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ABSTRACT
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Three studies examine the influence of sexual orientation employment anti-discrimination legislation on sexual orientation prejudice and discrimination, including interpersonal measures of discrimination. Although previous research has found evidence of greater perceived discrimination in areas without anti-discrimination legislation (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001), the causality of the relationship is unclear. Building on previous research we use three different paradigms (resume survey, field study, and lab experiment) that equalize the extent of sexual orientation disclosure with and without legal protections. Additionally, we expand the form of discrimination studied to include not only traditional formal measures but also more subtle, interpersonal measures. We balance internal and external validity concerns by triangulating from (i) a resume study in which human resource managers across the U.S. in areas with and without anti-discrimination legislation evaluate hypothetical matched applicants that differ only in presumed sexual orientation, (ii) a field study in which the same applicants portray themselves as gay (lesbian) or non-gay while applying for retail jobs in neighboring cities with or without legislation, and (iii) a lab experiment in which prior to interviewing a gay or lesbian confederate applicant for a management position, participants are led to believe that their area does or does not have sexual orientation anti-discrimination legislation. We
propose that, in combination, we can inform legislative debate with empirically-based research estimates for the likely efficacy of pending national legislation (i.e. ENDA).
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A private employer in the United States may typically choose whom to hire, whom to promote, whom to fire at his or her own discretion, even when those decisions are unmotivated by a concern for employee merit or bottom-line profits and productivity. While Title VII of the historic Civil Rights Act does provide national-level protection against employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, and religion, such protection on the basis of sexual orientation is absent.

Current legislative efforts are seeking to change that with the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA). Drafted in 1994, the bill would protect gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals from employment discrimination with (disparate treatment) provisions similar to those found in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. A revised ENDA bill passed the Democratic-controlled House in November 2007, although this was largely symbolic given President Bush’s vow to veto an earlier version of the bill. However, with the change in administration, ENDA may have a real chance to become law.

Nevertheless, civil rights for gays and lesbians remain a controversial issue, with over forty percent of the U.S. population still of the opinion that homosexuality should not be accepted by society (Pew Global Attitudes, 2007). Faced with an electorate in which most direct voter referendums have opposed such legislation (Gamble, 1997; Haider-Markel, Querze, & Lindaman, 2007), even politicians who may privately support such rights, may find themselves voting against protective laws to avoid angering their constituents.

In the absence of positive evidence for the efficacy of such legislation, politicians have been afforded a unique face-saving opportunity. Rather than having to oppose
legislation by claiming that discrimination towards gays and lesbians does not exist, or should in fact be allowed to exist, politicians can simply oppose such legislation by stating that, despite their support for the goals of the legislation, such legislation would not work. The 2002 ENDA Senate Committee testimony of Susan Collins (R-Maine), a moderate who will likely play a key role in whether ENDA becomes law, best illustrates this tactic: “To me, the key issue before us is how we can best promote acceptance, true acceptance, of the underlying principle… of nondiscrimination… So the question to me and the question I want to ask all of you is if we impose a Federal law which some may view as an unwanted edict… is that really going to promote acceptance and compliance with the underlying principle that we all want to see?”

Unlike the moral and religious grounds on which many of the most conservative congressmen have opposed sexual orientation anti-discrimination legislation, Senator Collin’s opposing claim can clearly be tested empirically. Local governments have often served as “laboratories” for evaluating new policies before their implementation at the federal level (Inman & Rubinfield, 1997), and sexual orientation anti-discrimination policy is no exception. Despite the absence of national-level protection, approximately half the country has outlawed sexual orientation employment discrimination, with 20 of the 50 states offering state-wide protection (www.thetaskforce.org), and some local jurisdictions offering legal protection within 15 of the 30 states without state-wide protection (http://www.actwin.com/eatonohio/gay/gayri.htm).

*Less Discrimination with Legal Protection: Correlation Does Not Imply Causality*

Existing research has documented lesser perceived discrimination among gay and lesbian employees in U.S. areas with state or local sexual orientation anti-
discrimination legislation than in areas without such legal protection (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Although individuals may be inclined to conflate reports of discrimination with the absence of legal protection, the existing finding is methodologically strengthened by the fact that presence of state or local legislation was coded by researchers rather than reported by those indicating the extent of discrimination. This finding is further bolstered by strong complementary evidence at the organizational level: gay and lesbian employees also perceive less discrimination when organizational sexual orientation nondiscrimination policies are in place relative to when they are not (Button, 2001; Griffith & Hebl, 2002; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001).

Nevertheless, this research falls short of addressing Senator Collin’s claim in that the directionality of the relationship between discrimination and legislation is unaddressed. There may be less discrimination in locales that legislate against discrimination because of two reasons: (a) areas that are more accepting of gays and lesbians are simply more likely to enact anti-discrimination laws (reduced discrimination causes legislation), and/or (b) legislation causes a reduction in discrimination. The far from random adoption of state and local gay rights ordinances certainly appears to support the first reason. Given that the adoption of local gay rights ordinances has been shown to relate positively to the presence of the gay and lesbian community and negatively to the presence of traditionalist religious groups (Wald, Button, & Rienzo, 1996), it is a fairly safe assumption that the level of discrimination is already lower in areas that adopt gay rights laws than in areas that do not adopt such laws—even before the laws take effect. However, this does not preclude the possibility that legislation itself also has a major effect on discrimination reduction. This simply means that research on
the efficacy of legislation has the difficult task of controlling for those factors on which areas with and without legislation differ.

However, the single study to date to control for at least some of those community variables related to the adoption of legislation found no evidence for any causal impact of state and local legislation on discrimination (Klawitter & Flatt, 1998). Given strong theoretical reasons to expect sexual orientation anti-discrimination legislation to reduce discrimination, our proposed research empirically revisits the issue by (a) taking into account the level of awareness of legislation, (b) systematically restricting our examination to a single job type, and (c) using a paradigm that accounts for the possibility that gay and lesbian individuals in areas without legal protection experience similar levels of discrimination only because, in the absence of legal protection, they are more likely to remain closeted at work. Additionally, we expand the form of discrimination studied to include interpersonal discrimination.

We begin by reviewing the evidence of formal and interpersonal discrimination towards gay and lesbians, drawing on both economic studies of wage disparities, and psychological field experiments. With that background, we then address the theoretical basis for sexual orientation anti-discrimination legislation to effectively reduce discrimination, describe the methodology and findings of Klawitter and Flatt’s (1998) research, and then turn our attention to how our proposed research addresses the three major limitations of the Klawitter and Flatt study.

Empirical Evidence of Sexual Orientation Discrimination

Evidence of sexual orientation discrimination has been investigated using two major types of studies: (a) correlational studies of wage disparities, in which wage
differences that remain after controlling for numerous relevant variables are presumed to be attributable to discrimination, and (b) experimental field studies, in which individuals are equated except for overt indication of sexual orientation. We address these two bodies of literature in turn. When reviewing wage discrimination evidence, we address gay men and lesbians separately, reflecting the fact that these findings diverge substantially based on gender.

Wage studies. Economic studies that control for factors such as experience, education, occupation, urban area, region of residence, and marital status have approximated that gay/bisexual men earn from 11% to 27% less than their heterosexual male counterparts, with more stringent definitions of gay/bisexual (e.g., more male sexual partners than female partners) yielding larger income effects than less stringent definitions (e.g., at least one male sexual partner) (Badgett, 1995; Berg & Lien, 2002; Clain & Leppel, 2001). Using a definition apt to most relate to whether men are known to be gay or bisexual at work (those who have had a male sexual partner in the past year, or those who have not had a sexual partner in the past year, but have had a male sexual partner in the last five years), gay/bisexual men are estimated to earn 30% less than similarly situated heterosexual men (Blandford, 2003). In fact, raw wages of gay men tend to be lower than those of heterosexual men despite the fact that gay men (a) tend to be more highly educated (i.e. nationally representative surveys find that 23.7% of gay men to have college degrees, compared to 17% of married men) and (b) live disproportionately in urban areas in which average wages (even within the same profession) are higher than in other parts of the country (e.g., New York City, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Washington, Seattle, Boston) (Black et al., 2000; Klawitter &
Some, but not all, of the wage disparity between gay and heterosexual men can be explained by disproportionately higher representation of gay men in more female-identified professions, which generally pay less well than male-identified professions (Carmichael, 1995; Ellis & Riggle, 1995), although this seems to not solely be a matter of personal choice. Discrimination towards gay men has shown to be greater in traditionally male-dominated fields such as management, construction, and production (Elmslie, 2007).

It should be noted that not all researchers would attribute the gay-straight male wage disparity to discrimination. Berg and Lien (2002) have suggested two alternative possibilities that merit discussion here. One possibility is that gay men might have a stronger preference for leisure over income because they are less likely than heterosexual men to have children. This seems a plausible theory because of the substantial costs associated with raising children, and because parents often wish to pass on money to their children. As one would expect, Census data indeed shows that unmarried opposite-sex partnered men are more than six times more likely to have children in the household than same-sex partnered men (36.2% vs. 5.2%, Black et al., 2002). However, empirical research shows that even when children in the household is controlled for, opposite-sex partnered men still earn substantially more than same-sex partnered men (Klawitter & Flatt, 1998).

The second possibility is that homosexual men may have a stronger preference for leisure over income because decisions about the labor-leisure trade-off are made taking household income into account. Because of the well-documented gender gap in wages, a worker of either gender with a male partner has a higher expected household income.
Hence, to enjoy the same standard of living (i.e. total household income), a same-sex partnered male would not need to work as at as high-paying a job to enjoy the same standard of living as an opposite-sex partnered male. Note that while this theory could potentially explain gender disparities between same-sex and opposite-sex partnered men, there seems to be less, not more, of a sexual orientation wage disparity between partnered as compared to single men. Domestic partnership (even when unrecognized legally) seems to attenuate, though not eliminate, wage discrimination towards gay men. Using similar covariates as the previously mentioned economic studies, men living with same-sex unmarried partners are estimated to earn 16-24% less than similarly situated married heterosexual men and 2-9% less than similarly situated unmarried partnered heterosexual men (Allegretto & Arthur, 2001; Elmslie, 2007; see also Klawitter & Flatt, 1998). Such estimates are based on the 1990 U.S. Census which for the first time asked whether an individual’s relationship to the head of household was “unmarried partner.” Other non-spouse and non-relative options include (a) roomer, boarder, or foster child; (b) housemate or roommate; or (c) other non-relative.

Wage discrimination towards lesbian women relative to heterosexual women is less clear, and wage gaps are not always found. Nationally representative surveys have found that lesbian women earn more than heterosexual women, with partnered lesbians earning more than both single and heterosexually-partnered women. These effects are robust to various definitions of sexual orientation (Black et al., 1998, 2000). However, even more so than for gay men, lesbian women tend to be more likely than their heterosexual counterparts to be highly educated. Nationally representative data show that 25% of same-sex partnered women have college degrees (13.9% have postcollege
education), while only 16% of married women have college degrees (6.1% have postcollege education). Also, like gay men, if to a somewhat lesser extent, lesbian women are more likely than their heterosexual counterparts to live in major urban areas in which average wages are higher than in other parts of the country (Black et al., 2000). Research that has controlled for covariates such as age, race, education, marital status, region, and occupation (e.g., Badgett, 1995) has generally not found evidence of either a wage advantage or wage disadvantage for lesbian women relative to heterosexual women.

**Interpersonal discrimination field experiments.** At this point, it is important to distinguish between formal and interpersonal discrimination. Although the economic wage-based studies seem to suggest that lesbians may not be subject to formal discrimination, substantial psychological evidence appears to show that both gay men and lesbians are treated with interpersonal discrimination.

As defined in Hebl et al. (2002), formal discrimination refers to the most overt types of discrimination, including discrimination in hiring and promotion, access, and distribution of resources. It is this type of discrimination that can be tracked and exposed most directly, and, where anti-discrimination legislation does exist, can be most unambiguously proven in a court of law. In contrast, interpersonal discrimination refers to more subtle nonverbal and indirect verbal behaviors that occur during interactions with others—for instance, whether members of a given group are more likely to be met with glares or scowls, or less likely to be greeted with friendliness and enthusiasm—relative to members of others groups.

Although it may seem that interpersonal discrimination is of less importance, substantial studies show that the consequences of interpersonal discrimination are far
from trivial. From the perspective of organizations’ bottom-line profits, interpersonal
discrimination ought to be a source of concern because stigmatized individuals pay
substantial attention to such subtle forms of discrimination, and respond to it (Valian,
1998). Notably, it is the nonverbal behaviors of interaction partners—rather than direct
verbal behaviors—that stigmatized group members have been shown to most base their
perceptions of whether bias has occurred (Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002). As
such, interpersonal discrimination towards stigmatized customers has been linked to
decreases in purchases, return visits, and referrals (King, Shapiro, Hebl, Singletary, &
Turner, 2007), and interpersonal discrimination towards stigmatized employees has been
linked to decreased organizational helping behaviors and increased intentions to leave
(King, Hebl, George, & Matusik, 2006).

To date, there have been only two field studies of interpersonal employment
discrimination towards gay and lesbian applicants. In these studies (Hebl et al., 2002;
Singletary & Hebl, in press) male and female confederates were sent to apply for retail
jobs in the Houston area (where no private employment sexual orientation anti-
discrimination legislation exists), with each confederate applying in some stores wearing
a hat identifying them as "Gay and Proud," while in others wearing a hat identifying them
as (presumably non-stigmatized) "Texan and Proud." This is a particularly rigorous
methodology in that it allows confederates to be kept blind to their condition (i.e. they did
not know which hat they were wearing at any given time), and prevents expectancies of
discrimination from altering confederate behavior. Although no evidence of significant
formal discrimination (i.e. proportion of applicants invited to interview) was found, store
managers interacted with confederates who were visibly identifiable as gay or lesbian for
less time and were less likely to respond to presumably gay or lesbian applicants with friendliness and positivity. No differences in extent of interpersonal discrimination were found for gay male relative to lesbian applicants.

Similar findings regarding interpersonal discrimination towards gays and lesbians have been documented across multiple domains, including general helping (request for phone call: Ellis & Fox, 2001; Gabriel et al., 2001; Gabriel & Banse, 2006; Gore, Tobiasen, & Kayson, 1997; Shaw, Borough, & Fink, 1994; request for change: Gray, Russel, & Blockley, 1991; Tsang, 1994), customer service treatment in retail establishments (Walters & Curran, 1996), and hotel reservation policies (Jones, 1996). Of this research, requests for a phone call using the wrong number technique (Gaertner & Bickman, 1971) is of particular interest because it has been conducted across cultures that vary in their acceptance of gays and lesbians. In this paradigm, random digit dialing is used, and those who answer the phone are asked by a male to call his male partner or (control) female partner, or are asked by a female to call her male partner (control) or female partner. As Gabriel and Banse (2006) noted, effect sizes for sexual orientation for callers of both genders are higher in studies conducted in the United States than in Britain and Germany, which are in turn higher than in Switzerland, and this pattern of effect sizes corresponds to the level of acceptance for gays and lesbians found in national surveys (Kelley, 2001; Melich, 2002; see also Pew Global Attitudes, 2007). We would add that this pattern also corresponds to how early sexual orientation anti-discrimination policies were adopted, with the first nationwide protection coming from Switzerland (in 2000), with legal protections coming later in the UK and Germany (2003 and 2006), and the US still without nationwide protection.
Legislation as a Cause of Lesser Prejudice: Theoretical Basis

Deterrence theory (e.g., Becker, 1968) posits that outlawing a given behavior reduces that behavior to the extent that punishment is certain and severe as a result of rational cost-benefit analysis. Deterrence theory has received substantial empirical support, although effects of severity of punishment are more mixed (review: Cook, 1980). When applied to anti-discrimination laws specifically, prejudiced employers are said to discriminate less because such laws create an “expected cost” of a magnitude that equals the cost of law violation if caught (e.g., attorney’s fees, fines) times the probability of being caught (Landes, 1968).

If legislation only impacted behavior to the extent that punishment is expected, anti-discrimination laws would likely have little effect. Fundamentally, the probability of an employer facing legal consequences for engaging in employment discrimination is quite small. In states with sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws, the likelihood of a gay or lesbian employee in those areas even filing a legal complaint is estimated at only 0.01% to 0.08% annually (Rubenstein, 2002). Nationally, roughly 60% of gays and lesbians report that they experience employment discrimination (Waldo, 1999). If the incidence of discrimination in areas with legislation were even a minute fraction of the national average, that is still much less than the likelihood of a gay or lesbian employee in those areas filing a legal complaint.

This is likely particularly true for interpersonal discrimination. Unlike overt acts of discrimination, such as blatant refusal to hire gays or lesbians or the use of hostile or derogatory language, interpersonal discrimination is difficult for a target to prove and,
hence, difficult if not impossible to take legal action against. As Hebl et al. (2002, p. 816) state, “A person cannot be arrested or formally reprimanded for glaring at a homosexual individual. Similarly there are no mandates on the number of words one must speak or the amount of smiling one must do on the basis of sexual orientation.”

However, a consideration of instrumental effects alone is incomplete. Despite the fact that the likelihood of a gay or lesbian employee in areas with sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws filing a legal complaint is estimated at only 0.01% to 0.08% annually, that is no less likely than the proportion of women and minorities who file legal complaints of discrimination (Rubenstein, 2001), both groups for whom anti-discrimination legislation has largely been accepted as having had a causal impact on reducing discrimination (Blacks: Burstein, 1985; Donohue & Heckman, 1991; women: Gunderson, 1989).

Much of the effects of laws likely derive from symbolic rather than purely instrumental effects (e.g., Tapp & Kohlberg, 1971; Zimring & Hawkins, 1973). The symbolic effects of legislation are such that, even absent any possibility of tangible punishment, legislation may reduce a given act (discrimination) simply by designating it as illegal, criminal, or deviant. In line with this, empirical work shows that the extent to which a law is seen as morally valid correlates with the extent to which the law is obeyed (Grasmick & Green, 1980; Meier & Johnson, 1977; Sarat, 1977). Thus, the force of law is not simply a fear of punishment; people fear violating the law because it authoritatively describes moral rules of conduct (Robinson & Darley, 1997). As such, anti-discrimination legislation may create a clear social norm that discrimination is societally unacceptable.
Thus, legislation may deter discrimination towards a given group because it changes attitudes about the morality of such discrimination. Simply learning the stance of one’s community has been shown to impact the extent of prejudice one expresses, even when attitudes are indicated privately, absent any real possibility of conflict or criticism (Stangor, Sechrist, & Jost, 2001; Wittenbrink & Henly, 1996). This effect is strong enough that even learning the opinion of a single community member has been shown to change one’s attitudes towards out-group members (Blanchard, Lilly, & Vaughn, 1991; Blanchard, Crandall, Brigham, & Vaughn, 1994; Monteith, Deneen, & Tooman, 1996; Zitek & Hebl, 2007), and resulting attitude change has been shown to last beyond the short-term (Stangor et al., 2001; Zitek & Hebl, 2007). Notably, more attitude change has been shown toward gays and other groups for whom there is more ambiguity about the social acceptability of prejudice than towards groups towards whom prejudice is more clearly socially accepted (racists) or unaccepted (Blacks) (Zitek & Hebl, 2007).


Klawitter and Flatt sought to determine whether some of the wage gap could be explained away after controlling for state and local anti-discrimination ordinances. As in previous research investigating the sexual orientation wage gap, they used data from the 1990 U.S. Census, which had, for the first time, allowed gay and lesbian couples to be identified by adding an “unmarried partner” category to the list of household relationships. They then compared same-sex couples’ incomes to those of opposite-sex unmarried couples, and opposite-sex married couples, within areas with and without legal protection. Male and female wages were examined separately, in addition to the combined household income of couples. Note that in 1989, when the earnings data for
their study was collected, anti-discrimination policies were far less widespread than they are now. At the time, only two states (Wisconsin, 1982; Massachusetts, 1989) had implemented anti-discrimination policies that applied to private employment, although local policies existed in 43 local areas (including areas in states with implemented policies). However, because gay men, and, to a lesser extent, lesbian women are more likely to live in areas that have legal protection than heterosexuals, in 1989 private employment laws covered 42 percent of male same-sex couples, and 30 percent of female same-sex couples (though only 19 percent of unmarried opposite-sex couples and 15 percent of married couples).

The zero-order correlations do appear to support a lessened sexual orientation wage gap in areas with anti-discrimination policies relative to areas without, at least with regards to men. Although overall, wages were higher in areas with anti-discrimination legislation than in areas without legislation for both heterosexual and homosexual individuals, that difference was larger for gay men and, to a far lesser extent, lesbians than for their heterosexual counterparts. While the combined income of an unmarried opposite-sex couple was .20 standard deviations higher in areas with legislation than in areas without, and the combined income of a married couple was .22 standard deviations higher, the combined income of a male same-sex couple was .32 standard deviations higher in areas with legislation than in areas without (for female same-sex couples incomes were .23 standard deviations higher). This pattern is consistent for individual earnings also. Though the incomes of married men and unmarried men living with an opposite-sex partner were .11 standard deviations higher in areas with legislation than in areas without, the incomes of men living with a same-sex partner were .23 standard
deviations higher in areas with legislation than in areas without. The incomes of women living with a same-sex partner were .21 standard deviations higher in areas with legislation than in areas without, as compared to .16 and .18 for married women and unmarried women living with opposite-sex partners, respectively.

However, this finding alone cannot speak to the issue of whether the legislation caused a reduced wage gap, as opposed to whether legislation was simply more likely to be adopted in areas with reduced employment prejudice and discrimination at the outset. Previous research has shown local governments have been more likely to adopt anti-discrimination policies in areas with more urban populations, higher education levels, and more non-family households (Haeberle, 1996; Wald, Button, & Rienzo, 1996)—all of which have been shown to be related to presence of the gay community, with the latter perhaps the most decent proxy for gay and lesbian population. Thus, although Klawitter and Flatt (1998) did not control for presence of the gay community directly (gay and lesbian couple population by zip code has since then been documented using 2000 Census data in Gates & Ost, 2004), they did at least control for a decent proxy for the gay community within the area, and two other area variables related to acceptance of alternative lifestyles.

After controlling for urban location, education, and presence of children, in addition to a standard set of variables that typically affect earnings (age, race, work-related disability, English proficiency, and region), they found no effect of anti-discrimination legislation on the sexual orientation wage gap. This was unaltered in separate analyses that additionally controlled for occupation and industry variables, and that limited the sample to full-time, full-year workers.
Although it ultimately did not alter the findings in measuring the effects of anti-discrimination policies on earnings, in subsequent analyses they controlled for two state-level variables that were intended to control for whether policies are adopted: a 1992 measure of public opposition to employment protections based on sexual orientation, by state (Gamble, 1994), and presence of a sodomy law in the state. Thus, their test of the efficacy of anti-discrimination policies was a stringent one—and, we would argue, an overly stringent one. We argue that a large part of the way that legislation affects behavior (i.e. reduced discrimination) is by changing public opinion about the acceptability of discrimination. In our opinion, if state public opinion had changed between adoption of the law (say, Massachusetts’ 1989 law) and 1992 when public opinion data were collected, the existence of the law could have had a large impact on public opinion change. Although the point is moot with regards to their findings, we do not believe the point is moot with regards to the study we are currently proposing.

We now turn our attention towards addressing three limitations of the Klawitter and Flatt (1998) study that may have accounted for their findings by (a) taking into account the level of awareness of legislation, (b) systematically restricting our examination to a single job type, and (c) accounting for the possibility that gay and lesbian individuals in areas without legal protection experience similar levels of discrimination only because, in the absence of legal protection, they are more likely to remain closeted at work. We expand upon each of these points in turn.

*Unknown level of awareness.* For legislation to have an impact, at minimum, the public needs to be aware of the existence of such legislation. Yet, particularly at the state and local levels, much of the public may be unaware of the laws in their jurisdiction,
and awareness of sexual orientation legislation may be disproportionately pervasive among gays and lesbians.

To our knowledge, no study to date has documented awareness of sexual orientation anti-discrimination legislation in the U.S. Yet a large-scale stratified random conducted among working age people in the U.K. has been conducted (Meager et al., 2002), and we suspect the same basic findings hold true in the U.S. as well: (a) among employment rights, a general right to anti-discrimination is among the most commonly named and commonly recognized, but (b) outside of race, gender, and disability, people are not well aware of which groups are protected from discrimination. Specifically, when asked to name an employment law, anti-discrimination laws were one of the most commonly named laws, on par with laws concerning worktime and health and safety. Furthermore, prompted awareness of the right to be protected from race, gender, or disability discrimination was over 90%, on par with rights concerning minimum wage, and substantially higher than prompted awareness of other employment rights (52%: right to set amount of parental leave until the child is 5 years old; 72%: right to annual leave, in-work rest breaks, and limit on number of mandatory hours per week). However, despite a pervasive general awareness of anti-discrimination laws on the basis of race, gender, and disability, this study also found that most people were unaware of which other groups were or were not protected from employment discrimination. Despite the fact that British law protected individuals from discrimination on the basis of marital status, but not on the basis of age, people were below chance levels in identifying which of the two was protected.
The British Meager et al. (2002) study also sheds some light on which groups among the working population may be most likely to be aware and knowledgeable of anti-discrimination legislation. Generally, the findings strengthen our expectations that (a) gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals are likely to be more aware of whether or not sexual orientation anti-discrimination law exists in a given area and applicability of such laws relative to their heterosexual counterparts, and (b) those in a position with hiring authority (i.e. managers) are likely to be more aware of whether or not sexual orientation anti-discrimination law exists in a given area and applicability of such laws relative to those without hiring authority. Specifically, when asked to name as many employment rights as they could, women, ethnic minorities, and individuals with disabilities—i.e. those most apt to benefit from the protection—were more likely than their White non-disabled male counterparts to freely name the right to protection from discrimination. Further, when legal protection does not exist, those who would be most apt to benefit from legal protection also appear to be those most apt to know of its non-existence. Specifically, despite the fact that older people were substantially less likely than younger people to know of race and sex anti-discrimination provisions, older people were substantially more likely than younger people to recognize that no legislation protected against discrimination on the basis of age (i.e. ages 16-25: 17.8%; ages 56-64: 31.8%).

When asked to freely name as many examples of employment legislation as possible, those in managerial/ administrative and professional/ technical fields (i.e. as opposed to sales, clerical, and blue-collar fields), and those with increasing vocational qualifications were increasingly likely to be able to name anti-discrimination law. In Britain, these qualification levels (NVQ 1 to NVQ 5) correspond to increasing levels of
job complexity; qualifications beyond the first level qualify individuals for supervisory positions of increasing levels, from team leader, through to senior management and director level. Further, across all aspects of legislation probed, those in managerial/administrative and professional/technical fields, and those with vocational qualifications beyond the most basic level (i.e. NVQ 2 or higher) had more substantive knowledge of anti-discrimination laws.

*Differentially discriminated against job types.* Prejudice and discrimination towards gays has been shown to vary to such a large extent based on specific job types. For instance, despite numerous polls that converge in showing that 75-80% of Americans support equal job opportunities for homosexuals (Hugick, 1992; Moore, 1993; Schmalz, 1993), only 40-50% of Americans support hiring homosexual elementary school teachers (Hugick, 1992; Schmalz, 1993). As noted, gay men are disproportionately more highly represented than heterosexual men in female-identified professions (Carmichael, 1995; Ellis & Riggle, 1995) and discrimination towards gay men has shown to be greater in traditionally male-dominated fields such as management, construction, and production (Elmslie, 2007).

Thus, because certain job types are highly over- or under-represented in certain parts of the country (e.g., New York: media and advertising; Houston: oil and gas), this may have obscured the relationship between (areas with) local laws and wage discrimination. Although Klawitter and Flatt (1998) included the 13 occupation (e.g., professional specialty; transportation and material moving; farming, forestry, and fishing) and 16 industry categories (e.g., mining; health services; wholesale trade) available from
Census data (http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen1990.html) in their analyses, the dummy-coded categorizations that they used had not been created on a theoretical basis. Most Census occupation or industry categories seem to collapse across a wide number of job types which capture distinctions that the public makes with regard to tolerance for gays and lesbians in different job types. For example, both a petrochemical engineer and a graphic designer would be classified in the same Census occupational category ("professional specialty"); both a park ranger and an actor would be classified within the same Census industry category ("entertainment and recreation services").

As such, our proposed research would address this by holding constant the job type that is applied for, with the same individuals applying for the same job type in both areas with and without legal protection.

_Differential disclosure._ We believe the most serious limitation of Klawitter and Flatt's (1998) study is how gays and lesbians were identified for inclusion in the study: an anonymous indication on Census forms. In the workplace, sexual orientation is not indicated anonymously, and public disclosure is a choice. The majority of gay and lesbian individuals are not "out" at work (Badgett, 2001; Day & Schroenrade, 1997; Griffith & Hebl, 2001; Ragins et al., 2007). Thus, notes Klawitter and Flatt (1998), unlike the visible stigmas of race and gender, for which anti-discrimination legislation has generally been accepted as having had a causal effect on discrimination reduction (Burstein, 1985; Donohue & Heckman, 1991; Gunderson, 1989), "gays and lesbians have had the option to hide their sexual orientation from employers and coworkers" (p. 677). Put simply, employers cannot discriminate on group membership that they do not know,
and empirical findings show that employees are indeed less likely to disclose when they have witnessed or experienced discrimination (Button, 2001; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001).

Thus, Klawitter and Flatt (1998) may have been unable to find differences in the extent of discrimination in areas with versus without gay rights laws because of differential rates of workplace disclosure in areas with versus without employment anti-discrimination laws. Other research supports this as a potential explanation. For instance, Ragins and Cornwell (2001) found that individuals in areas without legal protections are less likely to disclose their sexual orientation to others at work. This was found even in a sample of individuals recruited based on their active involvement with the gay and lesbian community. In line with this, a survey of public officials that asked about effects of local public employment legislation and found 40% agreed that since the passage of the legislation lesbian and gay employees felt “freer to be openly gay or lesbian” (Button, Rienzo, & Wald, 1995).

Thus, our proposed research would address this by holding constant the extent of disclosure in areas with and without legal protection (survey study; quasi-experimental field study), or when areas are characterized as with and without legal protection (lab experiment). In both proposed studies, the same individual would indicate their sexual orientation in the same manner across legal conditions.

Present Research

To provide both experimental tightness and external validity, we will use (a) a resume survey study, (b) a field study, and (c) a lab experiment. In the survey and field study, awareness of local anti-discrimination legislation is allowed to vary naturally. That is, even when laws are in place, it is likely that not all managers know that such laws are
in place. Thus, the survey and field studies test the effectiveness of gay rights legislation at the present level of awareness. The survey and field study use as their sample populations that likely have different levels of awareness of employment laws: (a) human resource managers (studied in the survey study), whose occupation generally requires greater familiarity with employment laws and policies, and (b) retail store managers (studied in the field study), who despite also being responsible for many employment hiring decisions, may be less familiar with legal mandates.

H1: The extent of prejudice from human resource managers towards gay men will be less in states with ordinances that prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation than in states without such ordinances. [Study 1]

H2: The extent of formal discrimination from human resource managers towards gay male job applicants will be less in states with ordinances that prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation than in states without such ordinances. [Study 1]

H3: The extent of prejudice from human resource managers towards gay men will be less in states with employment sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws than in states without, even after controlling for those variables previously shown to impact both prejudice and adoption of such laws: sexual orientation, religious and political views, and the existence of organizational anti-discrimination policies. [Study 1]
H4: The extent of discrimination from human resource managers towards gay job applicants will be less in states with employment sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws than in states without, even after controlling for those variables previously shown to impact both prejudice and adoption of such laws: sexual orientation, religious and political views, and the existence of organizational anti-discrimination policies. [Study 1]

As noted, in the field study we are relying on awareness of employment anti-discrimination laws among individuals who (unlike human resource managers) may not have thorough training on employment legislation. It is unclear whether the general public is aware of local laws regarding sexual orientation discrimination, and it is unclear whether norms about the social acceptability of discriminating against gays and lesbians are altered by such laws. Thus, we view the following “manipulation check” hypotheses to the field study as important findings in their own right:

H5: Public awareness of sexual orientation anti-discrimination law will be greater in cities with sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws than in cities without such laws. [“Manipulation check” to Study 2]

H6: Community norms of prejudice (H6a) and personal prejudice (H6b) towards gay and lesbians will be less in cities with sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws than in cities without such laws. [“Manipulation check” to Study 2]
If we do find evidence of (a) greater awareness of anti-discrimination law in areas with legislation than in geographically matched areas without legislation, and (b) social norms that view discrimination towards gays and lesbians as less socially acceptable in areas with legislation than in geographically matched areas without legislation, then we will proceed with comparing the extent of interpersonal discrimination in those areas, controlling for variables that prior research has shown to impact the adoption of legislation (Wald, et al., 1996):

H7: The extent of interpersonal discrimination by retail managers towards gay and lesbian job applicants will be less in cities with sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws than in cities without such laws. [Study 2]

H8: The extent of interpersonal discrimination by retail managers towards gay and lesbian job applicants will be less in cities with sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws than in cities without, even after controlling for those variables previously shown to affect both prejudice and adoption of such laws: local concentrations of gays and lesbians, local concentrations of religious and political Conservatives, and the existence of organizational anti-discrimination policies. [Study 2]
In the lab experiment, we manipulate whether individuals are led to believe that local legislation protecting gays and lesbians exists. This tests the effectiveness of legislation if awareness of legislation were universal:

H9: The extent of prejudice (H9a) and interpersonal discrimination (H9b) towards gay and lesbian job applicants will be less when interviewers are informed that their city has an ordinance that prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation than when interviewers are informed that their city has no such ordinance. [Study 3]

Study 1: Resume Study

Method

Participants

Two hundred fifty-five human resource managers (mean age = 44.4 years; SD = 10.5; mean professional human resource experience = 14.4 years, SD = 8.3) volunteered to participate. Individuals were recruited online through their local chapters of the U.S. professional association, Society for Human Resource Management. Of the local chapters contacted, 22% agreed to distribute the study invitation to their members, with individuals from a total of 32 chapters in 28 states ultimately participating. Participants were relatively homogeneous on gender (77.3% female), race (89.8% White), and sexual orientation (97.1% heterosexual), but were diverse in terms of geographical region (44.3% South, 21.6% Northeast, 20.0% Midwest, and 14.1% West), and, as will be described in the sections that follow, political and religious views.
Procedure

To help avoid suspicions as to our true interest in sexual orientation prejudice and discrimination, the study was presented as an examination of differences in how human resource professionals and undergraduate students evaluate the work and academic experiences of job candidates. Human resource managers were presented with a total of four resumes, each presenting the academic and work experiences of a hypothetical graduating college senior. Of these four, only the second resume was of interest to us; the remaining three served to bolster the credibility of our cover story, and to provide filler content before presenting questions about background values and beliefs, some of which, as will be described, pertained to the acceptance of gay men.

After viewing each resume, human resource managers were asked to infer the personality characteristics of the applicant, and evaluate their suitability for a typical entry-level management position. Entry-level management positions were chosen because (a) most of the human resource professionals in our study had substantial experience in management themselves (M = 11.1 years of experience in a management position, SD = 8.7 years), and (b) the human resource professionals in our study worked in a wide range of organizational settings, and we sought to choose a job type that would have broad applicability across organizations. All resumes, including the second resume, were designed to portray applicants who would be of moderate suitability for entry-level management positions. In the control condition, in which no information would give the impression that the second candidate was gay, mean hireability ratings were 4.6 (SD = 1.2) on a seven-point scale, with 4 as a midpoint.

Independent and Predictor Variables
Applicant sexual orientation. The independent variable of candidate sexual orientation was manipulated by presenting the male candidate (“James Peterson”) as either (a) recipient of the university “Alumni Scholarship” and president of the “Student Activities Association” (control condition) or (b) recipient of the university “Gay and Lesbian Alumni Scholarship” and president of the “GLBT Student Activities Association” (gay condition). As seen in Appendix A, this information was made salient by positioning it first under the “Management and Leadership” heading of the resume, directly following educational experience. The described experiences as president of the GLBT Student Activities Association or as president of the Student Activities Association were identical (e.g., redesigned networking program to increase turnout at student-alumni events). The end of the survey included a manipulation check to identify participant recognition of applicant sexual orientation.

Legislation. Sexual orientation employment anti-discrimination legislation was coded by the researcher based on the local SHRM chapter to which each participant belonged. Although participants were asked to provide both the city and state of their local SHRM branch, because many human resource professionals belong to SHRM branches that are outside of the city or town limits in which they work (e.g., individuals who are members of the Dallas SHRM branch, may work in Texas suburbs outside Dallas that, unlike Dallas, do not have city anti-discrimination laws), we did not believe it was reliable to assess the presence of city anti-discrimination legislation on the basis of SHRM branch city. Because it would be extremely rare for SHRM members to attend meetings in a state other than that in which they worked (there are 545 chapters, including at least two in every state), we did, however, believe it was reliable to code for
the presence or absence of state employment anti-discrimination legislation on the basis of the SHRM branch. This strategy has the additional advantage that state anti-discrimination laws typically are backed by more resources for enforcement relative to city laws (Rubenstein, 2001). Of the participants in our sample, 44.7% worked in a state with employment anti-discrimination law.

**Dependent Measures**

*Hireability.* We adapted an index of hireability used previously in resume studies of hiring discrimination (Rudman & Glick, 2001; α = .87) to apply specifically to entry-level management positions (α = .85). Participants indicated on three scales ranging from 1 (*not at all likely*) to 7 (*extremely likely*) the probability that (1) they would interview the applicant, (2) they would personally hire the applicant, and (3) the applicant would be hired.

*Prejudice towards gays.* We used Herek’s (1984, 1994, 1998) ten-item, seven-point Likert-type scale of Attitudes Towards Gay men (ATG) (α = .94). Statements tap affective responses to homosexuality and to gay men (e.g., “Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong”).

**Control Variables**

We additionally measured several variables that had been shown in previous research to relate to prejudice or discrimination towards gays and gay employees. Among these, sexual orientation, organizational support, and religious and political views were of the utmost importance because they had shown to also relate to whether communities are likely to adopt sexual orientation anti-discrimination law (Haeberle, 1996; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001; Wald et al., 1996).
Religious beliefs. The community presence of Evangelical Protestants had previously been shown to be negatively related to adoption of state and local sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws (Haeberle, 1996; Wald et al., 1996). While we could have asked participants whether they self-identified as Evangelical Protestant, we sought to classify individuals on the basis of their internal religious beliefs rather than religious affiliation (or religious attendance) which may be more influenced by external family or social pressures. Given the tendency of those who condemn homosexuality to cite Biblical scripture, we used a measure of Biblical belief culled from a previous large-scale national survey of U.S. religiosity (Baylor, 2005).

Participants were asked to indicate which one of four statements best describes their personal beliefs about the Bible: (a) It means exactly what it says/should be taken literally, (b) It is perfectly true, should not be taken literally, (c) It contains some human error, or (d) It is an ancient book of history and legends. A fifth option of “don’t know” was also available. Endorsing the first two options has been shown to relate to Evangelical identification. In the Baylor (2005) study 94.5% of those identifying as Evangelicals endorsed a belief in the Bible as perfect truth (option a or b), compared to 44.9% of those who did not identify as Evangelical. In subsequent analyses, we classified dichotomized participants’ religious views based on whether they endorsed a belief in the Bible as perfect truth; 43.5% of our participants endorsed this belief.

Political beliefs. Participants indicated one of seven degrees of political belief along a liberal-conservative spectrum, ranging from “very liberal” to “moderate” to “very conservative,” or “none, unaffiliated.” In analyses political beliefs were collapsed into
three categories: liberal (31.2%), moderate or no affiliation (33.0%), and conservative (35.8%).

Sexual orientation. Participants indicated sexual orientation among four responses: heterosexual (97.1%), homosexual, bisexual, or other.

Organizational support for gay employees. Ragins and Cornwell (2001) had found that the presence of community legislation was positively related to the presence of organizational anti-discrimination policies and same-sex partner benefits. Hence to help ensure that we were capturing effects of legislation, we additionally controlled for these organizational policies and practices relevant to gay employees (Button, 2001; Griffith & Hebl, 2002; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). After the resume ratings, we queried participants as to whether their organization offered: (a) an official sexual orientation anti-discrimination company policy (80.0%), and (b) one or more same-sex partner benefits (health insurance, bereavement leave, sick care leave) (55.5%). These questions were embedded within questions asking about diversity training, and company policy for numerous groups (race, religion, age, disability, etc.).

Additional demographic control variables. We additionally measured participant gender and age. Though these have not been shown to relate to the adoption of anti-discrimination law, these have each shown to relate to prejudice towards gay men (Herek & Glunt, 1993).

Results

Manipulation Check

At the conclusion of the study, following both the evaluation of the four resumes and the questions about participant demographics and background values and beliefs,
participants were asked to indicate whether any of the four applicants were gay. To minimize demand characteristics, this was embedded in a set of recognition questions about multiple, unrelated characteristics of the four applicants (i.e. were any of the applicants Jewish, Hispanic, Gay, blind, deaf, named Natalie, named George, or none of the above?) Unfortunately, the majority of participants in both conditions (53 out of 99 participants in the gay applicant condition and 84 out of 103 participants in the non-gay applicant condition) did not answer the manipulation check questions, and instead closed the final page of the survey without responding.

Of participants who had been presented with the control resume (depicting the recipient of the Alumni Scholarship and president of the Student Activities Association), none indicated that there had been a gay applicant. Of participants who had been presented with the gay resume (depicting the recipient of the Gay and Lesbian Alumni Scholarship and president of the GLBT Student Activities Association), 72% of individuals who answered the manipulation check questions (33 out of 46) indicated that there had been a gay applicant. Thus, the manipulation succeeded in creating substantially greater recognition that the applicant was gay in the experimental condition relative to the control condition \[\chi^2(2) = 65.64, p < .001\]. Because we recognized that awareness of applicant sexual orientation (disclosure) would be necessary for anti-discrimination legislation to impact hiring decisions, we excluded from analysis those 13 participants who had incorrectly answered the manipulation check. Participants who did not answer the manipulation check (i.e. because they closed the survey rather than answer) were retained in analyses.

*Sexual Orientation Prejudice With and Without Anti-Discrimination Legislation*
Hypothesis 1 proposes that broader sexual orientation prejudice is less in jurisdictions with anti-discrimination laws than in those without. While it is one thing for employment anti-discrimination laws to reduce the specific behavioral outcome that they impose penalties against (i.e. formal hiring discrimination), it is quite another for these laws to also cause a reduction in attitudes—which cannot be legally mandated. In support of Hypothesis 1, we indeed found that prejudice towards gay men, as measured by the ATG scale, was substantially lower in areas with anti-discrimination laws than in areas without \[t(214) = 4.464, p < .001; d = .61\].

**Formal Discrimination With and Without Anti-Discrimination Legislation**

Hypothesis 2 proposes that hiring discrimination is less in jurisdictions with relevant employment anti-discrimination legislation than in jurisdictions without such legislation. To examine hiring discrimination, one option would be to simply compare ratings of the gay applicant in areas with versus without anti-discrimination laws. However, because we wanted to rule out the possibility that individuals in certain regions of the country responded differently to aspects of the applicant’s resume other than his gay-related activities (e.g., individuals in Texas might respond more favorably to a Rice University degree than individuals in New York), we employed as a 2 (gay vs. non-gay resume) x 2 (presence or absence of law) between-subjects design. That is, we attributed only differences in how the matched gay and non-gay resumes were evaluated to discrimination, not just evaluations of a single resume. Hence we ran a 2 x 2 analysis of variance (ANOVA) and tested for a law by gay applicant interaction effect. In confirmation of Hypothesis 2, we found a significant interaction effect \[F(1, 189) = 4.55, p < .05, \text{eta}^2 = .02\], such that human resource managers in areas without anti-
discrimination laws evaluated the applicant as less hireable when presented as gay relative to when he was presented as non-gay \( r(75) = 2.52, p = .01; d = .60 \); in contrast, no hireability differences between the gay and non-gay applicant were found in areas with anti-discrimination laws \( r(114) = -0.37, ns; d = -.07 \). See Table 1. Additionally, because participant gender in our study was shown to affect hiring discrimination, we reran analyses including gender as a covariate; findings were unaltered.

Sexual Orientation Prejudice and Formal Discrimination With and Without Anti-Discrimination Legislation, Amidst Other Gay-Friendly Factors

Hypotheses 3 and 4 propose that sexual orientation prejudice (H3) and formal discrimination (H4) is less in jurisdictions with relevant employment anti-discrimination legislation even after controlling for one’s sexual orientation, religious views, political views, and gay-friendly practices within one’s organization. That is, it was important to determine whether sexual orientation discrimination was in fact less in areas with anti-discrimination law than in areas without such law because of the laws themselves. Alternately these differences might be explained by demographic or organizational differences previously shown to relate to adoption of community legislation.

With regard to attitudes of prejudice we indeed found a number of organizational and demographic differences which might be responsible for the lesser amount of prejudice in areas with such laws. Zero-order correlations indeed indicated that extent of Biblical belief \( r = .59 \) and political Conservatism \( r = .53 \) were each very strongly positively related to gay prejudice; same-sex partner benefits and presence of a company anti-discrimination policy were more modestly, negatively related to gay prejudice \( rs = -.20 \) and -.14). All of these factors were related to the presence or absence of local anti-
discrimination employment laws, with more politically and religiously conservative participants in areas without anti-discrimination laws, and more company anti-discrimination policies and same-sex partner benefits in the organizations of participants in areas with anti-discrimination laws. See Table 2.

To test Hypothesis 3, we used a linear regression model, with gay prejudice as a dependent variable, and entered presence or absence of employment anti-discrimination law, as well as age, gender, political Conservatism, Biblical belief, organizational same-sex partner benefits, and company anti-discrimination policy as predictors. It is worthy of note that measures of political Conservatism and Biblical belief alone explain almost half the variance in gay prejudice \( R^2 = .46 \). In strong support of Hypothesis 3, even with over half the variance in gay prejudice already explained, anti-discrimination legislation still explains additional incremental variance. While political conservatism \( \beta = .32, p < .001 \), Biblical belief \( \beta = .46, p < .001 \), and company anti-discrimination policy \( \beta = -.12, p < .035 \) contribute to the prediction of gay prejudice, anti-discrimination legislation contributed significantly to the prediction of gay prejudice beyond that explained by political conservatism, Biblical belief, and company anti-discrimination policy alone \( \beta = -.13, p < .05 \). See Table 3. Hence, these findings offer initial support for the idea that anti-discrimination employment laws may in fact be successful in causing a reduction in gay prejudice—that is, even attitudes which strictly speaking cannot be legally mandated or enforced.

We tested Hypothesis 4, regarding formal discrimination, using a 2 x 2 ANCOVA framework, with (a) sexual orientation, (b) religious views (Bible as “perfect truth” or not), (c) political views (liberal, moderate/ unaffiliated, or conservative), and (d) same-
sex partner benefits and (e) official anti-discrimination policy within one’s organization as covariates. In contrast to hypotheses regarding prejudice, Hypothesis 4 was not supported. After controlling for these five covariates previously found to relate to adoption of legislation, evidence of less discrimination in areas with anti-discrimination employment legislation than in areas without was not significant \( F(1, 128) = 2.00, \, ns, \, \eta^2 = .02 \).

Discussion

In Study 1 we began by addressing limitations of previous research by (a) objectively assessing the extent of discrimination, using a between-subjects design in which human resource managers evaluate job applicants who are matched on all qualifications and characteristics except for sexual orientation, and (b) holding constant the type of job applied for and the extent of sexual orientation disclosure in areas with and without legal protection. In so doing, we demonstrate that the relationship between sexual orientation employment anti-discrimination laws and perceived discrimination and is no mere perception. We find that gay applicants are in fact subject to more discrimination from hiring professionals in jurisdictions without anti-discrimination laws than in jurisdictions with legal protection, even when sexual orientation is systematically manipulated such that applicant qualifications and job type are held constant.

We additionally extend the literature by providing an empirical test of whether sexual orientation employment anti-discrimination law relates to the broader construct of prejudice. In so doing, we aim to distinguish between the ability of legislation to reduce behavior (employment discrimination) to avoid legal penalty, and the ability of legal mandates to promote more internalized acceptance (attitudes of equality and tolerance).
Our findings clearly show that anti-discrimination legislation relates to attitudes of prejudice, not just formal, legally enforceable discrimination.

Further, and most importantly, we provide empirical evidence suggestive of causal effects of legislation on prejudice and discrimination. To offer preliminary support for the idea that employment laws may in fact have a causal impact, we controlled for variables previously shown to relate to the adoption of anti-discrimination laws (Haeberle, 1996; Wald et al., 1996; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). If employment laws were related to lesser prejudice and discrimination even after controlling for (a) sexual orientation, and religious and political beliefs of those with hiring authority, and (b) organizational practices in support of gay employees, this would provide strong initial evidence in support of a causal impact of legislation.

Our data provide strong support with regard to anti-discrimination law and corresponding prejudice. Anti-discrimination legislation was related to decreased prejudice towards gays, even after controlling for those factors previously shown to impact community adoption of legislation. That is, our findings suggest that employment anti-discrimination legislation goes beyond affecting the specific behaviors that are outlawed (i.e. formal discrimination) to affecting the underlying principles of acceptance and tolerance towards gays that extend to domains outside of the employment sphere. Even privately held attitudes of prejudice toward gays-- which are not, and cannot be readily legally enforced-- appear to be affected by anti-discrimination legislation. This provides theoretical support for the idea that the effects of legislation are not simply instrumental effects based on the tangible threat of lawsuit, but are also symbolic, in
morally prescribing disregard and mistreatment for an out-group (i.e. gays) as wrong or immoral.

Limitations

Though anti-discrimination laws were shown to correspond to decreased attitudes of prejudice after controlling for all variables previously shown to relate to the adoption of legislation, we were not able to show this same finding with regard to discrimination. That is, the relationship between such legislation and discrimination did not reach levels of statistical significance after controlling for political and religious beliefs, and gay-friendly organizational practices. The reason for this may be methodological in nature. First, in testing for hiring discrimination, in contrast to our tests of prejudice, we needed to test for an interaction effect. That is, we did not simply compare hireability of a gay candidate in jurisdictions with versus without legislation. To do so, might have wrongly capitalized on any number of judgments that vary regionally yet are unrelated to sexual orientation (e.g., regional differences in reputation of the college and past employers of our applicant). Instead, we compared the extent of preference towards a gay vs. non-gay applicant who was matched in all other respects, in areas with and without legislation. This requirement of four conditions rather than two hence lowered our statistical power to detect an effect. Second, in testing for hiring discrimination, in contrast to our tests of prejudice, it was important to identify whether participants in fact noticed the sexual orientation of the applicant. Because some individuals in the gay resume condition did not notice (or at least recall) the candidate’s sexual orientation, this reduced our statistical power further.
While Study 1 provides initial support for the efficacy of sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws, as a resume study in which legislation was allowed to vary naturally, there remains the possibility of both internal and external validity concerns. Although we did control for all variables which previous research had shown to affect both prejudice towards gays and community adoption of anti-discrimination laws, without manipulating knowledge of legislation, there remains some possibility that not all relevant variables were controlled for. Further, as a hypothetical resume study, external validity may be limited in that participants may have responded differently than they would have under real hiring constraints, with a real expectation of future interaction with the applicant.

We respond to these external and internal validity concerns in turn in the remaining studies, beginning with a more ecologically valid Study 2.

Study 2: Field Study

Method

In Study 2 we employ a field study in which we compare the extent of interpersonal discrimination towards gay and lesbian applicants in geographically adjacent cities within the same metropolitan area that either do (Dallas and Fort Worth) or do not (e.g., Arlington, Mesquite) have sexual orientation anti-discrimination legislation.

Background on Local Laws

The Fort Worth ordinance was implemented in 2000, and covers both public and private employment and accommodations discrimination. The ordinance was controversial when passed, with the City Council voting in favor 6-1, despite
“impassioned” testimony from community members on both sides of the issue, heard before a City Hall “packed” with more than 200 people. Notably, a turning point in the passage of the law came when a Conservative Republican City Councilmember changed his position after being approached by a Fort Worth man who had lost his job after his employer discovered he was gay (Richardson, 2000; Fox, 2000). This Councilmember (Chuck Silcox) has retained his seat on the Council.

At the time the Fort Worth ordinance was passed, Dallas law only protected city employees from sexual orientation discrimination. In 2002, Dallas followed suit and extended legal protection to the private sector, as had been pledged on the campaign trail by the newly elected mayor. The Dallas City Council voted 13-2, with notables at the hearing including an American Airlines executive speaking in favor of the measure, and a leader of a religious anti-abortion group speaking against it (“Dallas Officials Adopt Measure,” 2002).

The Dallas and Fort Worth laws are similar in several ways. They both cover a near extensive list of employment-related actions, including advertising and recruitment, in addition to hiring, compensation, and promotion. They both apply only to actions that have happened in the past 180 days, and exempt companies with 15 or fewer employees, and religious organizations.

However, the Fort Worth law (City Code Chapter 17, Article III, Division III) is the stronger of the two. In contrast to the Dallas law (City code Volume 2, Chapter 46) which simply requires the fair housing office to investigate filed complaints, the Fort Worth law included creation of a human rights commission with the responsibilities both to investigate filed complaints, and to recommend proactive measures to the city council.
measures designed to eliminate prejudice and discrimination. Furthermore, the Fort
Worth law calls for harsher penalties. While violation of the Dallas law is punishable by
fines between $200 and $500, violation of the Fort Worth law is punishable by a $500
fine every day that the violation exists. Furthermore, the Dallas ordinance makes
punishment less likely by including language on intent that would likely make proving
discrimination more difficult. Specifically, the Dallas ordinance penalizes a person “if he
intentionally or knowingly violates a provision of this chapter or if he intentionally or
knowingly obstructs or prevents compliance with this chapter.”

“Manipulation check”

Before sending individuals to apply for jobs in geographically matched areas with
and without anti-discrimination laws, we first sought to determine (a) if individuals are
aware of the existence of anti-discrimination laws, such that more individuals report the
existence of such laws in areas that truly have the laws than in areas that do not, and (b) if
social norms were such that prejudice and discrimination were less socially acceptable in
areas with anti-discrimination laws than in areas without discrimination. We get at this
last point in two ways: (i) by asking about each participants’ personal beliefs (with the
average belief in a city representing the social norm), and (ii) by asking participants what
they believe the social norm in their city is, regardless of their personal feelings.

To assess this, five undergraduate research assistants randomly called individuals
residing in the Dallas Fort Worth Metroplex. Individuals’ phone numbers were culled
from the publicly available residential phone book listings of the Dallas and Fort Worth
Metropolitan Areas, which include listings of neighboring cities. Prospective participants
were asked to participate in a 5 minute phone survey on awareness of employment laws
conducted by researchers at Rice University. To participate, individuals had to be (a) age 18 or over and (b) employed in the past year. Participants were asked to name the city in which they currently or most recently worked.

To place the study in a broader context that may seem less threatening to prospective participants, the telephone script introduced the study as focused on awareness of employment laws generally (as adapted from a study conducted by the British government: Meager et al., 2002). Awareness of sexual orientation anti-discrimination law was presented among a list of other groups and was measured in (a) targeted free response format (asked to name groups covered by anti-discrimination law other than racial, gender, and religious groups), and (b) asked directly whether or not gays are protected from employment discrimination.

Questions about social norms for prejudice and discrimination acceptability (in the community where you work) were adapted from Crandall, Eshleman, and O'Brien (2002), who used a single-item (three response) measure for multiple potential prejudice targets. In addition to the single-item measure of prejudice acceptability used previously, we created three additional measures to capture: prejudice expression acceptability, differential treatment acceptability, and more negative treatment acceptability. Additionally, we asked about one’s personal beliefs about gays using five (five response) measures of prejudice adapted from Zitek and Hebl (2006; see also Blanchard et al., 1994 for similar measures) to apply specifically to the workplace (rather than the university or broader community setting). In Zitek and Hebl, the items revealed a high degree of inter-item consistency (alpha = .80), and a principal components factor analysis revealed a single factor solution (eigenvalue = 2.81; percent of variance accounted for: 56.1%).
A total of 807 households in the Dallas Fort Worth Metroplex area were phoned and asked to participate in the survey (see Appendix B for script). The ability to speak English and age and employment criteria left a remaining 673 participants eligible to participate. Of these, 113 participants consented to participate, and 111 participants completed the survey (response rate: 16.5%). We received completed responses from 49 participants who worked in Dallas, 17 participants who worked in Fort Worth, and 45 participants who worked in other cities in the area without sexual orientation protection.

In partial support of Hypothesis 5, we found evidence of greater open-ended awareness of sexual orientation anti-discrimination legislation in cities with such legislation (Dallas and Fort Worth) than in neighboring cities without such legislation. Of individuals who worked in areas without sexual orientation laws, seven out of 46 (15.2%) freely indicated the existence of sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws when asked about groups protected from employment discrimination. In contrast, individuals who worked in Dallas and Fort Worth, which do have sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws, were nearly twice as likely (twenty out of 67; 29.9%) to freely indicate the existence of sexual orientation laws. When asked directly whether gay people are protected from employment discrimination by law (given the option of responding yes, no, or don’t know) the difference between individuals in areas with and without legislation was smaller and was not statistically significant. Relative to 47.8% of those who worked in cities without sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws, only 56.7% of those who worked in cities with sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws indicated the existence of sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws when asked directly. See Table 4.
Although we did not find evidence of greater personal prejudice towards gays expressed among respondents in areas without such laws (H6b), social desirability biases seem to have been lessened when participants were asked to indicate whether negative community norms existed. In support of Hypothesis H6a, we found that the presence of sexual orientation anti-discrimination legislation is moderately correlated with more positive perceptions of community norms towards gay people ($r = .23, p < .05$). This encouraging result led us to proceed to our main study investigation of whether these norms can translate into a reduction in interpersonal discriminatory behaviors.

**Main Study**

We used a 2 (gay vs. non-gay) x 2 (law vs. no law) within-applicant (between-store managers) factorial design. Specifically, we extend the methodology used by Hebl et al. (2002) in Houston, which lacks private employment anti-discrimination legislation, to a metropolitan area in which some neighboring cities (Dallas, Fort Worth) have private employment protection, while other neighboring cities (e.g., Arlington, Mesquite) do not.

Six male and six female undergraduate students applied for a total of 295 retail jobs (each student applied for 22-28 jobs, five to seven trials per condition per applicant) (a) while wearing a visible indicator of their sexual orientation or while wearing no such indicator, and (b) in cities in the same metropolitan area that do or do not have local anti-discrimination laws. Sexual orientation was manipulated by wearing a baseball-style cap with a printed message of “Gay and Proud,” or “Texan and Proud” (non-stigmatized control; Hebl et al., 2002). In 45 stores, the manager was not available and so the participant interacted with a sales associate. Although the inclusion of interactions with
sales associates does not alter study findings, we report analyses for the 252 interactions with store managers, given our interest in interpersonal discrimination by those individuals most responsible for hiring process.

All stores were called by phone (using a Dallas-area cell phone number) within a week of visiting the stores to determine if they were currently hiring sales associates. Consistent with previous research (Hebl et al., 2002), only those stores that indicated that they were accepting applications were visited. Applicants followed a standardized script in which they ask about available jobs, request to complete an application, and present themselves truthfully. Interactions with managers were audiotaped and transcribed. See Appendix C for a listing of the shopping malls attended. As in Hebl et al. (2002), women were sent only to stores that target either both genders, or stores that target women exclusively; men were sent to stores that target either both genders, or stores that target men exclusively.

**Dependent measures.** Interpersonal ratings were completed by (a) applicants, immediately following the store interactions, and (b) two independent coders (based on audiotapes of the interactions). Ratings included (i) rudeness, (ii) hostility, (iii) standoffishness, and (iv) attempting to end the interaction prematurely, as well as (reverse-coded) (v) friendliness, (vi) helpfulness, (vii) interest, and (viii) enthusiasm (see Hebl et al., 2002). Inter-rater reliabilities, as reported in Table 5, were in line with that found in previous studies of interpersonal discrimination using a similar paradigm (e.g., Singletary & Hebl, in-press). Interpersonal ratings were standardized before averaging to create composite measures collapsing across three raters. Principal components analysis of the eight items revealed a single factor (eigenvalue = 5.44, percentage variance
explained = 68, factor loadings ranging from .52 to .83; \( \alpha = .93 \)). To create a more homogenous composite we dropped the three items with factor loadings below .65: hostility (.52), enthusiasm (.56), and interest (.61). Principal components analysis of the remaining five items maintained a single factor (eigenvalue = 3.87, percentage variance explained = 77.3, factor loadings ranging from .69 to .85; \( \alpha = .93 \)).

Note that we did not track measures of formal discrimination in the field study because the original Hebl et al. study—which was conducted in a city without private employment laws—found no statistically significant evidence of formal discrimination. Hence, because we would expect to find less, not more discrimination in areas with legislation, we did not include formal measures.

**Control variables.** Relying on findings from previous research, we control for and match on the community variables that have shown to relate to both prejudice towards gays and lesbians as well as adoption of sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws, to allow for greater confidence that differences in discrimination can be attributed to the existence of legislation. Specifically we controlled for (a) gay and lesbian concentration by Zip Code (Gates & Ost, 2004) and (b) concentration of religious and political Conservatives (Wald, Button, & Rienzo, 1996). As reported in the Census, we included both the proportion of same-sex couples (ranging from 0.4 to 0.8% of households) and non-family households (29.7% to 53.8%) to estimate concentrations of gay and lesbians. A composite average of these two standardized variables was used. Because previously used measures of the concentration of religious and political conservatives only reported concentration by metropolitan area, we used as a proxy recent voting data by precinct:
percentage of 2008 presidential primary votes for Mike Huckabee (6% to 21% for the areas in our sample).

Additionally, we controlled for whether the companies have an official non-discrimination policy towards gays and lesbians (Button, 2001; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Non-discrimination policies were culled directly from the non-discrimination policies listed on the paper applications given to the applicants. Where no such information was listed or where paper applications were not used, we consulted the Employment section of the company (e.g., Foot Locker, Gap, etc.) websites.

We also measured store crowdedness, as judged by the applicants, as well as several store personnel demographic variables (gender, same-sex interaction, age). Intercorrelations among interpersonal treatment and these control variables, by sexual orientation condition appear in Tables 6 and 7. Most notably, the relationships between gay and conservative areas and interpersonal negativity depended on whether or not the applicant was presumed gay. In line with hypotheses, in areas with a more gay population, applicants presumed gay were treated more favorably than non-gay applicants ($z = 2.29, p < .05$). Likewise, in areas with a more conservative population, applicants presumed gay were treated less favorably than non-gay applicants ($z = 1.97, p < .05$). Area population variables were hence maintained as essential covariates in seeking to isolate the effect of legislation.

**Results**

Hypothesis 7 concerned whether interpersonal discrimination towards presumed gay and lesbian applicants would be less in cities with sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws than in cities without such laws. We ran a 2 (city law) x 2 (applicant
presumed sexual orientation) MANOVA with the five interpersonal treatment ratings (rudeness, standoffishness, prematurely ending the interaction, and (reverse-coded) helpfulness, and friendliness) as the dependent variables. As predicted, we found a significant interaction effect between law and applicant presumed sexual orientation. 

\[ F(5, 244) = 3.13, p < .01 \]. That is, store managers were more negative when applicants were presumed gay in areas lacking city anti-discrimination laws; managers were less negative when applicants were presumed gay in areas with city anti-discrimination laws. Though the laws had the intended effect of ameliorating treatment towards gay and lesbian applicants, store managers actually overcompensated when laws were in place. 

Follow-up univariate analyses show these findings were driven largely by helpfulness \[ F(1, 248) = 5.79, p < .05 \] and rudeness \[ F(1, 248) = 3.91, p < .05 \]. See Figures 1 and 2.

**Controlling for community variables**

To test Hypothesis 8, we used a MANCOVA, adding gay and conservative area population concentrations, and company anti-discrimination policies as covariates. Findings were unaltered, with the interaction effect between presumed applicant sexual orientation and city law remaining significant \[ F(5, 241) = 3.14, p < .01 \]. That is, even after controlling for the community variables consistently shown to affect both adoption of laws and prejudice, sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws still ameliorated interpersonal discrimination towards gay and lesbian applicants.

**Discussion**

Study 2 extends existing research by showing, first, that despite less than universal awareness, the presence of local anti-discrimination legislation does correspond to more positive community norms towards gays and lesbians among the general public. Hence,
even for retail store personnel, who likely do not have as much knowledge of employment legislation as human resource management, the presence of sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws still corresponded to lesser discrimination towards gay and lesbian job applicants. Notably this relationship was shown even when jurisdictions are separated by only a few miles, within the same metropolitan area, and even after controlling for those community variables shown to affect both the adoption of anti-discrimination laws and prejudice in the absence of legislation. Hence it is not that gay and lesbian applicants were subject to less discrimination in cities with anti-discrimination laws simply because the cities with such laws were less conservative or had a larger gay population. Rather, it appears that even after controlling for these area variables, anti-discrimination legislation still reduces discrimination further.

We believe this is all the more notable given our analysis of more subtle, interpersonal measures of discrimination, which unlike formal, more blatant discrimination cannot be legally enforced. That is, it is unlikely that store managers fear lawsuits or legal penalties over rudeness or other differences in mundane interpersonal treatment, as they legitimately might fear if they were overtly refusing to hire gay employees. Instead, we argue that the mere fact that discrimination is labeled as illegal (without the threat of enforcement) may be sufficient to create a symbolic effect in changing the acceptability of prejudice and discrimination towards gays and lesbians.

With findings regarding lesser prejudice, more positive community norms, and lesser interpersonal discrimination in areas with anti-discrimination legislation, we have begun to build consistent support for the efficacy of sexual orientation anti-discrimination legislation.
As such, Study 2 extends findings of the efficacy of legislation to the criterion of interpersonal discrimination, among a population (retail store managers) that, despite responsibility for recruiting and selecting employees, may lack the specialized knowledge of employment laws required of human resource managers. Further, we extend findings to a field setting in which managers can realistically anticipate that their interpersonal behaviors towards applicants will have real-life consequences (i.e. whether an individual chooses to apply or accept a job offer, or, if hired, the nature of the relationship between the employee and store management).

Although Study 2 offers a more ecologically valid investigation of the efficacy of sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws, because legislation varied naturally, even with statistical controls for variables affecting the adoption of legislation, there remains the possibility of internal validity concerns. Hence we respond to these internal validity concerns in turn in the remaining Study 3, in which knowledge of legislation is manipulated.

Study 3: Lab Experiment

Method

In this study, we manipulate whether or not participants are led to believe that their local city (Houston) has employment legislation that protects gays and lesbians from discrimination by private employers. (In reality, Houston has a Mayoral Ordinance offering protection in public but not private employment). Because most individuals are not familiar with employment anti-discrimination legislation, as we describe, we were able to manipulate this knowledge for most participants.
Participants

Two hundred twenty nine individuals in the Houston area (52.0% male; mean age = 29.4 years, SD = 11.6) volunteered to participate in a one hour study entitled "Effects of Training Delivery Method on Recall and Skill-Acquisition" (see Appendix D). Participants were recruited through online classified ads targeting the Houston area (Craigslist, Houston Press; 67.7%) or through on-campus flyers and online bulletins targeting university students and staff. Participants were given course extra credit or $20 in exchange for their participation. All participants were high school graduates, fluent in English, and comfortable using a computer mouse and keyboard. Forty-four percent had completed a Bachelors degree and average full-time work experience was 8.8 years (SD = 10.2); diverse occupations such as engineer, clerk, teacher, manager, and student were represented.

In the initial pre-test of legal awareness (see Appendix E) 92.5% of participants indicated they believed employment discrimination against gay people was currently illegal in Houston. Though high, this did not quite rise to the level of awareness of race or religious anti-discrimination legislation (99.1% and 98.2% indicated discrimination against Latinos and Muslims, respectively, was illegal). As is described more fully in the sections that follow, participants were randomly assigned to a training condition that indicated either that sexual orientation discrimination was legal or illegal in Houston. In post-training surveys 92.0% of participants assigned to the Houston sexual orientation discrimination law condition later indicated belief and recall of this “fact;” similarly, 87.1% of those assigned to the no Houston sexual orientation discrimination law condition later indicated belief and recall of the opposing fact. Hence although most
participants believed, (partially incorrectly) that discrimination against gay people was illegal in their city, when told otherwise, most participants changed their belief.

Participants who missed this post-training legal manipulation check were subsequently excluded from analysis. Additionally, gay, lesbian, and bisexual participants (8.3% of participants) were excluded from analyses.

**Design and Procedure**

The study was described in accurate terms as involving training on how to conduct a job interview and a practice (mock) job interview. The study differed from the cover story described in that (a) training delivery method was not the focus of the study, and in fact all participants received the training via computer, and (b) the mock job interview was not with another participant but was instead with a research confederate.

After sitting together in a waiting room for a few minutes, the participant and confederate were led to computers in separate rooms to begin a 20 minute online training module. The training contained content on general information about job interviews as well as specific interviewing techniques (i.e., using open-ended and non-leading questions, and reflection and reinforcement) and, of primary interest to us, “legal guidelines.” As seen in Appendix E, participants were randomly assigned to receive, as part of the online training module, legal guidelines that indicated either that sexual orientation discrimination is legal or illegal in Houston. In addition, in the legal condition participants were instructed as to prohibited questions related to sexual orientation during job interview. To help minimize demand characteristics, information regarding the legal status of sexual orientation discrimination was presented along with the legal status and prohibited questions related to several other groups (e.g., protected: race, religion; unprotected: fat people).
Following training, the participant and the other attendee (confederate) were told to apply what they have learned by acting as employer and interviewee in a mock interview. The participant was always assigned to the role of interviewer, and the confederate to the role of interviewee. Because structured interviews have been shown to reduce bias, the interview was unstructured, although all participants read a job description (from the O*NET) of the Office Manager position for which they were interviewing the confederate.

Also prior to the interview, participants were given the applicant’s completed resume information form to review. The form contained information blanks for education (i.e. degree year, GPA, major and minor), work experience, skills, and (at the bottom of the page) activities. Handwritten responses on the form had ostensibly been filled out by the other participant (the confederate), and in fact were completed with all of the confederate’s true experiences—with one exception. The university Gay and Lesbian Student Association was always listed on the first line of the Activities section.

To reinforce the presumed sexual orientation of the confederate applicant, confederates additionally wore a 2” x 3” rainbow “Gay and Proud” pin on their backpack, which was placed facing the interviewer on the table at which the interview was conducted. As with the resume information sheet, the confederates answered interview questions based on their own true experience (with the exception of occasions in which the interviewer asked questions related to the Gay and Lesbian Student Association).

Participants were instructed that they would have up to 15 minutes to conduct the interview, and that they would be stopped after 15 minutes. In 25 out of 116 interviews (21.6%) the interview was still going and was stopped after 15 minutes. Mean interview
length was 10.5 minutes (SD = 3.2 minutes). Interview length and word count for the two cases in which the experimenter did not give the interviewers time instructions were omitted from analysis. The mock interview was videotaped, with cameras, partially obscured from view behind potted plants placed among office bookshelves, filming the face and upper body of the applicants and interviewers.

Following the interview, participants returned to their separate room to complete additional questions on the computer. First applicants completed a post-test on training content, which included questions about legal guidelines for several groups, including a manipulation check of the sexual orientation legal condition. Then participants completed demographic survey information (e.g., gender, age, race, sexual orientation, disability status, education, occupation) for themselves, as well as perceived demographics of the applicant they had interviewed, including sexual orientation which served as a check that participants had noticed and inferred the participant was gay, lesbian, or bisexual (i.e. as based on the Gay and Lesbian Student Association listed on the resume and/or the Gay and Proud button on the applicant’s backpack). Manipulation checks occurred before participants completed survey items about attitudes towards gays and lesbians at the end of the study. Forty-two participants (25.5%) were eliminated from analyses of interpersonal discrimination because they indicated in the perceived applicant demographics questions that the applicant was heterosexual.

Measures

Interpersonal ratings. We used positive measures of interpersonal treatment (e.g., Hebl et al., 2002; Singletary & Hebl, in press). This included (a) smiling, (b) friendliness, (c) helpfulness, (d) interest, and (e) enthusiasm. Each item was averaged across three
raters: those made by the confederate applicant immediately following the interview as well as those made by two independent raters based on the videorecordings. A principal components analysis showed a single factors (loadings ranging from .69 to .87, eigenvalue = 3.75, percentage variance accounted for = 75; α = .92). See Table 9 for inter-rater reliabilities and correlations among interpersonal measures.

**Interpersonal language.** To supplement these interpersonal ratings, we also transcribed the interviews and used the Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) software program (Pennebaker, Chung, Ireland, Gonzales, & Booth, 2007) to calculate the percentage word count of positive and negative emotion words, as well as nonfluencies (e.g., uh, er, umm) which imply nervousness. For negativity we focused on the anxiety negative emotion word category (e.g., worried, stressed) given that negative emotion words related to anger and sadness did not occur frequently in the job interview setting. See Appendix G for examples of how interviewer participants used anxiety words.

**Interpersonal quantity.** Additionally we used the number of words spoken by the interviewer and length of interview (in minutes) to measure the extent of interpersonal interaction. Word count and length were correlated r = .66. After standardizing these variables we collapsed them into a single indicator for interpersonal quantity.

**Prejudice.** At the end of the study, following the interview, demographic survey, and the manipulation checks, participants were asked to indicate their own ideological beliefs about gays and lesbians (20 item ATLG scale: Herek, 1994).

**Control Variables**

**Participant demographics and views.** Following the interview, participants indicated their age, gender, race, educational attainment (1 = high school graduate, 2 = some college, 3 =
Bachelors degree, 4 = graduate school), sexual orientation, religious affiliation, political affiliation, and Biblical belief (as measured in Study 1).

Confederate behaviors. The two independent raters additionally rated confederate applicant behavior to ensure that confederate applicants presented themselves consistently across conditions. As in Hebl et al. (2002), raters assessed how (reverse coded) (a) relaxed, (b) friendly as well as (c) nervous, and (d) attentive applicants behaved. These were included as an additional check as to the consistency of applicant behavior across conditions, despite the fact that applicants remained blind to condition. Principal components analysis revealed a single factor (eigenvalue = 1.92, percentage variance explained = 48; loadings ranging from .66 to .94; \( \alpha = .61 \)). No differences in applicant behavior between legal conditions were found \[ t(115) = 0.55, \text{ns} \].

Results

Interviewer Reference to Sexual Orientation

In line with legal content on prohibited questions regarding sexual orientation, participants who were instructed that sexual orientation discrimination was illegal (law condition) were less apt to mention sexual orientation (or related Gay and Lesbian Student Association activity) during the interview. Sexual orientation was mentioned five times in the illegal discrimination condition relative to nine times in the legal discrimination condition. As seen in Appendix F, interviewers in the legal discrimination (no law) condition who mentioned sexual orientation inquired (in seven out of nine cases) as to the extent of the applicant’s involvement with the Gay and Lesbian Association or, in one case, directly inquired as to the participant’s sexual orientation. Interviewers in the illegal discrimination (law) condition tended to ask more general questions (i.e. “What is the Gay and Lesbian Association?”) or asked about dealing with discrimination.
**Prejudice.**

Hypothesis 9a concerned the effect of learning that sexual orientation discrimination is legal or illegal on one's attitudes of prejudice towards gays and lesbians. Consistent with expectations we found that believing—prior to the manipulation, as indicated on the pre-test survey—that sexual orientation is legal is associated with more negative attitudes towards gays and lesbians ($rs = .16$ and $.14, p < .05$). However, in rejection of Hypothesis 9a, our manipulation that sexual orientation was or was not illegal had no effect on attitudes of prejudice. As is often found, attitudes of prejudice were strongly related to political and religious views ($rs = .49$ to $.55$), and may have been too deep-seated to have readily changed within a short time period, at least without more intensive elaboration or information about the legislation. See Table 8.

**Interpersonal Discrimination**

Hypothesis 9b concerned the effect of legislation on interpersonal discrimination. We measured interpersonal discrimination in terms of (a) interpersonal ratings, (b) interpersonal language, and (c) interpersonal interaction quantity. Though the law manipulation had no effect on ratings of interpersonal discrimination, our analysis of the interview transcripts revealed subtle differences that our raters did not detect. Consistent with hypotheses, being told that sexual orientation discrimination is illegal (law condition) reduced anxiety-related words [$t(115) = 2.39, p < .05$, two-tailed], and non-fluencies spoken by the interviewer [$t(115) = 2.12, p < .05$, two-tailed], and increased the extent or length of the interview [$t(113) = 1.74, p < .05$, one-tailed]. See Appendix G for examples of the usage of anxiety-related words (e.g., stress) by interviewers. An examination of the interview context in which anxiety-related words were used suggests
anxiety-related words were typically used to describe negative aspects (i.e. stress) related to the job the applicant was applying for, and to correspondingly ask the applicant about experiences that prepared the applicant to handle stress.

Discussion

In the first true experiment to ever test the effects of anti-discrimination legislation, we go beyond previous correlational research and show that even when individuals are randomly assigned, (gaining knowledge of) sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws causally affects interpersonal discrimination. Specifically, objective measures of (a) interviewing quantity (as determined by word count and length) decreased, and the proportions of (b) negative anxiety-related words, and (c) non-fluencies increased when participants were led to believe that sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws do not exist in their area.

The generalizability of lab experiments to real-world work situations is often suspect. For this reason, we worked to minimize participant suspicions as to the true nature of the study by (a) creating a credible cover story as to the purpose of the study, (b) having participants complete an interactive training module which contained substantial filler (non-legal) content (i.e. exercises and information about the importance of open-ended and non-leading interview questions, and reinforcement and reflection as interviewing techniques), and (c) presenting legal information regarding sexual orientation discrimination within the context of legal information on multiple protected and unprotected groups. Further, even if participants intuited our interest in how individuals interact with a gay or lesbian individual, because interviewers were not given a standardized list of interview questions, the cognitive demands upon them as
interviewer were substantial. Although participants were told they had up to fifteen minutes to conduct the interview, there was no clock in the interviewing room, and with the substantial cognitive demands upon them, the subjective passage of time may have seemed quite different. Even though interviewers may have focused on avoiding most overt references to the negative, stress is job-related, and so questions and statements regarding stress and anxiety may have gone under the radar of interviewers who were otherwise trying to be on their best behavior.

In contrast, after the interview, at the end of the study when participants completed direct measures of prejudice towards gays and lesbians, cognitive demands were low and our interest in gays and lesbians was transparent; for this reason, it should not be surprising that we were unable to detect differences in direct prejudice measures based on legal condition. In hindsight, implicit measures of prejudice (e.g., the Implicit Association Test) ought to have been used instead.

Further, the type of independent ratings of interpersonal treatment that were appropriate for relatively brief, applicant-directed interactions with store managers in the field study (Study 2), did not appear to be appropriate for a longer, interviewer-directed interaction in the lab. Perhaps more appropriate ratings would have focused on the difficulty of interviewer questions (i.e. did individuals in the no law condition ask more difficult questions of interviewers?), or the appeal of the job conditions described by the interviewer (i.e. did individuals in the no law condition describe the office manager position as less appealing?). That is, although participants were all given a standardized (O*NET) list of work activities required for an Office Manager position, participants typically added their own details of the conditions of the job during the interviews. For
instance, although the job description listed the need to supervise the work of subordinate administrative employees, many interviewers added details about the type of employees and their personalities, or details about the type of problems and conflicts the Office Manager would need to resolve.

Though we believe the experimental methodology was sound, our sample’s pre-existing beliefs may have limited our conclusions somewhat. That is, despite conducting the study in an area in which no private employment anti-discrimination laws exist for sexual orientation, almost all participants (92.5%) indicated that they believed sexual orientation discrimination was illegal in their area. Given this, we essentially demonstrated that leading people to believe that sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws do not exist worsens interpersonal discrimination. Ideally we would have liked to affect positive change by informing individuals who did not previously believe sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws exist of the presence of such laws. Houston is somewhat unique among areas that do not offer legal protections in that it is also a city with a relatively large gay and lesbian population (Gates & Ost, 2004). Replicating this study in an area with less of a gay community presence (as well as more of a conservative, Evangelical population) would potentially demonstrate the ability of legal knowledge to affect positive change.

General Discussion

In a series of three studies (resume survey, field study, and lab experiment) we have shown the relationship between sexual orientation employment anti-discrimination legislation on sexual orientation prejudice, community norms, and formal and interpersonal discrimination. Although previous research has found evidence of greater
perceived discrimination in areas without anti-discrimination legislation (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001), we extend this research to broader types of objective measures. Most importantly, we offer more substantial evidence as to the causality of the relationship between sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws and corresponding prejudice and discrimination.

That is, previous findings have shown that sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws are more likely to be adopted in areas with more gay, less politically and religiously conservative populations (Haeberle, 1996; Wald, et al., 1996), and more organizations with gay-friendly company policies already in place (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Each of these factors has been shown to relate to gay prejudice and/or discrimination (political and religious beliefs, and contact with gays and lesbians: Herek, 1988, 2002; Herek, & Glunt, 1993; organizational policies and the presence of gay and lesbian employees: Button, 2001; Griffith & Hebl, 2002; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). The study of the efficacy of anti-discrimination law is hence made difficult by the fact that communities are never randomly assigned to implement anti-discrimination law, and individuals, who often choose their communities, are in turn shaped by the communities in which they live. Hence, the relationship between the (non-randomly assigned) presence of anti-discrimination laws and lesser prejudice and discrimination could be explained by these factors.

However, in converging evidence from (i) a resume survey among human resource managers across the U.S. and (ii) a field study of retail managers in a metropolitan area in which cities vary in whether sexual orientation legal protection, we show that anti-discrimination laws correspond to (a) decreased prejudice towards gay
men, and (b) decreased interpersonal discrimination towards gay and lesbian job applicants—even after controlling for those factors (political and religious beliefs, sexual orientation, and organizational gay-friendly policies) related to whether communities adopt such legislation.

Further, because we recognize that measurement of control variables is imperfect, and because it is possible that other differences between communities with and without anti-discrimination legislation, that have not been documented in previous research, may exist, we also conducted a lab experiment which we randomly assigned participants to legal condition. Hence in addition to statistically controlled data from human resource managers and other managers in the field setting, we also show that (c) even when individuals are randomly assigned to receive information as to the presence (rather than absence of) sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws, this still results in less interpersonal discrimination towards gay and lesbian applicants. This was found using purely objective measures of interpersonal discrimination: interviewing quantity, and standardized word counts of negative anxiety-related words, and non-fluencies.

Though we can manipulate awareness of legislation, as researchers we do not have the power to experimentally manipulate the presence or absence of legislation in a given community. As such, the converging results from this series of three studies goes far in both statistically controlling, and randomly assigning individuals so as to help equate those factors previously shown to influence whether legislation is adopted in a given community. In doing so, we go a long way towards responding to Senator Collins’ claims that employment sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws may not “promote true acceptance, of the underlying principle” of non-discrimination. Our research findings
provide evidence that such laws do affect true, underlying principles of prejudice, and corresponding interpersonal behaviors in the employment sphere. We can only hope that legislators decide that these are, in fact, desired community outcomes.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Though we showed that anti-discrimination laws correspond to decreased attitudes of prejudice and interpersonal discrimination after controlling for variables previously shown to relate to the adoption of legislation, we did not have the statistical power to determine this same finding with regard to formal discrimination. That is, because we tested for the presence of an interaction effect rather than a main effect, the relationship between such legislation and formal discrimination did not maintain statistical significance after controlling for these factors. Further research will need to revisit the issue of the effects of legislation on hiring discrimination using a larger sample, perhaps in a more ecologically valid setting. We see the need for research designs that use pre- and post-test designs, such as those used in the 1960s to document the efficacy of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act in reducing employment discrimination towards Southern Blacks (e.g., Heckman & Payner, 1989). In particular, the combination of field setting realism and experimental control afforded by correspondence resume testing (e.g., Adams, 1981; Weichselbaumer, 2003) begs the extension of this methodology to comparisons of jurisdictions with and without sexual orientation anti-discrimination legislation. Additionally, future research ought to measure managerial knowledge of anti-discrimination legislation directly, given the need for legal awareness among this group if legislation is to impact employment outcomes.
Further, future studies ought to focus on how legislation can maximize changes in prejudice and discrimination. Would expectations of more rigorous legal enforcement impact the extent of discrimination? If legal enforcement expectations did not impact discrimination, this would support the idea that the effects of legislation are largely symbolic. How and by whom can the message of illegal discrimination be best delivered in diversity training? Certainly there are a number of questions as to the logistics of legislation and dissemination of such legislation that remain.

Ultimately, while the current patchwork of legal protection and non-protection in the U.S. may be personally or morally loathed by advocates on both sides of the issue, this also presents a much needed opportunity for empirical scholarship on the efficacy of sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws. State and local governments can continue to serve as “laboratories” for field research evaluating policy before implementation at the federal level (Inman & Rubinfield, 1997). While public knowledge and awareness of sexual orientation anti-discrimination laws remains low, lab experiments still have the potential to manipulate knowledge of such laws. Hence with the national Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA) still awaiting passage, we hope that future researchers will continue to seize this opportunity.
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Table 1

_Hireability as a Function of Applicant Sexual Orientation and Anti-Discrimination Law_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State law</th>
<th>No state law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>4.61_{b} (43)</td>
<td>4.13_{a} (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-gay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>4.53_{b} (73)</td>
<td>4.78_{c} (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sample sizes are in parentheses. Means in the same column that do not share subscripts differ significantly at \(p < .05\). Individuals who missed the manipulation check have been excluded.
Table 11

Intercorrelations among Prejudice, Anti-Discrimination Law, and Demographic and Organizational Variables (N = 174-208)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gay prejudice</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Anti-discrimination law</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Biblical belief</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Political conservatism</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Company policy</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Same-sex benefits</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Only heterosexual respondents are included. Sample size for Biblical belief responses is 174, given the exclusion of participants who indicated “don’t know”; sample size for other variables ranges from 203-208. Anti-discrimination law, company anti-discrimination policy, and same-sex partner benefits are coded 0 = absence, 1 = presence. Gender is coded 0 = male, 1 = female.

*p < .05
Table 3

*Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Prejudice Towards Gays (N = 163)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political conservatism</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical belief</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same-sex benefits</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company anti-discrimination policy</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-discrimination employment law</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Model R² = .55. Only heterosexual respondents are included. Anti-discrimination law, same-sex benefits, and company anti-discrimination policy are coded 0 = absence, 1 = presence. Gender is coded 0 = male, 1 = female.

*p < .05*
Table 4

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Sexual Orientation Legislation, Legal Awareness, Community Norms, and Prejudice (N = 111 - 113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. City law</td>
<td>.59 (.49)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Open-ended law</td>
<td>.24 (.43)</td>
<td>.17†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Close-ended law</td>
<td>.18 (.93)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community norms</td>
<td>.85 (.87)</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prejudice</td>
<td>1.22 (.89)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. City sexual orientation anti-discrimination law and open-ended awareness of this law are coded 0 = absence, 1 = presence. Close-ended awareness is coded -1 = no law, 0 = don’t know, 1 = law. Community norms of prejudice and discrimination were rated on a three-point scale coded 2 = definitely OK, 1 = maybe OK, 0 = definitely not OK. Prejudice was rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 0 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree.

* p < .05, two-tailed. † p < .05, one-tailed.
### Table 5

*Inter-Rater Reliability and Intercorrelations among Interpersonal Ratings (N = 252)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \alpha (r = 3) )</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Helpfulness</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Friendliness</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enthusiasm</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interest</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. End Interaction</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Standoffishness</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rudeness</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hostility</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Positive items have been reverse coded.
Table 6

*Inter*correlations among Interpersonal Negativity and Control Variables for Gay Applicant Conditions (N = 128)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpersonal negativity</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Manager gender</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Applicant gender</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Same-sex interaction</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personnel age</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Store crowdedness</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Store policy</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gay area</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conservative area</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Gender is coded 1 = male, 2 = female

* p < .05
Table 7

*Intercorrelations among Interpersonal Negativity and Control Variables for Non-Gay Applicant Conditions (N = 124)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpersonal negativity</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personnel gender</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Applicant gender</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Same-sex interaction</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personnel age</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Store crowdedness</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Store policy</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gay area</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conservative area</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.53*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Gender is coded 1 = male, 2 = female

* p < .05
Table 8

*Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations with Prejudice Towards Gays and Lesbians*

\(N = 185-188\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M (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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Law condition</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Law pre-test</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ATG</td>
<td>3.20 (1.6)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ATL</td>
<td>2.78 (1.4)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.91*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gender</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Age</td>
<td>28.78 (11.3)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Education</td>
<td>2.46 (.90)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bible belief</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conservatism</td>
<td>-.16 (.68)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Law is coded 0 = no law, 1 = law. Gender is coded 1 = male, 2 = female.

* * p < .05
Table 9

*Inter-Rater Reliability and Intercorrelations among Interpersonal Ratings (N = 117)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>α (r = 3)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Smiling</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Friendliness</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Helpfulness</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interest</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enthusiasm</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All correlations are significant, $p < .001$
Table 10

*Intercorrelations among Prejudice and Interpersonal Discrimination Measures (N = 115 – 117)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ATGL</td>
<td>2.87 (1.38)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rated pos</td>
<td>0 (.67)</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anxiety %</td>
<td>.14 (.24)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positive %</td>
<td>6.78 (2.26)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nonfluent %</td>
<td>3.09 (2.00)</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quantity</td>
<td>0 (.91)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Quantity and rated negativity measures have been standardized to create composites; descriptives for the other variables are expressed in the original metric. N = 115 for quantity; N = 117 for all other measures.
Table 11

*Interpersonal Discrimination as a Function of Law Condition (N = 105-117)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>No Law</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated positivity</td>
<td>-.02 (.67)</td>
<td>.02 (.63)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety words %</td>
<td>.09 (.18)</td>
<td>.20 (.29)</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive words %</td>
<td>7.13 (2.44)</td>
<td>6.45 (2.03)</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-fluencies %</td>
<td>2.70 (1.49)</td>
<td>3.47 (2.35)</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>.15 (.98)</td>
<td>-.15 (.82)</td>
<td>.33†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Quantity and rated negativity measures have been standardized to create composites; descriptives for the other variables are expressed in the original metric. N = 115 for quantity; N = 117 for all other measures.

*p < .05, two-tailed †p < .05, one-tailed*
Figure 1. Manager rudeness as a function of city anti-discrimination law and presumed sexual orientation.
Figure 2. Manager helpfulness as a function of city anti-discrimination law and presumed sexual orientation.
Appendix A

Matched Resumes

James K. Peterson
6150 Main Street, Houston, TX 77005; 713-408-1039; jkp2@rice.edu

EDUCATION
Rice University, BA May 2008
Majors: Sociology and Politics. GPA: 3.4

MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE

Student Activities Association, Rice University, 2006-present
President
- Organized meetings with members of the Rice Counseling Center and campus administration to create a peer assistance program.
- Spearheaded special council to address a controversial campus issue, and moderated student debate at invited forum.
- Redesigned networking program to increase turnout at student-alumni events.

Congressional Internship Program, Politics Department, Rice University, 2005-2006
Program Coordinator
- Redesigned and coordinated the application, evaluation, and selection procedures for student Congressional interns at request of department faculty.
- Met with congressional staffers in Washington, DC. Discussed placements and office policies in order to ensure the quality of individual internships.
- Designed, organized, and implemented campaign to secure low or no-cost housing for interns.

Mock Trial, Rice University, 2005-present
Co-captain
- Prepared legal cases with a team of student lawyers and witnesses.
- Participated as a lawyer in simulated courtroom trials in state and national competitions.

New Faculty Search Committee, Sociology Department, Rice University, 2007
Committee Member
- Interviewed and evaluated candidates.

AWARDS AND HONORS
Rice Alumni Scholarship ($3000)
National Merit Scholar
Outstanding Student Leadership Award

SKILLS
Language: Conversational Spanish
Computer: Microsoft Word, Powerpoint, and Excel; Adobe Pagemaker and Photoshop; SPSS and SAS.
James K. Peterson  
6150 Main Street, Houston, TX 77005; 713-408-1039; jkp2@rice.edu

EDUCATION  
Rice University, BA May 2008  
Majors: Sociology and Politics. GPA: 3.4

MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE  
GLBT Student Activities Association, Rice University, 2006-present  
President  
◦ Organized meetings with members of the Rice Counseling Center and campus administration to create a GLBT peer assistance program.  
◦ Spearheaded special council to address a controversial campus issue, and moderated student debate at invited forum.  
◦ Redesigned networking program to increase turnout at student-alumni events.

Congressional Internship Program, Politics Department, Rice University, 2005-2006  
Program Coordinator  
◦ Redesigned and coordinated the application, evaluation, and selection procedures for student Congressional interns at request of department faculty.  
◦ Met with congressional staffers in Washington, DC. Discussed placements and office policies in order to ensure the quality of individual internships.  
◦ Designed, organized, and implemented campaign to secure low or no-cost housing for interns.

Mock Trial, Rice University, 2005-present  
Co-captain  
◦ Prepared legal cases with a team of student lawyers and witnesses.  
◦ Participated as a lawyer in simulated courtroom trials in state and national competitions.

New Faculty Search Committee, Sociology Department, Rice University, 2007  
Committee Member  
◦ Interviewed and evaluated candidates.

AWARDS AND HONORS  
Rice Gay and Lesbian Alumni (GALA) Scholarship ($3000)  
National Merit Scholar  
Outstanding Student Leadership Award

SKILLS  
Language: Conversational Spanish  
Computer: Microsoft Word, Powerpoint, and Excel; Adobe Pagemaker and Photoshop; SPSS and SAS.
Appendix B

Telephone Script

I am a research assistant at Rice University, where we are conducting a study on community awareness and acceptance of employment laws. We are interested in the opinions and beliefs of individuals of working age. This should take about 5 minutes.

First, could you tell me if you are currently employed? Y/N
In what city do you work? _________________

If no, [have you worked within the past year?] Y/N
   ➔ If no, thank them for their time and terminate interview.
   ➔ If yes, In what city did you work most recently? _________________

I would now like to ask you a few questions about workplace laws. We are not necessarily looking for right answers—we just want to find out more about people’s awareness of employment laws and rights. Part of our aim is to identify which rights are less well known.

Can I ask you first of all: very generally, how well informed do you feel about rights at work?
Very well informed
Well informed
Not very well informed
Not well informed at all
Which of the following statements best describes how you feel?
   I know a lot about laws and rights at work.
   I could know more and would like to be able to find out more.
   I could know more but I don’t feel I need to.

Now I would like to ask you some questions about rights as an employee.

Firstly, can you tell me of any laws that protect employees’ rights at work? (code all that apply)
(if respondent gives one law, probe “any other laws you can think of?” than go to next question)
Minimum wage
Family/medical leave
Working hours, in work rest breaks, etc.
Anti-discrimination legislation
Others (record)

Now I’d like to ask you some questions about different categories of employment rights at work. Don’t worry about whether you get the answers right or not, we just want to find
out which employment rights are well known and which are the rights people just haven’t heard of.

One area of employment rights says employees should be treated fairly regardless of race, gender, or religion.
Were you aware of this right?
Yes
No
DK/Not sure

In addition to race, gender, and religion are there any other groups that are legally protected from discrimination at work?
(open response)

I will now read a list of different groups. For each group, please tell me if you think the group is or is not protected from employment discrimination by law.
Veterans
Pregnant women
Gay people
Fat people
People with a criminal record

For each group, please tell me if in the community where you work in it is...
“Definitely OK to express negative feelings about this group”
“Maybe OK to express negative feelings about this group”
“Definitely NOT OK to express negative feelings about this group”

Black people
Jewish people
Veterans
Pregnant women
Gay people
Fat people
People with a criminal record
For each group, please tell me if in the community where you work in it is...
“Definitely OK to treat this group differently from other groups”
“Maybe OK to treat this group differently from other groups”
“Definitely NOT OK to treat this group differently from other groups”

Black people
Jewish people
Veterans
Pregnant women
Gay people
Fat people
People with a criminal record

For each group, please tell me if in the community where you work in it is...

"Definitely OK to treat this group more negatively than other groups"
"Maybe it’s OK to treat this group more negatively than other groups"
"Definitely NOT OK to treat this group more negatively than other groups"

Black people
Jewish people
Veterans
Pregnant women
Gay people
Fat people
People with a criminal record

Finally, I’d like to ask your personal opinions. Your personal opinion may be different from that of the larger community.
For this set of questions we’ll focus on gay people. I’ll read you a statement and then please tell me if you:
STRONGLY DISAGREE
DISAGREE
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
AGREE
STRONGLY AGREE

1. People should be able to tell jokes that make fun of Gays at work.
2. Tougher laws should be enacted that help prevent discrimination against Gays at work.
3. A business should be able to refuse service to someone based on sexual orientation
3. People who discriminate against Gays at work should be punished.
4. When hiring, employers should be able to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation.

Thank you for your time.
Appendix C

Field Study Locations, With and Without Anti-Discrimination Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Parks at Arlington</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>3811 South Cooper Street</td>
<td>76015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Mall</td>
<td>Hurst</td>
<td>1101 Melbourne St.</td>
<td>76053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town East Mall</td>
<td>Mesquite</td>
<td>2155 Town East Mall</td>
<td>75150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NorthPark Center</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>8687 N. Central Expressway</td>
<td>75225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View Center</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>13331 Preston Rd</td>
<td>75240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Galleria</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>13350 Dallas Parkway</td>
<td>75240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulen Mall</td>
<td>FortWorth</td>
<td>4800 S Hulen Street</td>
<td>76132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgmar Mall</td>
<td>FortWorth</td>
<td>1888 Green Oaks Road</td>
<td>76116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Consent Form Excerpt and Cover Story

Rice University
Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Study Title: Effects of Training Delivery Method on Knowledge and Skill Acquisition (08-123X)

Principal Investigator: Mikki Hebl, Associate Professor, Industrial/ Organizational Psychology

The purpose of this study is to determine whether training delivered by computer can result in similar levels of knowledge and skill acquisition as training delivered by a human trainer, provided that both trainings include practice with other trainees.

You will be asked to complete a training in which information is either (a) presented by a human trainer, or (b) presented on computer. The content of this training concerns practical advice on how to interview job applicants, including both best practices and legal guidelines.

Training will include exercises and quizzes during and after training, as well as practice conducting and responding to a job interview with another participating trainee.
Appendix E

Excerpt of Training Content from Law and No Law Conditions

A number of laws exist at the federal, state, and local levels as to what criteria may and may not be considered in employment.

Take this quiz to determine which of the following groups are currently protected from employment discrimination here in Houston.

1. For each group, identify whether employment discrimination in Houston is currently LEGAL or ILLEGAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Discrimination is ILLEGAL</th>
<th>Discrimination is LEGAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>Latinos Discrimination is ILLEGAL</td>
<td>Discrimination is LEGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>Muslims Discrimination is ILLEGAL</td>
<td>Discrimination is LEGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior citizens</td>
<td>Senior citizens Discrimination is ILLEGAL</td>
<td>Discrimination is LEGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant women</td>
<td>Pregnant women Discrimination is ILLEGAL</td>
<td>Discrimination is LEGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay people</td>
<td>Gay people Discrimination is ILLEGAL</td>
<td>Discrimination is LEGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat people</td>
<td>Fat people Discrimination is ILLEGAL</td>
<td>Discrimination is LEGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal immigrants</td>
<td>Illegal immigrants Discrimination is ILLEGAL</td>
<td>Discrimination is LEGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with a criminal record</td>
<td>People with a criminal record Discrimination is ILLEGAL</td>
<td>Discrimination is LEGAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Houston it is ILLEGAL to discriminate against:

Latinos
Senior citizens
Muslims
Pregnant women
Gay people

In contrast, in Houston it is LEGAL to discriminate against:

Fat people
Illegal immigrants
People with a criminal record

In Houston it is ILLEGAL to discriminate against:

Latinos
Senior citizens
Muslims
Pregnant women

In contrast, in Houston it is LEGAL to discriminate against:

Gay people
Fat people
Illegal immigrants
People with a criminal record
A candidate MAY NOT be asked:

Race

Questions regarding color of applicant’s skin, eyes, hair

Place of birth, nationality, or ancestry

What is his mother/native language, or the language he speaks most often

How he or she acquired foreign language ability

A candidate MAY NOT be asked:

Age

Birth date

Ages of children

A candidate MAY NOT be asked:

Religion

Questions about observance of holidays

A candidate MAY NOT be asked:

The number and/or ages of children or dependents

Questions regarding pregnancy, childbearing, or birth control

Names or addresses of children of the candidate

A candidate MAY NOT be asked:

Questions indicating the candidate's sexual orientation (candidates may, however, be
told of domestic partner benefits)

Questions about marital status
Appendix F

Interviewer References to Sexual Orientation or Gay Pride, by Condition

LAW condition

Rice, uh, what was that, Gay Pride Association. What is that?... I was at the last one [Pride parade], it was really fun.... Yeah, yeah, it was actually, r枥, really fun.... Yeah, yeah, totally. And it's very flattering too, r枥, for me. It's just, r枥, the gay men are just very, r枥, vocal, youknow. And it's, r枥, it's cool. (Sam_s96_3.19; LAW)

Okay, and it says the Rice Pride Gay and Lesbian Student Association. Now if we have employees were of the gay or lesbian community, how would you deal with that?... Like if there were certain situations where say another employee were, uh, to discriminate them in any way, as an office manager how would you deal with that? (Bryan_s170_4.22; LAW)

How do you feel that your background in cultural events and the Pride organization could help you as far as managing a group of clerical or administrative workers? (Bryan_s181_4.24; LAW)

The Rice Pride. What's that? The Gay and Lesbian. Yes. How do you feel about that? (Bryan_s207_4.30; LAW)

So bro, okay Gay and Proud, pride, the rainbow, nice bag .... You're pretty flamboyant with the colors, so you don't have no problems with people, uh, youknow, saying any remarks offensive to? You don't have no problem with that coming around because, you know what I'm saying, uh, I don't know what people do in their spare time. But, I'm not sure, but you probably would be probably about the only gay guy that would be working here. So you don't have problem coexisting with other ideals and beliefs that don't, you know what I mean?... And, uh, and I really commend you, uh, youknow, being proud for what you are.... Alright, uh, could you pull up your, uh, uh, Pride Gay and Lesbian Student Organization Rice page?.... Do you get along with women? You do? Okay. Awesome, awesome, awesome. You get along with women. So have you ever considered dating women? I'm just asking this personally. You don't like women. Okay. Rrwell, that wasn't illegal to ask you that, was it? Asking if you like women or dating them?.... Because I ask that because I have friends, youknow, or what not, that were into that lifestyle. And some of them interpreted the, uh, relationship dynamics as I'm your friend, and some people would take it as, uh, and I always made a point to ask, you know what I'm saying. (Bryan_s229_5.06; LAW)
NO LAW condition

I see that you've, uh, participated in Rice Pride Gay and Lesbian Student Association. Are you yourself, uh, gay or lesbian? Okay. Surprisingly in Houston you are allowed to discriminate against people on that basis. Yes, I was very surprised to find that. I'm afraid I can't offer you the job. I am embarrassed for Houston, I'm sorry but. (Reem_s38_2.12; NO law)

Rice pride association. How do you, I'll say, contribute? What kind of programs, what have you? Does the group interact only at Rice, or does it kind of branch out into the community? Okay, I mean, but, do you...? In groups that I've been in, that the group will, I mean like maybe a car wash or something, will do something to help the Montrose area community. Does your group do things like that? (Reem_s56_2.19; NO law)

What do you do with Rice Pride? Are you rrlike some type of officer in the association or?.... Wow. Uh, and how did you get into doing the website, were they looking for someone to do their website or did you just kind of volunteer?.... Okay. Uh, and what, do you guys put on some type of events or what exactly is the organization about?... Cool. (Bryan_s169_4.21; NO law)

So you were presidents of all these, Rice Pride, uh, Colleges Against Cancer. (Reem_s174_4.22; NO law)

You work with Gay and Lesbian Society. Is that fun? (Stephen_s145_4.13; NO law)

They have a, uh, gay and lesbian association?.... How do you get associated with that? (Bryan_s204_4.30; NO law)

You're in Rice Pride. So are you, rrwell, are you a position of, are you just a member, an officer?.... So you're a big contributor. Okay, that's awesome. (Bryan_s206_4.30; NO law)

And I saw something about the Art Car and I know it's a Gay and Lesbian, they have a division with that. (Bryan_s210_5.01; NO law)

Tell me about Rice Pride. What's the role that you play there? Okay. (Bryan_s178_4.23; NO law)
Appendix G

Examples of Interviewer Usage of Anxiety Words

And tell me about how you work in a stressful situation. How do you deal with stress? (Sam_s93_3.12)

Uh, being an office manager can be a stressful job. Kind of tell me some things that you do to relieve stress.
I guess the, what, if you do get stressed, and you probably will get stressed to be realistic.
Uh, how would your co-workers be able to know that you're stressed out? (Bryan_s234_5.07)

Okay. And, uh, as an individual yourself, how do you deal with stress?
And, uh, how about a stressful employee, say an employee doesn't want to come into work or there's a conflict between you and an employee. How do you deal with a stressful situation when it involves somebody else? (Becky_s27_2.06)

So you're saying that you had a lot of experience with that and that, uh, you were able to handle that well without getting stressed. And I mean, how much of an issue to you is stress and anxiety? (Reem_s129_4.08)

I would imagine that that would get a little stressful at times. Between maybe two people in your group, how would you handle that situation?
Some of the challenges will be a stressful environment. We've had, like I was telling you earlier, the fights, we've had multiple fights. People are just yelling and screaming at each other. (Chris_s72_2.24)

Because being at a university like this you'll have to face stress and in the workforce as an office manager you will have to deal with a lot of stress. Stress from deadlines. Stress from above, your supervisors, stress from below. Yeah. So the fact that you think you can handle stress productively is a good approach to have. (Bryan_s209_4.30)

So you work well with under pressure and kind of trying to, I guess, make sure everything runs smoothly.
And do you ever, how do you handle stress, how do you work under stress, how do you think you work under stress? (Sam_s70_2.24)

You know, if you have a couple of team members that can't get along, are you able to resolve that issue in the office setting without having it escalate into something detrimental?
But it's a good thing that you are familiar with conflict resolution, so you're able to, you know, kind of squash any turmoil with that. (Stephen_s76_2.26)