as a nonsignificant Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction, \( F(1, 95) = .57, p = .45, \eta^2 = .01 \). In sum, neither Interpersonal nor Formal Discrimination impacted the number of items attempted on the in-basket.

*Hypothesis 2* suggested that Stigma Consciousness would impact perceptions of Interpersonal Discrimination (*Hypothesis 2a*) and that Stigma Consciousness would moderate the relation between the experience of Interpersonal Discrimination and Objective Performance on the in-basket, such that highly stigma conscious individuals would perform better than less stigma conscious individuals (*Hypothesis 2b*). Prior to examining *Hypothesis 2*, I conducted a 2 (Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent)
by 2 (Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA on Stigma Consciousness to determine if Stigma Consciousness was influenced by the manipulations (i.e., did the experience of discrimination induce Stigma Consciousness in participants). The ANOVA yielded a nonsignificant effect of Interpersonal Discrimination, $F(1, 93) = .81, p = .37, \eta^2 = .01$, Formal Discrimination, $F(1, 93) = .08, p = .77, \eta^2 = .00$, and the interaction between Interpersonal and Formal Discrimination, $F(1, 93) = .81, p = .37, \eta^2 = .01$ (see Table 9 for means and standard deviations). Thus, as expected experiencing discrimination did not appear to induce Stigma Consciousness. In order to assess Hypothesis 2a, I examined the correlation between Stigma Consciousness and perceptions of Interpersonal Discrimination. Results revealed a small positive relation between Stigma Consciousness and perceptions of Interpersonal Discrimination ($r = .14, p = .07$). Thus, results do not support Hypothesis 2a. In order to examine Hypothesis 2b, I conducted a regression analyses following Baron and Kenny (1986; see Table 10 for complete results). Contrary to expectations results revealed that Stigma Consciousness did not moderate the relation between Interpersonal Discrimination and performance. Thus, Hypothesis 2b was not supported.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that the experience of Interpersonal Discrimination would reduce attentional resources as measured by performance on congruent and incongruent items at Time 2 on the Stroop Color Naming Task. Specifically, Hypothesis 3 predicted that individuals experiencing Interpersonal Discrimination would perform worse (take longer to answer items, miss more items) than individuals in the Control condition (Hypothesis 3a), Formal Discrimination condition (Hypothesis 3b), and Combined Discrimination condition (Hypothesis 3c). In order to examine Hypothesis 3, I conducted
a 2(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA on Attentional Resource Depletion. Results reveal a main effect of Interpersonal Discrimination on Attentional Resource Depletion, $F(1, 86) = 13.21, p < .01, \eta^2 = .13$, and nonsignificant effects of Formal Discrimination, $F(1, 86) = .09, p = .77, \eta^2 = .00$, and the interaction between Interpersonal and Formal Discrimination, $F(1, 86) = .22, p = .64, \eta^2 = .00$ on Depletion (see Table 11 for complete results). In sum and as expected, the experience of Interpersonal Discrimination impaired performance on the Stroop Task and thus indicates Attentional Resource Depletion. Thus, results support Hypothesis 3a and 3b, but do not support Hypothesis 3c.

In order to gain a better understanding of overall performance on the Stroop and not just Attentional Resource Depletion, I conducted additional exploratory analyses on the individual components of the Stroop (number of items incorrect, time on congruent items, and time on incongruent items) at both Time 1 and Time 2. I will first present results from Time 2 since this is a direct measure of Attentional Resource Depletion. Performance at Time 1 on the Stroop is not a measure of depletion. However, it does provide useful information so I will report the results after presenting the depletion findings.

Stroop Performance After Completing the In-Basket Task: I conducted two analyses to examine the performance on the individual components of the Stroop. First, a 2(Interpersonal: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA on Number Incorrect on the Stroop revealed a main effect of Interpersonal Discrimination (see Table 12 for complete results). Second, I conducted a 2(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent)
MANOVA on time spent on congruent and incongruent items of the Stroop task at Time 2. The overall MANOVA yielded significant main effect of Interpersonal Discrimination, $F(2, 86) = 7.42, p < .01, \eta^2 = .15$. Conversely, the MANOVA revealed nonsignificant effects of Formal Discrimination, $F(2, 86) = .34, p = .71, \eta^2 = .01$, as well as a nonsignificant Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction, $F(2, 86) = .08, p = .93, \eta^2 = .00$. An examination of the between subjects effects revealed a significant main effect of Interpersonal Discrimination on the amount of time spent answering Congruent and Incongruent Items. Results did not provide support for a main effect of Formal Discrimination nor an Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction on the amount of time spent answering Congruent and Incongruent Items at Time 2 (see Tables 13 and 14 for complete results). Thus, results on the Stroop at Time 2 provide additional support for Hypothesis 3a and 3b, but not Hypothesis 3c.

**Performance on Stroop Color Naming Task Before Completing the In-Basket.** I conducted two analyses to examine the performance on the individual components of the Stroop at Time 1. First, a 2(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2 (Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA on Number Incorrect on the Stroop revealed a main effect of Interpersonal Discrimination (see Table 15 for complete results). Second, I conducted a 2(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) MANOVA on the individual components of the Stroop task at Time 1. The overall MANOVA yielded significant main effect of Interpersonal Discrimination, $F(2, 86) = 12.90, p < .01, \eta^2 = .23$. Conversely, the MANOVA revealed nonsignificant effects of Formal Discrimination, $F(2, 86) = .77, p = .47, \eta^2 = .02$, as well as a nonsignificant Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction, $F(2, 86) = .52, p
=.59, \eta^2 = .01. An examination of the between subjects effects revealed a significant main effect of Interpersonal Discrimination on the amount of time spent answering Congruent and Incongruent Items. Results did not provide support for a main effect of Formal Discrimination nor an Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction on the amount of time spent answering Congruent and Incongruent Items at Time 1 (see Tables 16 and 17 for complete results). As expected, results from Time 1 indicate that individuals who experienced Interpersonal Discrimination performed worse on the Stroop Color Naming Task.

*Hypothesis 3d* predicted that Stigma Consciousness would moderate the relation between Interpersonal Discrimination and Attentional Resource Depletion. Contrary to expectations, Stigma Consciousness did not moderate the relation (see Table 18 for complete results). Thus, *Hypothesis 3d* was not supported.

*Hypothesis 3e* predicted that Attentional Resource Depletion would mediate the relationship between Interpersonal Discrimination and Objective Performance on the in-basket. I conducted a series of regression analyses following Baron and Kenny (1986) to examine *Hypothesis 3e* (see Table 19 for complete results). First, I conducted a regression on Objective Performance. Interpersonal Discrimination was a significant predictor of Objective Performance on the in-basket task, \( \beta = -.28, t(91) = -2.79, p < .01 \). Second, I conducted a regression on Attentional Resource Depletion. Interpersonal Discrimination was a significant predictor of Attentional Resource Depletion, \( \beta = .37, t(87) = 3.63, p < .01 \). Third, I conducted a regression on Objective performance using Attentional Resource Depletion as a predictor. Attentional Resource Depletion was a significant predictor of Objective Performance \( \beta = -.29, t(88) = -2.83, p < .01 \). Fourth, I
conducted a regression on Objective performance using Interpersonal Discrimination and Attentional Resource Depletion as predictors. When regressed together, Interpersonal Discrimination was a significant predictor of Objective Performance, $\beta = -0.23$, $t(87) = -2.08$, $p < .05$, and Attentional Resource Depletion was a nonsignificant predictor of Objective Performance, $\beta = -0.20$, $t(84) = -1.87$, $p = .06$. A Sobel test did not reach conventional levels of significant ($z = -1.71$, $p < .10$). Thus, results do not support a partial mediation model and do not support Hypothesis 3e.

**Coder Analyses of the Interaction.** To gain a more complete picture of participant behavior, individuals blind to the study’s hypotheses viewed videotaped data and rated the interaction that occurred between the participant and the assessor as well as the participant behavior while working on the in-basket. A 2(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA on Coded Positivity revealed a significant main effect of Interpersonal Discrimination, $F(1,84) = 8.25$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .09$ (see Table 20 for means and standard deviations). Conversely, the ANOVA revealed nonsignificant effects of Formal Discrimination, $F(1,84) = .10$, $p = .76$, $\eta^2 = .00$, as well as a nonsignificant Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction, $F(1,84) = 2.39$, $p = .13$, $\eta^2 = .03$. In sum, results from independent coders reveal that participants respond more negatively to the assessor when they experience Interpersonal Discrimination.

**Coder Analyses of Work Behaviors While on the In-Basket Task.** Independent coders used videotaped data to assess participant behavior while working on the in-basket task. A 2(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA on Coded Work Behavior revealed a significant main effect of
Interpersonal Discrimination, $F(1, 84) = 15.67, p < .01, \eta^2 = .16$. Conversely, the ANOVA revealed nonsignificant effects of Formal Discrimination, $F(1, 84) = .10, p = .76, \eta^2 = .00$, as well as the Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction, $F(1, 84) = 3.31, p = .07, \eta^2 = .04$ (see Table 21 for means and standard deviations). In sum, data from independent coders revealed that when participants experienced Interpersonal Discrimination they appeared to be less engaged and effortful while working on the in-basket task.

**Additional Outcomes of Discrimination.** A number of additional analyses were conducted to obtain a better grasp on the impact that discrimination has upon a number of other organizationally relevant outcomes (i.e., helping behavior, perceptions of the assessor, negative affectivity).

**Helping Behavior.** I conducted a 2(Interpersonal: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA on Helping Behavior to further examine the extent to which various types of discrimination have an impact on other organizationally relevant outcomes. Results revealed a significant effect of both Interpersonal Discrimination, $F(1, 95) = 6.72, p = .01, \eta^2 = .07$, and Formal Discrimination, $F(1, 95) = 6.71, p = .01, \eta^2 = .07$, (see Table 22 for complete results). Conversely, results revealed a nonsignificant Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction, $F(1, 95) = .01, p = .93, \eta^2 = .00$. In sum, the experience of discrimination (i.e., Interpersonal and Formal) decreased a participant’s likelihood of engaging in future instances of Helping Behavior.

**Assessor Likeability.** A 2(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA on Assessor Likeability. Results revealed a significant effect of both Interpersonal Discrimination, $F(1, 95) = 11.07, p <$
.01, $\eta^2 = .10$, and Formal Discrimination, $F(1, 95) = 6.68, p = .01, \eta^2 = .07$ on Assessor Likeability (see Table 23 for complete results). Conversely, results revealed a nonsignificant Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction, $F(1, 95) = .25, p = .62, \eta^2 = .00$ on Assessor Likeability. In sum, the experience of discrimination (i.e., Interpersonal and Formal) decreased a participant’s perceptions of the assessor.

_Perceptions of Interactional Justice._ A 2(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA conducted on perceptions of Interactional Justice revealed a significant effect of both Interpersonal Discrimination, $F(1, 90) = 10.17, p < .01, \eta^2 = .10$, and Formal Discrimination, $F(1, 90) = 16.01, p < .01, \eta^2 = .15$. Conversely, results revealed a nonsignificant Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction, $F(1, 90) = 2.03, p = .16, \eta^2 = .01$ on Interactional Justice (see Table 24 for complete results). In sum, the experience of discrimination (i.e., Interpersonal and Formal) decreased a participant’s perceptions of Interactional Justice.

_Task Likeability, Negative Affectivity, and Participant Effort._ A 2(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA conducted on Task Likeability revealed nonsignificant effects of Interpersonal Discrimination, Formal Discrimination, and a nonsignificant Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction (see Table 25 for complete results). In sum, it appears that discrimination (i.e., Interpersonal, Formal, Combined) does not impact participants perceptions of the task. Similarly, a 2(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA conducted on Negative affectively revealed identical results. That is, Interpersonal Discrimination, Formal Discrimination, and a Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination interaction were not significantly related to
participant reports of Negative affectivity (see Table 26 for complete results). Thus, discrimination did not increase negative affectivity. Likewise, a 2(Interpersonal Discrimination: Present, Absent) by 2(Formal Discrimination: Present, Absent) ANOVA conducted on Participant Effort revealed nonsignificant effects of Interpersonal Discrimination, Formal Discrimination, and Interpersonal X Formal Discrimination (see Table 27 for complete results. It is important to note that these results contradict reports from independent coders. Data provided by coders revealed that the experience of discrimination resulted in decreased work effort on the in-basket task. Thus, it appears that the experience of discrimination did not alter participants Task Likeability, Negative Affectivity, or perceptions of Reported Effort (using self-report data from participants).

Discussion

The present research extends previous research on discrimination by examining the extent to which formal and interpersonal discrimination impact job performance and other organizationally relevant outcomes. Thus, this dissertation sought to answer the question or whether Jane’s experiences (i.e., interpersonal discrimination) were more pernicious than Julie’s experiences (i.e., formal discrimination) at work, and vice versa.

Major Findings. Overall, results reveal that discrimination has potentially deleterious consequences for incumbent performance and other work behaviors and attitudes. First, results reveal differential effects of interpersonal discrimination and formal discrimination. Specifically, individuals receiving differential treatment in the form of interpersonal discrimination, as well as combined discrimination performed worse than individuals who did not experience discrimination (i.e., control group) or those who experienced discrimination that was formal in nature. In sum, interpersonal
discrimination (in isolation or combined with formal discrimination) resulted in decreased performance on an objective measure of work performance.

Unexpectedly, combined forms of discrimination also resulted in lowered performance. Previous research examining perceptions of discrimination has found that many stigmatized individuals believe that discrimination is a plausible experience for members of their stigmatized groups. However, individuals are less likely to report that they themselves have experienced discrimination (Taylor, Wright, Moghaddam, & Lalonde, 1990). Shelton and Salvatore (2007) posited that nonstigmatized individuals’ lowered performance on the Stroop in conditions involving overt discrimination resulted because nonstigmatized individuals were unaccustomed to experiencing overt discrimination and spent valuable cognitive resources in an attempt to understand the occurrence. Likewise, in this study stigmatized individuals may be so unaccustomed to receiving such forms of discrimination that combined forms of discrimination are particularly threatening which may explain lowered performance.

Another potential explanation for this finding is interactional justice. The combination of incivility and bias is a severe form of discrimination that may be especially demotivating for individuals. Previous research examining organizational justice and social exchange relationships reveals that perceptions of interactional justice (using information based upon interactions with one’s supervisor) are positively related to both performance and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) directed towards the supervisor (Williams, 1999, Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002). Thus, having positive interactions with your supervisor may increase perceptions of interactional justice and lead to increased performance and OCBs, whereas, negative interactions with authority
figures decreases interactional justice and the likelihood of engaging in OCBs. Experiencing combined forms of discrimination constitutes a very negative social interaction and thus participants are likely to develop negative perceptions toward the assessor and as a result may work less hard than they might otherwise. Ratings provided by independent coders found that individuals in conditions involving interpersonal and combined discrimination appeared to be less interested, motivated, and diligent while working on the task. In sum, individuals who received combined discrimination also performed worse on a measure of objective performance.

Second, results revealed that interpersonal discrimination and combined forms of discrimination were detrimental to performance on a measure of attentional resources. These results support recent research by Salvatore and Shelton (2007). Specifically, participants who experienced interpersonal discrimination (both in isolation and when combined with formal discrimination) performed worse on the Stroop task (both before and after the in-basket task) than those in the control and formal discrimination conditions. Participants likely utilized cognitive resources in an effort to reconcile the attributional ambiguity that they were feeling as a result of this experience. That is, when experiencing formal discrimination, women in this study were easily able to attribute the assessor’s behaviors to discrimination and thus did not need to utilize resources in an attempt to discern the cause of the behavior. Conversely, the attribution for interpersonal displays of bias were less clear and as a result participants likely utilized valuable attentional resources in an attempt to determine the underlying motive for negative interpersonal displays. That is, participants needed to determine if the negative interpersonal treatment they received was the result of some bias on the part of the
assessor, or if there was some other alternative explanation (e.g., the assessor was having a bad day, the assessor was not sociable, or the assessor had a negative disposition in general).

Third, results revealed that discrimination in general was related to decreased likelihood of engaging in future helping behaviors. For instance, individuals that experienced discrimination reported being less likely to complete a number of helping behaviors. Previous research demonstrates that helping behaviors, a component of organizational citizenship behaviors, are an important component to overall job performance and organizational success (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Such tasks may include behaviors such as offering assistance to co-workers, completing tasks outside of one’s job requirements. Previous research found that found that individuals who perceived discrimination reported performing fewer organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs; in the form of altruistic behaviors such as doing things not required by their jobs; Ensher et al., 2001) than individuals who did not perceive their co-workers, supervisors, and organizations to be sexually or racially discriminatory. A recent study by King (2009) found similar results. Specifically, the study did not find a relation between perceptions of climate for gender equality or inequality and supervisory ratings of work performance. That is, women who believed their organizations were biased against women, performed as well as women who did not possess this bias. However, supervisors reported that women who perceived a climate of gender inequality performed fewer organizational citizenship behaviors (i.e., helping behaviors) than women who did not perceive a climate of gender inequality. In line with previous research, the current study found that when individuals experience discrimination they are likely to omit some
of the behaviors that they might otherwise engage in (i.e., intentions to help the assessor in the future. Thus, the experience of discrimination (i.e., interpersonal, formal, combined) was related to decreased willingness to assist the assessor in the future. This finding is particularly important given that such acts of volition are important for overall organizational effectiveness.

Fourth, the experience of discrimination was negatively related to perceptions of the assessor. That is, the experience of either interpersonal, formal, or combined forms of discrimination led to decreased ratings of likeability and competency of the assessor. Thus, individuals enjoyed interacting with the assessor less when they experienced differential treatment (i.e., interpersonal, formal, combined discrimination). Previous research reveals that individuals quickly make judgments about interaction partners on the basis of very short interactions and using limited amounts of information (see Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Thus, in just a few minutes with the assessor individuals are able to determine whether or not they would enjoy working with the assessor or individuals having characteristics that are similar to the assessor’s. In the workplace, liking and respecting one’s co-workers and supervisors is important because such attitudes can transfer into relevant work behaviors (Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003 for review). Individuals who have better relationships with their supervisors and co-workers tend to engage in a number of activities that individuals who do not have positive attitudes about their supervisors are less likely to complete. For instance, individuals that like their supervisors want their supervisor’s to maintain a positive image about them and are more likely to work harder to maintain a positive impression such as doing things to assist their supervisors and coworkers compared to individuals who are not concerned about their
supervisor's opinions (Wayne & Linden, 1995). Similarly, negative attitudes toward one's supervisor may potentially lead to decreased task performance or decrease the likelihood that the individual will go above and beyond required tasks.

Fifth, the experience of interpersonal, formal, and combined discrimination was negatively related to perceptions of interactional justice. When individuals were discriminated against, they perceived less fairness regarding how the assessor treated them. This is particularly important because perceptions of interactional justice have been shown to be related to performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, and turnover (Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002). Thus, the experience of discrimination reduces perceptions of interactional justice.

In sum, results reveal that interpersonal discrimination and combined forms of discrimination are particularly detrimental to task performance, performance on a measure of attentional resources, and helping behavior. In addition, interpersonal and combined types of discrimination are related to a number of negative attitudinal variables as well. Specifically, when individuals receive interpersonal and combined displays of negativity, they report less likeability for the assessor. In addition, results reveal that though formal discrimination is not related to actual performance, it does have an impact on a number of other organizationally relevant outcomes.

This study found that formal discrimination in isolation was not related to task performance. It is important to note that I do not want to minimize the organizational significance of experiencing formal discrimination. In fact, the experience of formal discrimination was related to a number of other behavioral and attitudinal outcomes. For instance, formal discrimination decreased positive perceptions of the assessor (i.e.,
perceiving the assessor as less competent and likeable). In addition, formal discrimination resulted in the decreased likelihood of future helping behavior and that though such acts may not be explicitly part of one's day-to-day job tasks they are an important component of job performance and are often used when assessing individual performance. Though not measured in this study, the experience of formal discrimination is likely to have a number of non-work related negative consequences for stigmatized individuals as well. That is, previous research reveals that such displays of negativity are likely to result in a number of negative psychological and health-related outcomes (e.g., stress, high blood pressure, depression; Hudson Banks, Kohn-Wood, & Spenser, 2006; Jackson, Kubzansky, & Wright, 2006). In sum, though the current study does not reveal a direct relationship between formal discrimination and task performance, it does reveal that formal discrimination is related to other types of performance that are essential for successful organizational performance.

Moderation Relation: Discrimination, Stigma Consciousness and Performance.

The current research did not find support for stigma consciousness as a moderator of the relation between interpersonal discrimination and performance. One reason for this may be attributable to the demography of the participant sample. The majority of the participants in the current research were members of racial/ethnic minority groups. Thus, most participants were dually stigmatized. Previous research has demonstrated that African American women do not respond as negatively toward gender discrimination as they do to racial discrimination (King, 2005). Thus, it is plausible that dually stigmatized women may have a more heightened awareness of their race, or a combination of race and gender rather than gender discrimination in isolation. Given that the confederates
were White males, differential treatment may have been viewed through a different lens (i.e., racial discrimination).

I performed a series of exploratory analyses to determine whether or not individuals who belonged to minority groups reported differential levels on stigma consciousness for gender and if the results varied by participant race. In order to determine whether or not participant race influenced stigma consciousness, I conducted an ANOVA on Stigma Consciousness by Race. There was a marginal effect of Race, $F(3, 91) = 2.16, p < .10, \eta^2 = .07$, however the results were contrary to expectations. Follow-up t-tests revealed that Black participants reported being higher in Stigma Consciousness ($M = 4.61, SD = .91$) than Asian participants ($M = 4.05, SD = .86$), $t(43) = 1.99, p = .05, d = .63$. Similarly, Black participants reported higher levels of Stigma Consciousness than White participants ($M = 4.01, SD = .90$), $t(41) = 2.06, p = .05, d = .66$. Likewise, Black participants reported higher levels of Stigma Consciousness than Hispanic participants ($M = 3.82, SD = 1.05$), $t(33) = 2.30, p < .05, d = .80$. No differences emerged between Asian and White participants with respect to Stigma Consciousness, $t(58) = .19, p = .85, d = .05$, between Asian and Latina participants, $t(50) = .86, p = .39, d = .24$, or between White and Latina participants, $t(48) = .68, p = .50, d = .19$. No group was highly stigma consciousness, in fact across the groups there were moderate levels of stigma consciousness. It is worth noting that the sample sizes for these groups was small, and future research should be conducted to further examine the extent to which racial differences in sensitivity to discrimination exist. Given that the sample in the current research was ethnically diverse, it may have been appropriate to use a measure of stigma
consciousness directed towards race in addition to gender. Future research should attempt to make sure to assess all the stigmatized groups to which participants belong.

In the current research, attentional resource depletion did not mediate the relation between interpersonal discrimination and performance. One potential explanation for why attentional resource depletion did not fully mediate the relation may be attributable to the way in which attentional resource was measured. In this study, I examined attentional resource depletion using the Stroop. Previous research on prejudice and discrimination also used the Stroop as a measure of attentional resource depletion and has revealed significant effects (e.g., Richeson & Shelton, 2003; Richeson, Trawalter, & Shelton, 2005; Salvatore & Shelton, 2007). Thus, there is some evidence that the Stroop is an effective measure of attentional resource depletion. However, it is important to note that in the current study, participants completed the Stroop at multiple times and as a result practice effects may have attenuated the effects. Previous studies examine attentional resource depletion using a variety of measuring such as hand grip exercises and persistence. Thus, using another methodology for assessing attentional resource depletion may have yielded statistically significant results. In addition, there may be other constructs that also contribute to decreased performance on the in-basket task. Thus, it is likely that performance decrements are driven by a combination of factors rather than a single factor in isolation. Future research should examine additional measures of attentional resource depletion and in addition, examine other constructs that further explain the relation between interpersonal discrimination and performance.

*Additional Explanations for Performance.* The finding that attentional resource depletion did not mediate the relation between interpersonal discrimination and
performance suggests that there may be other constructs that influence the relation. One additional explanation for the relationship between discrimination and performance may be the perceptions of interactional justice and norms of reciprocity that may account for the decreased amount of effort that individuals put forth when completing the in-basket task as a result of their experiences (Cropanzano, Prehar, & Chen, 2002; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002). Thus, it is plausible that experiencing interpersonal and combined forms of discrimination demotivated individuals. Individuals in organizations go through a variety of social exchanges on a daily basis. These exchanges occur between subordinate and supervisor or the organization itself. In this study, the interaction that took place between the assessor and the participant can be viewed as a social exchange. Norms of reciprocity predict that during an interaction individuals are likely to reciprocate the treatment that is given to them. Specifically, when given positive treatment, individuals are likely to respond in kind, and similarly when given negative treatment individuals are likely to respond reciprocate negative behaviors directed towards them.

During the interaction that took place between participants and the assessor, participants likely used the limited amount of information obtained during the short interaction with the assessor (who may be seen as an authority figure) to make a number of inferences. Receiving negative cues from the assessor, in the form of interpersonal discrimination, may have reduced participants perceptions of interactional justice and an individuals desire to perform. Rather than being negative toward the assessor, participants may have reciprocated negativity in another way. Thus, negative interpersonal treatment from the assessor may have decreased individual's desire to work hard and do well on the task. Though results from participants do not support this notion,
ratings provided by independent coders reveal that when participants receive interpersonal discrimination, they appear to be less engaged in the task compared to situations where interpersonal discrimination is not experienced. Since participants were told that the assessor was affiliated with the organization conducting the research, participants may have been reciprocating the assessor's negativity and thus performed worse on the task. Participants did report lower levels of interactional justice, which has been shown to be related to performance (e.g., Cropanzano, Preher, & Chen, 2002; Rupp & Cropanzano). Future research should explore a number of other alternative explanations for lowered performance as a result of interpersonal and combined discrimination.

*Theoretical Contributions.* The current research builds upon previous research pertaining to discrimination in three ways. First, the current research moves beyond examining the attitudinal (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment; (Ensher et al., 2001; Foley, Hang-Yue, & Wang, 2005; Sanchez & Brock, 1996) and contextual variables (Avery et al., 2008; Brief et al., 2000; Dietz et al., 2008) that have typically been examined when researching discrimination in the workplace. Specifically, the current research explicitly examines both attitudinal and behavioral outcomes that are associated with discrimination. Very few studies examine behavioral outcomes of discrimination, and the studies that have examined such consequences have focused on examining organizational consequences of discrimination (e.g., King et al., 2006). The current research examines the individual level consequences of discrimination. Thus, the current research can inform current conceptualizations of discrimination outcomes by
considering attitudinal and behavioral outcomes at both the individual and organizational levels.

Second, the current research extends previous research by examining two distinct types of discrimination (i.e., differentiating formal and interpersonal discrimination. Previous research reveals that interpersonal discrimination is a common experience for individuals belonging to stigmatized groups (Swim et al., 2001; Hebl et al., 2002; King, et al., 2006). The current study builds upon previous research by examining additional organizationally related outcomes that result from experiencing interpersonal discrimination. Rather than focusing on attitudinal measures, the current research answers calls from researchers to examine discrimination in an ongoing social interaction to gain a better grasp of the impact of such differential treatment upon individuals.

Third, the current research expands research on attributional ambiguity (Crocker & Major, 1989). Much of the previous research on attributional ambiguity focuses on the self-protective nature of the construct. The current study reveals that the experience of attributional ambiguity can have negative impacts in workplace settings. For instance, the experience of interpersonal discrimination may be particularly detrimental for individuals who complete tasks that require such resources on a day-to-day basis. That is, if attentional resources are required in order to effectively complete such tasks, the experience of interpersonal discrimination or combined discrimination may impair an individual’s ability to complete such tasks. In addition, the experience of interpersonal and combined forms of discrimination may be particularly problematic when individuals are completing novel tasks.
Practical Contributions. Many stigmatized groups are protected from formal discrimination by federal, state, and municipal legislation. However, no known federal legislation governs the interpersonal treatment that is given to stigmatized individuals. Thus, it is very likely that stigmatized individuals receive interpersonal discrimination at work. As a result, it is important for organizations to be aware of the negative impacts of such displays and to take steps to remediate the occurrence of interpersonal discrimination. Since receiving subtle discrimination is linked to performance decrements, there are several implications that organizations should consider. First, subtle biases may be linked to formal discrimination. For instance, as a result of the negative displays that are differentially exhibited towards stigmatized individuals, it is likely that targets may not be performing as well as they might be if interpersonal discrimination was not present. Many selection decisions are based on performance data. As a result, stigmatized individuals may be promoted or terminated at differential rates than non-stigmatized individuals as a result of experiencing interpersonal discrimination. Previous research has revealed that indeed stigmatized individuals are promoted and terminated at differential rates in organizations (see Hargis, Baltes, Fried, and Levi, 2006 for a review). In addition to stereotyping, actual discrimination (i.e., interpersonal or combined) might explain this occurrence. That is, discrimination exhibited toward stigmatized individuals may potentially result in decreased performance, and since performance is used for many selection decisions, lowered performance is likely to be used to evaluate candidates for promotion or transfer and as a result stigmatized individuals are less likely to be considered for such positions.
In addition to assessing actual task performance, supervisors consider other types of behavior when evaluating overall subordinate performance. Specifically, supervisors often use OCBs to evaluate performance. As evidenced by the current study, when stigmatized individuals perceive discrimination they engage in fewer OCBs. Thus, this decreased likelihood of performing OCBs as a result of experiencing discrimination may also influence the extent to which stigmatized individuals are selected for promotions, transfers, or even terminations. In sum, discrimination may have deleterious consequences for stigmatized individuals and may help to explain disproportionate representation at mid and upper levels in an organization.

Second, in addition to individual level consequences for stigmatized individuals, the presence of interpersonal discrimination may be linked to bottom-line consequences for organizations in the form of decreased productivity. Thus, organizations may not be accomplishing productivity goals as quickly as they would like to, may be spending more money on productivity than they would if these negative interpersonal displays were remediated, and may also spend more money on training or replacing underperforming employees than if interpersonal discrimination was not occurring. Thus, interpersonal discrimination has bottom-line consequences for organizations.

Third, stigmatized individuals may choose to voluntarily leave an organization to obtain employment at another organization where they are not subjected to negative forms of interpersonal treatment. Thus, there are implications for how the organization is viewed by not only the incumbent, but recommendations that may potentially be made to the incumbent’s friends and family members who might seek employment or purchase goods or services from the organization as well (King et al., 2006). Thus, it may be
worthwhile for organizations to invest in initiatives designed to reduce subtle biases as it has bottom-line implications for organizations.

Limitations. First, the current study was conducted in a laboratory setting. Conducting laboratory research allowed me to manipulate the treatment that was given to individuals. In a field study, it would have been very difficult to conduct the current study. As a result of conducting a laboratory study using undergraduate students, one might wonder if the findings would be applicable in the workplace. It is important to note that the majority of participants had at least six months of work experience, and a large portion of participants had more than five years of experience. Thus, these individuals are better representatives of working adults than typical college students.

Second, there are a number of other ways in which formal discrimination can be manifested in the workplace. In this specific study, individuals overheard a discriminatory comment with respect to gender. In order to ensure that the study was believable, statements that were included in the study made three criteria: were likely to be heard in organizations, flowed in a short conversation, and also were rated as being sexist in nature. In the formal discrimination condition, participants reported that the assessor was “slightly” sexist. Having a slight to moderate level of sexism helped to preserve the realism of the experiment as most instances of formal discrimination are likely to be less overt than in the past. In actual workplaces, there is likely to be some variation with respect to the way in which individuals experience formal discrimination. For instance, individuals may experience formal instances of discrimination that range from overhearing discriminatory comments to being unfairly passed up for a promotion or raises. The severity of the formal discrimination may influence the affect of formal
discrimination on performance. The current research provides a first step in assessing the extent to which formal discrimination has an impact on performance. More severe instances of formal discrimination may have other outcomes and further research might try to examine this phenomenon in greater detail.

Third, it is difficult to determine the long-term impacts of experiencing formal and interpersonal types of discrimination. Specifically, once individuals are on the job, do they develop methods for coping with such subtle negativity? Do individuals simply habituate to such occurrences? In other words, the effects may be attenuated over time. Conversely, it is also plausible that these effects may also increase over time. What happens as people continuously experience interpersonal, formal, or combined forms of discrimination? Perhaps there is a point at which an individual is no longer able to cope with such treatment and the effects become more pronounced. Do the differences become more significant or are people likely to select out of the organization? The current study demonstrates that there are a number of short-term consequences associates with the experience of discrimination. That is, experiencing interpersonal or combined forms of discrimination have deleterious impacts on performance. However, the current study does not examine the long-term effects of discrimination and future research should consider the long-term consequences of experiencing subtle discrimination.

Directions for Future Research. Given that the experience of interpersonal discrimination may potentially be an everyday occurrence for some individuals, it is important to examine remediation strategies from a variety of perspectives. Most importantly, for organizations should consider developing interventions designed to reduce the display of interpersonal discrimination (e.g., civility training). Developing
intervention programs may help to create a more positive organizational culture of
civility which may improve overall organizational effectiveness (see Pearson, Andersson,
& Porath, 2000 for a review). Future research may consider assessing the effectiveness of
training programs for reducing interpersonal forms of discrimination, or identifying
additional methods for prejudice reduction. Since the underlying cause of differential
treatment is often based upon prejudice, it is important to develop ways to prevent the
development of such negative attitudes (see Dovidio, Bringham, Johnson, & Gaertner,
1996; Fiske, 1998 for reviews). Thus, future research should consider interventions that
decrease the negative impacts of interpersonal discrimination at both the individual and
organizational levels, perhaps "resilience" and "response to incivility" training.

Though the current study finds significant results for the impact of various forms
of discrimination upon performance, little can be said about the mechanisms driving the
relations. That is, there may be a number of other constructs that are useful in explaining
the relationship. Identifying additional potential mechanisms will be useful for
developing interventions that can be utilized for remediation. Thus, future research may
examine additional individual difference and contextual variables that might explain the
relationship. In addition, future research might examine perceptions of intention to
discriminate, or the consequences of discrimination.

Conclusion

On the surface, Julie’s experience involving formal types of discrimination
appears to be worse than the interpersonal negativity that characterizes the interactions
that Jane has with her supervisor. The reality is that both are problematic. Formal
discrimination negatively impacts helping behavior, supervisor perceptions, and
interactional justice. Interpersonal discrimination negatively influences all the
aforementioned constructs as well as job performance. Discrimination remains an
unfortunate reality for individuals in the workplace. Much more research is needed to
find ways for remediating the prejudicial attitudes that are prevalent throughout our
society. The current study reveals that even small, subtle forms of negativity (i.e.,
interpersonal discrimination), such as decreased eye contact, smiling, rudeness, and
hostile tones can have negative impacts on performance. When examining discrimination,
it may be particularly important to examine subtle, interpersonal displays of negativity in
addition to more overt, formal types of discrimination, because as evidenced by both
previous and current research, interpersonal discrimination has deleterious consequences
for not only individuals, but organizations as well.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>This is a realistic statement.</th>
<th>Most people would be offended.</th>
<th>This statement is discriminatory.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don't think women should be managers.</td>
<td>6.08 (1.81)</td>
<td>6.22 (1.82)</td>
<td>5.67 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women should be followers and not leaders.</td>
<td>6.47 (1.25)</td>
<td>6.22 (1.23)</td>
<td>5.96 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are not suited for management.</td>
<td>6.59 (1.29)</td>
<td>6.16 (1.22)</td>
<td>6.09 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women should be at home cooking and washing dishes.</td>
<td>6.21 (1.66)</td>
<td>6.16 (1.45)</td>
<td>5.91 (1.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women belong in support roles and not in management.</td>
<td>6.20 (1.35)</td>
<td>5.93 (1.29)</td>
<td>5.83 (1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't like the thought of having a female boss.</td>
<td>6.29 (1.41)</td>
<td>6.00 (1.41)</td>
<td>6.18 (1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We aren't going to hire a woman.</td>
<td>6.42 (1.20)</td>
<td>6.13 (1.19)</td>
<td>5.76 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

Formal Discrimination Pre-test Results
Table 2

*Correlations between Items on the Stroop Color Naming Task*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean(SD)</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. Time1Incorrect</td>
<td>.27 (.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time2Incorrect</td>
<td>.15 (.36)</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time1Congruent</td>
<td>1.60 (.46)</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.14†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Time2Congruent</td>
<td>1.37 (.32)</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.14†</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time1Incongruent</td>
<td>1.79 (.46)</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.17†</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time2Incongruent</td>
<td>1.65 (.43)</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: **=p < .01, †= p < .10
Table 3

*Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for the Manipulation Check of Formal Discrimination*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>1.09 (.33)</td>
<td>3.44 (1.65)</td>
<td>2.19 (1.64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1.26 (.44)</td>
<td>3.44 (1.65)</td>
<td>2.16 (1.55)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1.18 (.40)</td>
<td>3.31 (1.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.90</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal X Formal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 99. **p < .01.
Table 4

Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for the Manipulation Check of Interpersonal Discrimination (Increased Positivity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Discrimination</th>
<th>Interpersonal Discrimination</th>
<th>Interpersonal X Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>$M$ ($SD$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>3.68 (1.40)</td>
<td>3.05 (1.26)</td>
<td>3.17 (1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>3.37 (1.32)</td>
<td>3.95 (1.39)</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 99$. **$p < .01$.}
Table 5

*Intercorrelations between Dependent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Means (SD)</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpersonal</td>
<td>3.64 (1.38)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Formal</td>
<td>1.77 (1.25)</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reported</td>
<td>2.15 (0.91)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assessor</td>
<td>4.70 (1.29)</td>
<td>-.80**</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Helping</td>
<td>3.49 (1.43)</td>
<td>-.73**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Task Likeability</td>
<td>4.55 (0.71)</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attentional</td>
<td>1.52 (0.37)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15†</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depletion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>1.47 (1.32)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Stigma</td>
<td>4.07 (0.93)</td>
<td>0.14†</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.16†</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>4.30 (1.41)</td>
<td>-0.90**</td>
<td>-0.61***</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.76**</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Effort on Task</td>
<td>5.32 (1.09)</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.89**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Coded Positivity</td>
<td>5.70 (0.68)</td>
<td>-0.17†</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.18†</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Coded Work</td>
<td>5.44 (0.56)</td>
<td>-0.44**</td>
<td>-0.33***</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.15†</td>
<td>-0.15†</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.† = p < .10, * = p < .05, ** = p < .01.*
Table 6

Counts of the Number of Items Correct (Percentages) in each Advertisement by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Advertisement 1</th>
<th>Advertisement 2</th>
<th>Advertisement 3</th>
<th>Advertisement 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>12/24 (50%)</td>
<td>12/24 (50%)</td>
<td>17/24 (71%)</td>
<td>5/24 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>8/29 (28%)</td>
<td>6/29 (21%)</td>
<td>11/29 (38%)</td>
<td>7/29 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>6/21 (29%)</td>
<td>13/21 (48%)</td>
<td>14/21 (67%)</td>
<td>7/21 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>5/25 (20%)</td>
<td>6/25 (24%)</td>
<td>9/25 (36%)</td>
<td>2/25 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Numerator represents number of individuals with correct answers and the denominator represents total number of individuals in the condition.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Discrimination</th>
<th>Interpersonal Discrimination</th>
<th>Formal Discrimination</th>
<th>Interpersonal X Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>1.92 (1.28)</td>
<td>1.90 (1.37)</td>
<td>1.91 (1.31)</td>
<td>1.11 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1.24 (1.31)</td>
<td>1.04 (1.14)</td>
<td>1.43 (1.31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 99$. **$p < .01$.**
Table 8

*Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Number of Items Attempted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>$M$ (SD)</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absent</strong></td>
<td>15.50 (2.67)</td>
<td>15.95 (2.48)</td>
<td>15.64 (2.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present</strong></td>
<td>14.60 (3.42)</td>
<td>14.25 (3.85)</td>
<td>14.39 (3.76)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.04†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td>14.94 (3.30)</td>
<td>14.98 (3.35)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal X Formal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $N = 99$. †$p < .10.$
Table 9

*Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Stigma Consciousness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( \eta^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>4.13 (1.06)</td>
<td>4.21 (.97)</td>
<td>4.17 (.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>4.01 (.96)</td>
<td>3.98 (.92)</td>
<td>4.00 (.93)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>4.07 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.08 (.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal X Formal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 99.*
Table 10

*Moderated Regression Analysis Predicting Objective Performance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination (ID)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigma Consciousness</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID x SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj$R^2$</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Attentional Resource Depletion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>$M$ (SD)</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>1.39 (.26)</td>
<td>1.37 (.27)</td>
<td>1.38 (.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1.62 (.37)</td>
<td>1.67 (.44)</td>
<td>1.65 (.40)</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1.50 (.33)</td>
<td>1.54 (.40)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal X Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 90. **p < .01.*
Table 12

*Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Number of Items Incorrect at Time 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>.05 (.21)</td>
<td>.05 (.22)</td>
<td>.05 (.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>.28 (.46)</td>
<td>.21 (.42)</td>
<td>.24 (.43)</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.17 (.38)</td>
<td>.14 (.35)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal X Formal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 90. *p < .01.*
Table 13

*Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Time Spent on Congruent Items at Time 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absent</strong></td>
<td>1.29 (.28)</td>
<td>1.26 (.22)</td>
<td>1.25 (.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present</strong></td>
<td>1.43 (.30)</td>
<td>1.49 (.41)</td>
<td>1.46 (.41)</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal X Formal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 90. **p < .01.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Discrimination</th>
<th>Interpersonal Discrimination</th>
<th>Formal Discrimination × Interpersonal Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>1.49 (35)</td>
<td>1.62 (39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1.75 (32)</td>
<td>1.85 (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 90. **p < .01.
Table 15

Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Number of Items Correct at Time 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>.05 (.21)</td>
<td>.10 (.31)</td>
<td>.07 (.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>.64 (1.15)</td>
<td>.37 (.77)</td>
<td>.51 (.98)</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.36 (.90)</td>
<td>.25 (.62)</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal X Formal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 91. **p < .01.*
Table 16

*Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Time Spent on Congruent Items at Time 1.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Discrimination</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>1.38 (.29)</td>
<td>1.37 (.26)</td>
<td>1.36 (.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1.70 (.48)</td>
<td>1.89 (.53)</td>
<td>1.79 (.50)</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Discrimination</td>
<td>1.54 (.43)</td>
<td>1.65 (.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal X Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Note. N = 99. **p < .01._
Table 17

*Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Time Spent on Incongruent Items at Time 1.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Discrimination</th>
<th>Interpersonal Discrimination</th>
<th>Interpersonal X Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>1.54 (.31)</td>
<td>1.60 (.29)</td>
<td>1.56 (.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Discrimination</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1.93 (.48)</td>
<td>2.03 (.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Discrimination</td>
<td>1.76 (.46)</td>
<td>1.84 (.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal X Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 90. **p < .01.*
Table 18

*Moderated Regression Analysis of Interpersonal Discrimination and Stigma*

*Consciousness Predicting Attentional Resources Depletion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Discrimination (ID)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigma Consciousness (SC)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID x SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj$R^2$</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

*Mediated Regression Analyses for Interpersonal Discrimination on Objective Performance with Ego Depletion as Mediator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adj R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>7.79*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ID)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>13.21*</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depletion</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>7.99*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>6.16*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depletion</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.20†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE.* In Steps 1, 3, and 4 Objective Performance is the dependent variable. In Step 2, Depletion is the dependent variable.
Table 20

*Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Coded Positivity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>6.01 (.49)</td>
<td>5.84 (.61)</td>
<td>5.92 (.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.40 (.87)</td>
<td>5.66 (.48)</td>
<td>5.52 (.72)</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>5.65 (.79)</td>
<td>5.74 (.54)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal X Formal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 88. **p < .01.*
Table 21

Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Coded Work Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>5.81 (.52)</td>
<td>5.55 (.61)</td>
<td>5.68 (.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>5.18 (.41)</td>
<td>5.31 (.51)</td>
<td>5.24 (.46)</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>5.45 (.55)</td>
<td>5.42 (.57)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal X Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.04†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 88. **p < .01; †p < .10.*
Table 22

Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Helping Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( \eta^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absent</strong></td>
<td>4.22 (1.29)</td>
<td>3.48 (1.76)</td>
<td>3.88 (1.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present</strong></td>
<td>3.48 (1.17)</td>
<td>2.79 (1.26)</td>
<td>3.16 (1.25)</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>3.82 (1.27)</td>
<td>3.11 (1.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal X Formal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 99. **p < .01.*
Table 23

*Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Assessor Likeability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>5.50 (.96)</td>
<td>4.75 (1.35)</td>
<td>5.15 (1.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>4.57 (1.10)</td>
<td>4.06 (1.38)</td>
<td>4.33 (1.26)</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal</strong></td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>4.99 (1.13)</td>
<td>4.38 (1.40)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal X Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 99. **p < .01. *p < .05.*
Table 24

Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Perceptions of Interactional Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$\eta^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.40 (1.09)</td>
<td>3.99 (1.43)</td>
<td>4.80 (1.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.17**</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.20 (1.09)</td>
<td>3.53 (1.41)</td>
<td>3.90 (1.28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.01**</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.74 (1.23)</td>
<td>3.73 (1.41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal X Formal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 99. **p < .01.*
Table 25

*Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Task Likeability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>4.58 (.57)</td>
<td>4.70 (.55)</td>
<td>4.64 (.56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>4.39 (.79)</td>
<td>4.56 (.86)</td>
<td>4.47 (.82)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.48 (.70)</td>
<td>4.63 (.73)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 99.*
Table 26

Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) for Reported Negative Affect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Discrimination</th>
<th>Interpersonal Discrimination</th>
<th>Interpersonal X Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.09 (.66)</td>
<td>2.13 (.76)</td>
<td>2.09 (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>2.30 (1.07)</td>
<td>2.05 (1.03)</td>
<td>2.21 (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.11 (.70)</td>
<td>2.19 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.09 (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.34 (.01)</td>
<td>.50 (.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 97.
### Table 26

*Analysis of Variance Results, Means (Standard Deviations) Reported Effort*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Discrimination</th>
<th>Interpersonal Discrimination</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>η²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Discrimination</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>5.50 (.78)</td>
<td>5.50 (.74)</td>
<td>5.50 (.75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>5.12 (1.21)</td>
<td>5.22 (1.41)</td>
<td>5.17 (1.30)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Discrimination</td>
<td>5.29 (1.04)</td>
<td>5.35 (1.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal X Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.29 (1.04)</td>
<td>5.35 (1.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $N = 99.$
Appendix A: Confederate Experimenter Script

Hello. (if standing) You can go ahead and have a seat and sign in. While you are doing that, I wanted to thank you for coming in today. We are currently working on a project in conjunction with a company we will call CWS Advertising Inc. The primary purpose is to design and validate an assessment center exercise. Mark (nod at confederate assessor) is affiliated with the organization we are partnered with and will be taking you through the in-basket portion of the exercise. The in-basket will consist of a number of tasks that are common for consultants and mid-level managers. The in-basket tasks do not show any gender differences; that is, women perform just as well as men on these tasks. The in-basket portion of today’s exercise will take about 45 minutes, and Mark will be explaining the process to you in more detail. Before we begin, I’d like for you to read and sign the informed consent. I will step out for awhile, but I will be back at the end of the exercise to wrap-up the study and answer any questions that you might have. (leave the room)

**Return to the testing room after 45 minutes have passed**

I know you’ve just gone through a lot of information, and you’re almost finished. We would like you to take a short survey that asks you some questions about yourself and your experience in the in-basket. I’ll give you bout 10 minutes to complete the measure.

**Debriefing**

[Come back a few minutes later] I want to thank you so much for your participation. This study was about the extent to which positive or negative interactions have an influence on your job performance. During the exercise you experienced treatment from a

DO NOT WRITE
confederate that was trained to exhibit a number of behaviors. The confederate’s behavior in no way reflected his true attitudes toward you or women in general. We apologize for any discomfort that may have occurred as a result of your participation. Your participation will enable us to better understand the implications of various forms of bias on performance. To protect the authenticity of future data collection, we ask that you keep your experience in this study confidential. We are still collecting data and do not want others to know about the nature of the study, the tasks that they will complete, or any other information relevant to the study. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated. Should you desire to know the findings of the study or have any questions about your participation please contact Sarah Singletary (email: sarahlbs@rice.edu; phone: 713.348.3901). Thank you for your participation.
Appendix B: Confederate Assessor Script

"To insure the validity of this study, I am going to read some standardized content to you. The consent form explained a little bit about what we'll be doing today, but I want to give you a little bit more detail. What you will be doing today is what is known as an in-basket task. Basically, you will pretend that you are Cameron Thomas. Cameron's been working for awhile as a mid-level manager at a fairly large advertising firm. One thing you should know is that Cameron (you) has been out on vacation for the last two weeks. Unfortunately, while you were away, you weren't able to check email or voicemail messages. A lot has happened in the last two weeks and you are eager to get back into the swing of things. Today is Monday, July 7th and it's now 9:00 and you have a meeting at 10:00. Your goal is to go through and respond to as many messages as possible before your meeting.

"Look, I need to go make a phone call to get some information that I will need for this assessment. I'll be back."

GO into the Audiovisual room and say:

**Condition 1 and 2:** "Hey. I'm at Rice today collecting some additional data. Can you give me the protocol number again? [pause] Uh huh, [pause] uh huh! Okay, thanks! [pause] You're right! [pause] Things are looking pretty good, I hope to be done soon. [go into back room and set up computer for Stroop Test]"

**Condition 3 and 4:** "Hey. I'm at Rice today collecting some additional data. Can you give me the protocol number? [pause] Uh huh [pause] Uh huh. Ok, got it. [pause] Well, it's been majority women. I don't know why we are getting so many women in here as
participants. I don't know why we keep collecting their data because we aren't gonna hire one. I don't like the thought of having a woman consultant. Other than that, things are looking pretty good, I hope to be done soon.

Condition 2 and 4: You will behave rudely, use hostile tones, and be abrupt with the participant.

Go back to the testing room, open the link (www.dcityorg/brainames/stroop) and say:

"The short task that you're about to complete will allow us to assess your ability to process information. The following test is called the Stroop Color Naming Task. It is a simple task that requires you to click on the button that describes the color of the word that appears on the screen and not the meaning. For instance, if the word blue [point to the screen] shows up, you will click on the word green. You will begin by clicking the start button. Then just click on the button that describes the color of the word you see. Try to work as fast as you can because the test is timed. Any questions? I'll give you a couple of minutes to do the assessment and then will be back with your materials." (This is the Computerized Stroop Test)

One minute later, return to the room with the in-basket materials (ads, in-basket, response booklet) — RECORD STROOP RESULTS IN THE PARTICIPANT’S RESPONSE BOOKLET Hand the in-basket materials to the participant.

Now, you are ready to Formally begin the in-basket. I have just given you two sets of

DO NOT WRITE
materials: a managerial simulation in-basket material booklet, and a response booklet.

[point to each item] The in-basket task contains emails, memos, and other organizational correspondence that you will need to read. It also contains a calendar detailing your monthly schedule that you may want to refer to when confirming meetings [open the in-basket booklet up and show them the calendar (page 2) and an email to be sure they know which booklet it is]. The in-basket task also contains advertisements that you will want to pay particular attention to. Just so you know, you are a mid-level consultant at an advertising firm. So anything dealing with advertisements is very important. Emails before the advertisements will give you very specific instructions about what to do with the advertisements. The email that is immediately before the advertisement contains very important information that is relevant to your job, therefore, it is essential that you complete all tasks that are related to the advertisements. The response booklet contains response forms for each of the items contained in the managerial simulation in-basket booklet [show them a response form and a corresponding email – the first in each book]. You will use this to record any responses that you have to the issues that are presented. If you run out of space [open the response booklet to the last few pages and show them the notes pages], you may use the back of the response sheet OR you may use the notes pages in the back of your booklet. Just be sure to indicate the issue that you are responding to.

During the next forty minutes, you will review all the material in your in-basket. Decide whether or not the item deserves a response. [Open the response booklet again to the first form] You will first answer the question of whether or not the item requires a response –

DO NOT WRITE
circle yes or no to indicate your choice. If the item does not deserve a response, then
should indicate why it does not deserve a response. If the item merits a response, then
decide how you want to respond to each item (i.e., via letter/memo, email, phone, or
personal meeting). All of your responses should be written on the response forms. Write
a precise, detailed response (i.e., don't just write a few notes, instead write out what you
would actually say when responding to the issue). For instance, you might draft a memo
or write out a message that you will deliver via phone or voicemail. You might also
decide that you need to have a meeting with an individual (or individuals). If so, you will
need to schedule a meeting and prepare an agenda for a personal meeting and list your
goals for the meeting. After the forty minutes have passed, the assessor will return to ask
you to provide feedback about the in-basket, and you will also rate me. (in condition 1
and 3, this is said normally; in condition 2 and 4, this is said rudely)

Return in 45 minutes or when the participant finishes if before.
The assessment that you took earlier is more reliable when you take the measure multiple
times. We'd like for you to complete it again.

RECORD STROOP RESULTS IN THE RESPONSE BOOKLET

I wanted to tell you about a study that I am doing. In the near future, I will be collecting
some additional data for a study that my organization is sponsoring. I am trying to
obtain names of individuals that might be potentially interested in helping me out. Will
you write down your name, email address, and then indicate if you are willing to
participate by writing Yes or No in the third column? Hand the participant the sheet.

While you are doing that, I'll go get the experimenter.

DO NOT WRITE
Appendix C: In-Basket Task Materials

RICE

CWS Advertising Inc.
Simulation

In-Basket Materials

2008

DO NOT WRITE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 TODAY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mtg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MGM Prep Mtg 3-5pm</td>
<td>MGM Presentation 10:00am</td>
<td>-Out at ANA</td>
<td>-Out at ANA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mtg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mtg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Mtg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

July 2008
E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: Owen Wilson
Date: July 1, 2008
Subject: Meeting

Cameron,

I would like for you to set up a time to meet with me as soon as you return. My schedule is pretty full the week of the 7th, and I will be out of town during the early part of next week. Does July 18th work for you? How about 10:00?

Owen

Owen Wilson
Vice President of Advertising and Marketing
CSW Advertising Inc.

We make the ads that get it sold!
E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: Mark Dean
Date: July 2, 2008
Subject: Brief

Cameron,

I know that you're aware that I'll be transferring in three weeks. I just received a call from a prospective client. You should take the lead and draft a brief for the client immediately. I am forwarding you a copy of the email that was sent to me. I'd suggest using the Children's Museum as a template for developing the brief. I have attached the Children's Museum brief to this email. It is pretty straightforward. Try to get the brief out to Veronica as soon as possible.

-Mark

Mark Dean
CWS Advertising Inc.

We make the ads that get it sold!

--------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Veronica Masden
Date: Tue, Jul 2, 2008 at 4:55 PM
Subject: Swatch
To: Mark Dean

Mark,
Thanks for agreeing to draft something up so quickly. What we are looking for is an ad that showcases our strengths as a leader in the industry. We are trying to reach out and appeal to younger men. We have catered to older men in the past. We want to be seen as hip and cool and are hoping to branch out. Any ideas that you have would be great. We would like print and television ads and we are looking to spend at max $200,000. We are looking forward to seeing a presentation by July 17th.

Best,
Veronica Masden
Swatch, Marketing Director
New Product Division for America's

Please respond to each item in your booklet before moving on to the next issue.

Do not write in this booklet.
ATTACHMENT
Children’s Museum Advertising Brief
Prepared by CSW Advertising Inc.

Shorthand Target
The primary target is the parents with children 0-12 years of age, along with their teachers, grandparents and caregivers as a secondary target.

The Task for Communications
Parents should feel a call to act immediately on the ad by bringing their children to the Museum. The parents should feel that they are giving their child the best entertainment and educational experience out there.

How does the Target view the Brand Today?
What is there to do at a children’s museum? I don’t know if the 40-minute trip into the city is worth the time and effort when there are many other options for family time in my neighborhood. I’m not convinced that there would be something for July of my kids to do at the museum since I have a toddler, a 9 yr. old and a 12 yr. old, etc.

Consumer Promise (Customer Benefit)
The Houston Museum for Children promises to provide an entertaining and creative way to expand a child’s mind and potential.

Support
The Museum’s dynamic environment and innovative exhibits should impress parents so that they will depend on the Museum’s activities to enhance a child’s potential to be a great leader and thinker.

What principle attitude toward the brand should the target hold as a result of the communication?
My child had a great time at the Museum. The experience was exciting for my child, and engaging in such a positive learning and entertainment adventure with my child makes me feel like a wonderful parent.

Brand Personality
The Museum is a creative, cutting-edge, hip, cool, fun entertainment experience that is also educational, constantly changing, and has a child-centered focus. Their consistently low price and high value is a bargain, plus the dynamic environment with its unique exhibits and educational activities appeal to a wide range of ages.

PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH ITEM IN YOUR BOOKLET BEFORE MOVING ON TO THE NEXT ISSUE.
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Guidelines

Budget: $30,000

Media: TV, Print

Timing/Due Dates

Scheduled estimate by: July 2, 2008

Job delivered by: July 16, 2008
To: Cameron Thomas
From: Lauren Miller
Date: July 2, 2008
Subject: Covergirl Outlast Ad

Cameron:

Hope that all is well. I need a favor. I've been working on the Covergirl Outlast Ad for a couple of weeks and I cannot tell how many tubes of lipgloss are in this advertisement. Will you do a quick count for me? I've attached the ad to this email. It's really important that I get an accurate count before we submit the ad. I need your response before the start of our next staff meeting on the 7th.

Thanks,

Lauren Miller
Senior Associate, Creative Team
CWS Advertising Inc.

We make the ads that get it sold!
NEW OUTLAST LIPCOLOR

Now Outlast offers the Most Shades in Longwear plus the crystal clear way to find the right one for you. 41 brilliant, wearable (and see-through) shades—and a clear new shade shopping system—so you can't go wrong...all day long!

Want to see the difference up close? Go to covergirl.com/swing/augustaseptlookinnew.html.
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E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: Michelle Schmidt
Date: July 2, 2008
Subject: ANA Annual Conference

Cameron,

I believe that you are going to the ANA Conference this year. Please send me your travel dates before the next staff meeting can so that I can take care of booking your travel and hotel.

Thanks,
Michelle

Michelle Schmidt
Administrative Assistant
Creative Team
CWS Advertising Inc.

We make the ads that get it sold!
E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: ANA Conference Registration
Date: July 2, 2008
Subject: ANA Annual Conference and Exposition – Last Days for Discounted Registration

Register for the ANA Annual Conference & Exposition Today (July 16 – 19, 2008)
Discount Registration Deadline is July 9, 2008

2008 Annual Conference Hotel Accommodations
Visit the ANA Annual Conference web site to make your hotel reservations today. View a complete list of ANA Annual Conference hotels and a map with the locations for each. It is recommended that you make your reservations early.

Networking & Special Activities
- Tuesday Night Show with Lionel Richie
- Chicago Tours
- ANA Child Care Center
- Conference Orientation

Membership Active Through: January 31, 2009

The SHRM Annual Conference is a chance for you to get together with some of the greatest minds in human resources, academia, business, globalization and leadership. Learn real strategies and techniques for improving your work and your workplace.

Conference Highlights
Find out more about the exciting educational opportunities planned for the 2008 ANA Annual Conference. Make your reservations today.

ANA Business Education

PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH ITEM IN YOUR BOOKLET BEFORE MOVING ON TO THE NEXT ISSUE.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS BOOKLET.
ANA Business Education offers advertising professionals the knowledge to become advertising leaders. Instructors and professors from prestigious universities will help you learn the creative and business skills you need to be a key player in improving your organization.

You Will Learn To:

Increase knowledge of business essentials.
Confidently discuss core business issues.
Understand how changes in the economic landscape impact your business.
Analyze financial statements.

We look forward to seeing you at the conference.

- ANA - We're building a leading marketing community
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E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas

From: Lou Hayes

Date: July 1, 2008

Subject: Wired Ad

Cameron,

While you were gone, one of your clients, Wired, contacted us to put together a print brief for their new magazine promotion. We decided to showcase all of their magazine covers. What do you think? Also, can you count the number of times you see "Wired" in the ad? You've got such great attention to detail, I decided to check my counts with you. I've attached the ad to this email. Please get this information to me before our next staff meeting on July 7th.

Thanks.

-Lou

Lou Hayes
Managing Consultant
Creative Team
CWS Advertising Inc.

We make the ads that get it sold!
ATTACHMENT

PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH ITEM IN YOUR BOOKLET BEFORE MOVING ON TO THE NEXT ISSUE.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS BOOKLET.
IDEAS WITH IMPACT

In 1993 WIRED jump-started our world with the belief that technology would radically transform business and culture. It has. Fifteen years later, WIRED is still the first word on the people, companies and ideas that are changing the world around us.

Go to wired.com for the latest news, analysis and reviews.

To subscribe wired.com/subscribe
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E-MAIL

To: Advertising and Marketing Managers, Directors, Staff

From: Owen Wilson

Date: July 2, 2008

Subject: Staff Meeting

As you know, last quarter's revenue was down significantly from this time last year. I have scheduled a meeting to discuss how we might ensure that this trend does not continue. The meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 15th at 4:00 p.m. You should expect the meeting to last about an hour of so. I hope to see all of you there; please let me know if you will be there so that I can order the appropriate number of materials.

Owen

Owen Wilson
Vice President of Advertising & Marketing
CWS Advertising Inc.

We make the ads that get it sold!
E-MAIL

To: All employees  
From: Linda Moore  
Date: July 5, 2008  
Subject: New hire

I just wanted to let everyone know that we have hired a new executive administrative assistant. Susan Baker joined CSW late last week. We are very excited to have Susan with us! Please send her a welcome email.

Thank you,

Linda Moore

Executive Assistant

CWS Advertising Inc.

We make the ads that get it sold!
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E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: Jeremy Rice
Date: July 6, 2008
Subject: MGM ad

Hi Cameron,

I wanted to give you an update on the MGM ad. While you were on vacation we were able to we make significant progress on the MGM advertisement. We have developed two creatives that we think could be used for the new MGM ad campaign. Since you are the primary on the MGM project, I wanted you to select the ad which best represents the advertising brief that we developed after the last project meeting. Let me know which one is best, and it would be helpful if you could tell me why you choose one over the other. Since you'll be at a conference during the presentation, I want to make sure I fully understand your reasoning. Please proof the creatives and send me your response before the next staff meeting. Also, please let me know if it meets all of the required criteria. I have attached the ad brief and ads to this email so that you don't have to dig for them!

I hope to hear from you soon.

Jeremy
J. Rice
CWS Advertising Inc.

We make the ads that get it sold!
ATTACHMENT
MGM Hotel & Casino Las Vegas Advertising Brief
Prepared by CWS Advertising Inc

Shorthand Target
The primary target for the ad is women that are in relationships. They are women that would enjoy spending quality time with their significant others.

The Task for Communication
Women should immediately let their significant other know that they’ve found a wonderful place for a weekend getaway that is both romantic AND fun.

How Does the Target View the Brand Today?
They are somewhat reluctant and are likely to ask, “What is there to do at the MGM other than gamble? I am not interested in going because I do not gamble. I could find better things to do.”

Consumer Promise (Customer Benefit)
MGM Hotel and Casino Las Vegas promises to provide an opportunity for couples to spend some quality time together in a romantic, fun and exciting atmosphere.

Support
There are lots of things to do at the hotel other than gamble. There are spas, pools, fine dining, concerts and exclusive shows in addition to gambling.

What principle attitude toward the brand should the target hold as a result of the communication?
Something like, “My partner and I had a GREAT time at the MGM. It was fun, romantic, relaxing and I would love to go again.”

Brand Personality
The MGM has a somewhat masculine branding image. Typical ads often contain ads in dark colors and contain their signature images of wildlife. It is a Las Vegas staple and popular among tourists.

Guidelines
Budget: $60,000
Media: Print – for women’s magazines

Timing/Due Dates
Scheduled estimate by July 16, 2008
Job delivered by
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ATTACHMENT

Escape begins at mgmgrand.com | 1-800-929-1111
maximumVegas. MGM GRAND
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E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: Elliott Thompson
Date: July 6, 2008
Subject: Time off

Cameron,

I wanted to know if it would be possible for me to schedule a few days off at the end of July. We should be finished with all of our active campaigns by then and we don't have any projects that are scheduled for completion until the end of August. Since I know that you will need to be here when I take time off, I'd like to know which days you suggest. Let me know as soon as possible so that I can get the dates to HR.

Thanks in advance,

E.T.

Elliott Thompson
Creative Team Associate
CWS Advertising
We make the ads that get it sold!
E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: Kellie Weiss
Date: July 2, 2008
Subject: Blue Cross Blue Shield

Cameron:

Here is the new Blue Cross Blue Shield ad that we developed while you were out. Please do me a big favor and count the number of blue shirts that you see in the ad. Just remember to only count the blue shirts that you see. I really need to get this information before the staff meeting begins, so send me your count before then.

Thanks,

Kellie Weiss
Senior Associate, Creative Team
CWS Advertising Inc.

*We make the ads that get it sold!*
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E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: Chris Smith
Date: July 2, 2008
Subject: EMERGENCY

I wanted to let you know that we are having a HUGE problem with the AAA account. After the meeting we had on the 22nd of June, we started working on the storyboards. We developed four storyboards based upon the information that we gathered on the 22nd. We sent them off one week ago (right after you checked our proofs), and just received word that they are unhappy with our mockups and are refusing to submit a payment. Apparently, Gene Peterson contacted Owen directly. From what I heard, Owen is furious and wants to know what happened. I'm not sure what the problem is, but I definitely do not feel like I am in a position to really fix this situation. I wanted to give you a heads up. I'm sure that Owen or Brenda will be contacting you.

Best,

Chris

Chris Smith
Director of Marketing – New Accounts
CSW Advertising Inc.

We make the ads that get it sold!
E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: Owen Wilson
Date: July 2, 2008
Subject: AAA

Cameron,

You should have received the email from Chris Smith regarding the AAA account. As stated in the memo, the client is displeased with the creative we developed for their campaign. Since your team worked directly on this project, it is imperative that you address their concerns promptly, actually now. Make sure to address a few key points in your email: apologize for not meeting their expectations, show your willingness to do whatever it takes to rectify the situation, and assure the client that your team will do everything in your power to meet their needs from this point forward. Request to schedule a meeting with the account executive and the client to discuss the matter further this week. Make sure you are empathetic but also optimistic about re-developing the campaign. We want this client to maintain their confidence in our ability to deliver an advertising strategy that will grow their business. I don't need to remind you that this client is a big one. I trust that you will give it nothing but your best!

-Owen

Owen Wilson
Vice President of Advertising and Marketing
CSW Advertising Inc.

*We make the ads that get it sold*
E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: admin@cswadin.com
Date: July 1, 2008
Subject: Annual CSW Advertising Inc picnic

It’s that time of year again!!! Get ready for some of the best BBQ!!!! Make sure to mark the following date on your calendar. We will be having our annual picnic on Friday, July 25th at 11:00 am. As always your immediate family is welcome to attend the event. Please RSVP to admin@cswadin.com by Tuesday, July 7th. We would like to get an accurate headcount for the caterer.

Thanks,

Sandy Leu
Office Manager
CWS Advertising Inc.
We make the ads that get it sold!
E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: Jason Mitchell
Date: July 2, 2008
Subject: Dr. Scholl’s

Hi Cameron,

I hope you had a good vacation and are ready to get back to work! Since we started this new proposal, I've thought about nothing but shoes. I've been counting up the number of shoes and am not sure if we have the number the client requested. How many do you count? FYI: Don't count the insoles.

Also, it's very important that I get this information before the start of the staff meeting.

Thanks.

Jason Mitchell
Consultant, Creative Team
CWS Advertising Inc.

We make the ads that get it sold!
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E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: Chase Bank
Date: July 1, 2008
Subject: Verification Needed

Dear Bank Customer,

We recently reviewed your account, and suspect that your Chase online account may have been accessed from an unauthorized computer. This may be due to changes in your IP address or location. Protecting the security of your account and the network is our primary concern.

We are asking you to immediately login and report any unnoticed password changes, unauthorized withdrawals, and check your account profile to make sure no changes have been made.

To protect your account please follow the instructions below:

* DO NOT SHARE YOUR PASSWORD WITH OTHER USERS

* LOG OFF AFTER USING YOUR ONLINE ACCOUNT

Please click the following link, to verify your account activity:

https://www.eppicard.com/online/auth/index.jsp

We apologize for any inconvenience this may cause, and appreciate your assistance in helping us maintaining the integrity of the entire Chase system. Please login as soon as possible.
E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: Alicia Johnson
Date: July 2, 2008
Subject: Pampers

Cameron,

Glad to see you're back! Pampers is coming out with a new product for older children. Interesting I know...at any rate, they asked for a fun print ad. Can you take a look at the brief and the proposed ad that we came up with? How well does the ad match the brief? Are we on target? I could have sworn that we only had six kids in here that day taking pictures, can you tell me how many kids you see? I really need this information prior to our next staff meeting so that I can incorporate this information into the presentation that my team is giving.

Thanks,

Alicia Johnson

Managing Consultant, New Accounts

CWS Advertising Inc.

*We make the ads that get it sold!*
E-MAIL

To: Cameron Thomas
From: Brenda Bryant
Date: July 2, 2008
Subject: Project Status

Cameron,

I did not receive an update on your projects prior to your vacation. Could you let me know the status of your current projects by the start of our next staff meeting? As you know Mark Dean is transferring to another division and I will be sending a majority of his current projects to your team until a suitable replacement is found. We are currently interviewing for Mark’s position so it should not take that long.

B. Bryant

Brenda Bryant
Director of Advertising
CSW Advertising Inc

*We make the ads that get it sold!*
CWS Advertising Inc.
Simulation

Response Booklet

2008
**Stroop Test Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># incorrect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Time Congruent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Time Incongruent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Response Form Item 1

Dated: July 1, 2008

From: Owen Wilson

Subject: Meeting

Does this email require a response?  (circle one)  Yes  No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken?  (circle one)

E-mail  Memo  Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.
Response Form Item 2

DATED: JULY 2, 2008

FROM: MARK DEAN

SUBJECT: BRIEF

Does this email require a response? (circle one) Yes No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

E-mail Memo Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.
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Response Form Item 3

DATED: JULY 2, 2008

FROM: LAUREN MILLER

SUBJECT: COVERGIRL OUTLAST AD

Does this email require a response? (circle one)  Yes  No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

   E-mail  Memo  Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.
Response Form Item 4

Dated: July 2, 2008

From: Michelle Schmidt

Subject: ANA Annual Conference

Does this email require a response? (circle one)  Yes  No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

E-mail  Memo  Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.
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Response Form Item 5

DATED: JULY 2, 2008

FROM: ANA CONFERENCE REGISTRATION

SUBJECT: ANA CONFERENCE AND EXPOSITION- LAST DAYS FOR DISCOUNTED REGISTRATION

Does this email require a response? (circle one) Yes No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

E-mail Memo Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.
Response Form Item 6

Dated: July 2, 2008

From: Lou Hayes

Subject: Wired Ad

Does this email require a response? (circle one) Yes No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

E-mail    Memo    Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.
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Response Form Item 7

DATED: JULY 2, 2008

FROM: OWEN WILSON

SUBJECT: STAFF MEETING

Does this email require a response?  (circle one)  Yes  No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken?  (circle one)

   E-mail       Memo       Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.
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DATED: JULY 5, 2008

FROM: LINDA MOORE

SUBJECT: NEW HIRE

Does this email require a response?  (circle one)  Yes  No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken?  (circle one)

    E-mail       Memo       Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.
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DATED: JULY 6, 2008

FROM JEREMY RICE

SUBJECT: MGM AD

Does this email require a response? (circle one) Yes No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

E-mail Memo Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.
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Response Form Item 10

Dated: July 6, 2008

From: Elliot Thompson

Subject: Time Off

Does this email require a response? (circle one) Yes No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

E-mail Memo Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.
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Response Form Item 11

Dated: July 2, 2008

From: Kellie Weiss

Subject: Blue Cross Blue Shield

Does this email require a response? (circle one) Yes No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

E-mail    Memo    Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.

Please write legibly. Make sure to fully respond to each item before moving onto the next issue. If you need more space, use the back of the page or the notes pages in the back of the booklet. Please clearly identify the item that you are addressing.
Response Form Item 12

DATED: JUly 2, 2008

FROM: Chris Smith

SUBJECT: Emergency

Does this email require a response? (circle one) Yes No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

E-mail Memo Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.

Please write legibly. Make sure to fully respond to each item before moving onto the next issue. If you need more space, use the back of the page or the notes pages in the back of the booklet. Please clearly identify the item that you are addressing.
Response Form Item 13

Dated: July 2, 2008

From: Owen Wilson

Subject: AAA

Does this email require a response? (circle one)  Yes  No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

E-mail  Memo  Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.

Please write legibly. Make sure to fully respond to each item before moving onto the next issue. If you need more space, use the back of the page or the notes pages in the back of the booklet. Please clearly identify the item that you are addressing.
Response Form Item 14

Dated: July 1, 2008

From: CSW Admin

Subject: Annual CSW Advertising Inc. Picnic

Does this email require a response? (circle one) Yes No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

E-mail Memo Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.

Please write legibly. Make sure to fully respond to each item before moving onto the next issue. If you need more space, use the back of the page or the notes pages in the back of the booklet. Please clearly identify the item that you are addressing.
Response Form Item 15

Dated: July 1, 2008

From: Jason Mitchell

Subject: Dr. Scholl’s Ad

Does this email require a response? (circle one) Yes No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

   E-mail    Memo    Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.

Please write legibly. Make sure to fully respond to each item before moving onto the next issue. If you need more space, use the back of the page or the notes pages in the back of the booklet. Please clearly identify the item that you are addressing.
Response Form Item 16

DATED: JULY 1, 2008

FROM: CHASE BANK

SUBJECT: VERIFICATION NEEDED

Does this email require a response? (circle one) Yes No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

E-mail Memo Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.

PLEASE WRITE LEGIBLY. MAKE SURE TO FULLY RESPOND TO EACH ITEM BEFORE MOVING ONTO THE NEXT ISSUE. IF YOU NEED MORE SPACE, USE THE BACK OF THE PAGE OR THE NOTES PAGES IN THE BACK OF THE BOOKLET. PLEASE CLEARLY IDENTIFY THE ITEM THAT YOU ARE ADDRESSING.
Response Form Item 17

Dated: July 2, 2008

From: Alicia Johnson

Subject: Pampers

Does this email require a response?  (circle one)  Yes  No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken?  (circle one)

E-mail  Memo  Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.

Please write legibly. Make sure to fully respond to each item before moving onto the next issue. If you need more space, use the back of the page or the notes pages in the back of the booklet. Please clearly identify the item that you are addressing.
Response Form Item 18

DATED: JULY 2, 2008

FROM: BRENDAL BRYANT

SUBJECT: PROJECT STATUS

Does this email require a response? (circle one) Yes No

Why or why not?

If yes, circle the action needs to be taken? (circle one)

E-mail Memo Letter

If yes, use the space below to respond.

PLEASE WRITE LEGIBLY. MAKE SURE TO FULLY RESPOND TO EACH ITEM BEFORE MOVING ONTO THE NEXT ISSUE. IF YOU NEED MORE SPACE, USE THE BACK OF THE PAGE OR THE NOTES PAGES IN THE BACK OF THE BOOKLET. PLEASE CLEARLY IDENTIFY THE ITEM THAT YOU ARE ADDRESSING.
PLEASE WRITE LEGIBLY. MAKE SURE TO FULLY RESPOND TO EACH ITEM BEFORE MOVING ONTO THE NEXT ISSUE. IF YOU NEED MORE SPACE, USE THE BACK OF THE PAGE OR THE NOTES PAGES IN THE BACK OF THE BOOKLET. PLEASE CLEARLY IDENTIFY THE ITEM THAT YOU ARE ADDRESSING.
PLEASE WRITE LEGIBLY. MAKE SURE TO FULLY RESPOND TO EACH ITEM BEFORE MOVING ONTO THE NEXT ISSUE. IF YOU NEED MORE SPACE, USE THE BACK OF THE PAGE OR THE NOTES PAGES IN THE BACK OF THE BOOKLET. PLEASE CLEARLY IDENTIFY THE ITEM THAT YOU ARE ADDRESSING.