eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Master's Theses

Theses and Dissertations

2011

The Ends Determine the Means: Activated Goals Explain the Decision to Confront

Kala Jean Melchiori
Loyola University Chicago

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

THE ENDS DETERMINE THE MEANS:

ACTIVATED GOALS EXPLAIN THE DECISION TO CONFRONT

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

PROGRAM IN APPLIED SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

BY

KALA J. MELCHIORI

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY 2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Robyn K. Mallett, for providing me with much needed guidance and encouragement while writing this thesis. I would also like to thank Tracy DeHart for her helpful input. Finally, I would like to thank Phil McCabe for his sympathetic kindness, stanch support, and unwavering good faith.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Women believe that they would confront perpetrators of sexual harassment, but when put

in a sexually harassing situation they rarely confront (Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001).

Women may overestimate their likelihood of confronting because they think they would

be concerned with fairness, but in actuality the need to belong strongly dissuades women

from confronting harassers. I tested this idea by randomly assigning women to be primed

with a belonging, fairness, or no goal, and then had them predict how they would respond

to sexually harassing or surprising interview questions. Women who viewed the sexually

harassing interview questions predicted more confrontational behavior and negative

emotions than women who viewed surprising interview questions. I found partial support

for the impact of goals; women who were primed with a belonging goal were less likely

to predict several confrontational behaviors and predicted more fear than women primed

with a fairness goal or no goal.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

During a town hall meeting in the Democratic Republic of Congo in 2009, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton publicly responded to what she understood to be a sexist question. Clinton believed that a student asked her what her husband thought about a political issue, to which she responded "Wait, you want to know what my husband thinks? My husband is not the secretary of state — I am. You ask my opinion, I will tell you my opinion. I'm not going to channel my husband" (Sisk, 2009).

Most women assume they would act as Clinton did and publicly confront someone who discriminated against them based on their sex. However, in reality, women rarely make a public response to sexism (Ruggiero & Taylor, 1997; Swim & Hyers, 1999; Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001). More generally, people often imagine that they would say or do something when faced with discrimination, but more often than not, people ignore discrimination (Ayres, Friedman, & Leaper, 2009; Fitzgerald, Swan, & Fischer, 1995; Kaiser & Miller, 2001; 2003; Kawakami, Dunn, Karmali, & Dovido, 2009; Stangor, Swim, Van Allen, & Sechrist, 2002; Swim & Hyers, 1999; Swim & Thomas, 2006; Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001). Despite this discrepancy between what people think they will do and what they actually do, people assume that those who are discriminated against want to act as they imagine and immediately rectify the situation by confronting those responsible.

1

Why do people choose not to speak up in the face of injustice? The present research tests the idea that people may believe that they would publicly respond to discrimination, but fail to do so because they do not accurately anticipate the goal they will actually have in mind when they are met with an instance of discrimination. More specifically, targets may not confront discrimination because they have a strong motivation to be liked by the perpetrator and to follow social rules (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Pickett, Gardner, & Knowles, 2004). That motivation to be liked could inhibit a public response. To date, research has not systematically considered the role of goals in the confrontation process.

People may have the goal to belong during discriminatory interactions, when in fact it is the goal to be treated fairly that likely promotes confrontation. Understanding the conditions under which people publicly respond to prejudice can help us make sense of the sometimes contradictory literature on confronting. We know that targets do sometimes proactively respond to discrimination (Mallett & Swim, 2005; 2009; Swim & Thomas, 2006), but we do not know what responses are effective and when they choose different responses. If we can shape the goal to be treated fairly as a norm for discriminatory situations, we may be able to increase the frequency of public responses to discrimination. Similarly, if we understand how belonging goals hinder confrontational responses, we can craft more effective policies for combating discrimination.

Prediction Errors

The discrepancy between what people imagine versus actually do is well established in the literature. People often mispredict how they will feel and behave in response to future events. Specifically, people commonly demonstrate the impact bias

and overestimate the degree to which events will affect them emotionally and how long they will have this emotional reaction. The impact bias is due, in part, to focalism. In essence, focalism is a more specific form of our overarching tendencies to downplay the influence of the situation on our behavior (Jones, 1979). Focalism is the idea that we are so focused on the event in question, we underestimate the impact and importance of other events on our cognitions and emotional reactions (Wilson & Gilbert, 2005).

This impact bias has been demonstrated in numerous populations and circumstances: faculty members forecasted their feelings 5 years after failing to achieve tenure, women who imagined facing unwanted pregnancies, and even sports fanatics who are asked to anticipate how they will feel after a loss by their favored football team. In one of most illustrative paradigms of affective forecasting, the researchers asked undergraduates to estimate how happy they would be about living in one of several different dormitories (Dunn, Wilson, & Gilbert, 2003). These dorms differed in a number of ways (e.g., location and aesthetic quality), but the participants were so focused on weighing those differences that they failed to see how important the similar social settings of the dorms would influence their happiness. Dunn et al.'s (2003) research demonstrates that people underestimate the influence that other people will have on their response. Perhaps targets of discrimination also underestimate the influence of others on their responses to prejudice. Specifically they do not anticipate the influence that their need to be accepted and belong will have on their responses to discrimination.

The impact bias also occurs in the context of intergroup interactions. People who are about to engage in intergroup interactions often commit the intergroup forecasting

error, predicting that the exchange will go more negatively than what they actually report after the interaction takes place (Mallett, Wilson, & Gilbert, 2008). People also mispredict how they will behave in response to discrimination. Swim and Hyers (1999) found that over 80 percent of women imagined that they would have at least one confrontational response to a sexist interaction. However, only half of women choose to actually confront a man who made a sexist comment, and most of those women only confronted him indirectly (e.g., making a joke or a subtle statement that contradicted the sexist remark) but said they would have liked to make a more confrontational response. In this case, there was a large gap between imagined actions and real behavior; a higher percentage of women indicated that they would publicly respond to a sexist comment from a male than the percentage of women who actually responded.

In an intriguing paper, Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001) found that not only do most women incorrectly assume that they would confront sexual harassment, but women also fail to anticipate how they will emotionally react to the situation. In study 1, women were asked to imagine how they would behaviorally respond and emotionally react to an interview that either included three sexually harassing interview questions or three surprising (but not offensive) interview questions. Sixty-eight percent of women imagined they would refuse to answer at least one sexually harassing question, 28 percent said they would either rudely confront the interviewer or leave the interview, and most women reported that they would feel angry if actually in the situation. However, in study 2, women actually participated in an interview for a research assistant position and a male confederate asked the same three sexually harassing questions from study 1 during the

course of the interview. All of the women answered the questions, none rudely confronted or left the interview, and most women reported that they felt afraid while they were in the situation.

Kawakami et al. (2009) also found that people were poor estimators of their emotional and behavioral responses to racial discrimination. A diverse group of participants imagined that they would be highly distressed if they overheard a blatantly racist comment, yet an equally diverse group of participants who actually heard a White confederate make a racist comment about a Black confederate reported feeling no more upset than participants who had heard no comment at all. Furthermore, none of the participants directly responded to the White confederate's remark. Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001) and Kawakami et al. (2009) demonstrate an interesting phenomenon— both targets of discrimination and third party observers do not accurately anticipate how they will feel in response to discrimination. Targets of discrimination *underestimate* the degree to which a discriminatory comment will upset them, but people who only overhear a discriminatory remark *overestimate* the degree to which the comment will upset them.

The research on affective forecasting errors (Mallett et al., 2008; Wilson & Gilbert, 2003) suggests that people may be unlikely to publicly respond to discrimination from an outgroup member if they overestimate how badly a confrontation would go. People may choose to avoid confrontation for at least three basic reasons. First, people may choose not to respond to discrimination, whether consciously or unconsciously, in an effort to preserve their emotional well being (Shelton & Stewart, 2004). Likewise, people may also avoid responding because they fail to anticipate the possible emotional benefits

of confrontation. Second, they may rationalize their lack of action by minimizing the discriminatory nature of the event (Ruggiero & Taylor, 1995). People who desire to be treated fairly and are discriminated against may experience cognitive dissonance if they fail to confront. If confrontation is costly, they may choose to alleviate the dissonance by not categorizing the interaction as discriminatory rather than risking confrontation. Third, they may rationalize that not confronting was an advantageous choice because they weighed their potential losses more heavily than possible gains (Wilson & Gilbert, 2005).

People may imagine that any confrontation will result in a highly negative conflict, yet due to our psychological immune systems we may be able to quickly recover from the uncomfortable nature of the situation after speaking up, perhaps even faster than if we did not say anything at all (Wilson & Gilbert, 2005). This phenomenon has been termed "immune neglect" because we fail to see how our cognitions can become a psychological immune system to combat the ill effects of adverse experiences. For example, Gilbert, Pinel, Wilson, Blumberg, and Wheatley (1998) asked participants to forecast how they would feel after failing to obtain a job. Forecasters predicted that they would feel equally bad whether the interview was fair (several interviewers who asked pertinent interview questions) or unfair (one interviewer who asked somewhat irrelevant questions), but people who actually experienced the unfair interview reported feeling happier than those who were in a fair interview. The forecasters fell prey to immune neglect; they did not realize how quickly their psychological immune systems would influence their affective reactions to the unfair rejection.

Our inability to accurately predict how we will behaviorally and emotionally react in an intergroup interaction paints a grim picture for intergroup relations. However, research has demonstrated that there are some ways to correct these errors. For example, one way to overcome the intergroup forecasting error is to emphasize similarity. White participants who were asked to focus on their similarities to a Black partner had a more positive evaluation of their Black partner and a more favorable impression of the upcoming interaction than those who were asked to focus on their differences (Mallett et al., 2008). Therefore encouraging people to find commonalities with individual outgroup members can actually diminish the intergroup forecasting error. Furthermore, receiving corrective information about their expectations can allow White participants to engage in more positive intergroup contact in the future (Mallett & Wilson, 2010). Once people are aware of the situational constraints on their behavior and the often fleeting effects of even negative interactions, they should be better able to predict the valence of future intergroup interactions, helping them to act in accordance with their values.

Barriers to Confrontation

People may expect the worst of confrontations because publicly responding to discrimination is costly. Targets of discrimination may choose not to directly confront someone due to the anticipated magnitude of costs that confrontation carries. A primary cost for confrontation may be interpersonal; in general, the confronted individual, as well as witnesses to the interaction, dislike the confronter, regardless of how kind the confronter tries to be (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006). People dislike being rejected, and therefore targets may avoid publicly responding to

prejudice in an effort to maintain their esteem in the eyes of the confronter and other

witnesses. Targets may be further deterred from publicly responding to prejudice because

confrontations offer an opportunity to confirm a stereotype (Kaiser & Miller, 2003) and

people tend to question the motives of the confronter (Kaiser & Miller, 2001). Another

cost to confrontation is that the burden of proof of a discriminatory act relies on the

target. Public instances of discrimination can make confrontation costly because it is hard

for the target to prove discrimination and know that others agree that discrimination has

taken place (Stangor et al., 2002). People cannot be sure of how others perceive a shared

situation, and therefore may avoid confrontation due to the desire to act in accordance to

the group. Finally, confrontation carries the risk of retaliation (Shelton & Stewart, 2004).

The threat of hate crimes and sexual violence may be the ultimate cost that targets face if

they choose to confront discrimination.

People may also choose not to confront simply because confrontation can be

socially disruptive. In many ways, the normative standard of behavior is to avoid

confrontation and steer clear of sensitive issues such as racism and sexism (Swim &

Hyers, 1999). People may avoid confrontation in an effort to adhere to these

conversational norms. People desire to be seen as good group members; this desire may

exert a strong inhibitory effect on confrontation. Our attitudes can also shape how we

respond to discrimination. Research has demonstrated that women who endorse

traditional gender roles are less likely to attribute discriminatory behavior to sexism, and

are therefore less likely confront sexism than those who hold more progressive attitudes

about gender (Swim & Hyers, 1999). Therefore a target may choose to confront

discrimination in the face of social costs and social norms if the target has strong attitudes about equality and feels personally motivated to confront.

The above costs can be gravely serious for target group members. In many situations, especially in those where one's job or physical well-being might be at stake, confronting prejudice may be a dangerous and ill-advised option. However, many people may fail to see the benefits of confrontation that exist when the costs are relatively low. Research shows that confronting discrimination reduces prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behaviors. Czopp et al. (2006) found that Whites who were confronted about racism felt badly about their behavior, reported less prejudiced attitudes, and were less likely to respond stereotypically in a future task. Furthermore, when confronted with evidence that they were not living up to egalitarian ideals, self-dissatisfaction motivated the accused to make sustained changes to their attitudes and behaviors (Devine, Monteith, Zuwerink, & Elliot, 1991; Rokeach & Cochrane, 1972). This evidence suggests that confrontation may be an effective way to impose egalitarian social norms on public behavior.

Furthermore, responding to discrimination may even result in immediate positive outcomes for the confronter. Research has indicated that people whose actions are aligned with their personal ideals have higher self-esteem (Pelham & Swann, 1989) and self-satisfaction (Heine & Lehman, 1999). Therefore people who are concerned with social justice issues may experience positive intrapersonal outcomes if they confront prejudice. For example, Swim and Hyers (1999) found that women who embraced nontraditional gender roles reported higher state self-esteem than women who endorsed

traditional gender roles after hearing a sexist remark. Perhaps these women were better

able to identify the remark as sexist, and therefore not let the remark affect how they

viewed themselves. Further research on the possible positive outcomes of confronting for

the target needs to be conducted.

Misprediction of Goals

Perhaps people can better predict their future affective states and behavior in

response to discrimination if the goals they have in mind when imagining their response

match the goals that would actually be active during the situation. Goals are the end states

we pursue throughout life, the basis of our behavior, and our standards for evaluation

(Elliott & Dweck, 1988; Fishback & Ferguson, 2007; Swim & Thomas, 2006). There has

been a recent push by the psychological community to look more closely at the role of

goals in intergroup interactions (Migacheva, Tropp, & Crocker, 2010; Swim & Thomas,

2006). Fiske (2004) identifies five basic social goals that shape our behavior:

understanding, enhancing the self, trusting, controlling, and belonging. Of these five core

goals, belonging and controlling goals may be particularly relevant to confrontation

because each implies a contradictory response to discrimination.

The goal of belonging is an expansive, basic, pervasive human need to be a part

of a larger social group (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Fiske, 2004). Belonging goals

encourage people to seek out relationships with others – we want to be liked and accepted

by others, and will behave in ways to facilitate and preserve these relationships. The need

to belong may motivate a target's response to prejudice. For example, the need to belong

affects our attributions to discrimination. Discrimination threatens the need to belong

(Swim & Thomas, 2006), so people may deal with this threat by denying the discrimination. Carvallo and Pelham (2006) looked at how the need to belong influenced perceived discrimination. They found that participants who were primed with the need to belong reported less personal discrimination but more group discrimination than participants in the control condition. Ruggiero and Taylor (1995) found that women only made attributions to discrimination if they were extremely confident that a male held prejudicial beliefs.

If goals influence whether or not we make attributions to discrimination, they may also shape how we choose to respond once we identify discriminatory behaviors. The ability to accurately predict others' beliefs is unlikely in many real world situations due to the ambiguous nature of modern prejudice. In a world where prejudice and discrimination are becoming more covert due to changing social norms, disadvantaged groups may be more hesitant than ever to label something as discriminatory, and therefore reason that confrontation is inappropriate. Denial of personal discrimination can be a strong barrier to confrontation; people cannot overtly respond to discrimination if they convince themselves that the discrimination has not taken place.

Belonging goals may lead to avoidant behaviors, such as ignoring an uncomfortable situation (Swim & Thomas, 2006). Plant and Butz (2006) found that White participants who received feedback that revealed that they had negative responses towards Black people reported more anxiety about an upcoming intergroup interaction than participants who were not given any feedback. Plant and Butz (2006) could have inadvertently primed a belonging goal when implementing their manipulation.

Participants who were told that they demonstrated a negative attitude towards Blacks probably had their need to belong threatened. Thus, the need to belong was more salient when they reported their feelings about the upcoming interaction, and reported more emotions that are correlated with avoidant behaviors (Butz & Plant, 2010).

On the other hand, control goals may lead to approach behaviors, such as questioning why someone made a discriminatory remark. Controlling goals stem from our desire to competently negotiate our social environment (Fiske, 2004). People want to feel efficacious over their own outcomes, and one way we do this is by trying to convince others to see the world from our own perspective (Swim & Thomas, 2006). Our desire to control our own outcomes leads us to want others to comply with our wishes and behave in ways that help us achieve our goals. Therefore, our ability to control our own outcomes will be enhanced if others treat us fairly (e.g., by receiving equal pay for equal work, we enhance our chances of career success). In this respect, the need for control includes the desire to be treated fairly. This general desire to be treated fairly is reflected in research on evaluations of procedural and distributive justice (Tyler, 1994).

A "fairness goal" consists of the motive to be treated fairly in order to maintain control over the self and over interactions with other people. For example, the fair process effect states that people who believe that a procedure was fair react more positively to the procedural outcomes than people who think the procedure was unfair (van den Boss, Bruins, Wilke, & Dronkert, 1999). People who think the procedure was unfair are more apt to attribute their poor performance to external causes, while those who thought the procedure was fair are more likely to accept personal responsibility for

their poor performance. In other words, van den Boss et al. (1999) argue that the belief

that procedures were fair or unfair may trump the other concerns employees have with

their work environment. If perceived fairness is one of the hallmarks of employee

contentment, a lack of fairness may motivate people to detect and address the cause of the

unfair treatment. Thus fairness goals may influence people to act upon instances of

discrimination.

Furthermore, research has demonstrated that avoiding confrontation of unfair

treatment may result in negative outcomes. Targets of discrimination who do not publicly

respond to prejudice may miss out on an opportunity for validation from other target

group members (Miller & Major, 2000). Also, the suppression of emotion during

intergroup interactions can lead to increased negative outcomes, such as impairments of

executive function (Richeson & Trawalter, 2005). Targets who actively try to manage

their emotions while in discriminatory situations have also been found to have increased

levels of hypertension (Miller & Major, 2000). Therefore, if fairness goals lead people to

pursue confrontation, doing so may help people avoid negative outcomes associated with

emotional suppression.

In sum, controlling goals may influence people to confront an individual in order

to preserve their sense of mastery over their social world, whereas belonging goals may

influence people to avoid confrontation in order to preserve their sense of acceptance by

the offending individual. The present study seeks to investigate the effect of primed goals

on confrontation. Specifically, I will look at the goals that are typically primed when

discrimination scenarios are studied in the lab. Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001) utilized a

scenario that involved a male interviewer who asked a female applicant sexually

harassing or surprising questions. I plan to use the same scenario that they utilized in their

paradigm, but I will expand upon their design by priming a fairness goal, a belonging

goal, or no goal at all before the participants read the scenario and report how they

believe they would respond.

The Present Study

I predict a main effect of the type of questions on anticipated actions and

emotions such that women will imagine stronger reactions to the sexually harassing

interview than to the surprising interview. I predict a main effect of the goal

prime on predicted actions and emotions. When averaging across type of questions, I

predict that participants in the belonging goal condition will self-report less negative

emotions and fewer overtly confrontational behaviors than participants in either the

fairness goal or no goal conditions. I predict that there will be no differences between the

fairness goal and no goal conditions on these measures. Finally, I predict that the main

effects will be qualified by an interaction between the type of questions and goal such

that women who are primed with a belonging goal and view sexually harassing interview

questions will imagine more negative emotional reactions (e.g., fear) and fewer overtly

confrontational responses (e.g., tell the interviewer he is being inappropriate) than women

who are primed with a fairness goal or no goal.

CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

Female undergraduates (n = 236) at a private Midwestern university completed the study for course credit. The majority of participants were White (n =173), 25 participants identified as Latino, 18 South Asian, 8 Black, 6 East Asian, 4 Pacific Islander, 4 mixed or multiple ethnicities, and 1 person chose not to report her ethnicity. The age of the participants ranged from 17-32 years old (M = 18.86; SD = 1.61).

Design

I used a 3 (goal: fairness, belonging, no goal) x 2 (type of questions: sexually harassing, surprising) between-participants design with predictions of emotional and behavioral responses as dependent variables.

Procedure

Up to four participants reported to the lab for each experimental session. When they came into the lab they were greeted by a female research assistant and were randomly assigned to condition. Participants completed all materials via computer.

After reviewing and signing the consent form (see Appendix A), the experimenter informed the participant that she would first complete a pilot test of an instrument to be used in a later study. This pilot test was actually a sentence unscrambling task designed to

prime a fairness goal, belonging goal, or no goal (see Appendix B). After the participant

read the scenario and instructions, she was presented with a description of an interview

that either included sexually harassing or surprising questions. After reading each

question, the participant was asked to write how she believed she would respond (see

Appendix C). These open-ended responses were coded by two independent coders. After

writing how they believed they would respond to a question, participants predicted their

likelihood of experiencing several emotions in response to the question (see Appendix

D). Participants then rated the likelihood that they would respond in the specific ways

detailed by Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001; see Appendix E). Finally, participants

completed the manipulation check (see Appendix F) and the debriefing questions (see

Appendix G) and were given a debriefing form (see Appendix H).

Materials

Type of questions. The questions were taken directly from Woodzicka and

LaFrance (2001), who pretested several potentially offensive questions and chose

three that were surprising and three that were sexually harassing. The sexually

harassing questions were: (1) Do you have a boyfriend? (2) Do people find you

desirable? (3) Do you think it is important for women to wear bras to work? The

surprising questions were: (1) Do you have a best friend? (2) Do people find you

morbid? (3) Do you think it is important for people to believe in God?

Manipulation checks. The respondents rated the extent to which they found

each question to be sexually harassing, surprising, and inappropriate, respectively (1

= *not at all*, 7 = *very*) (see Appendix F). I calculated an average for each rating

across the three questions. The combined ratings for sexually harassing ($\alpha = .89$),

surprising ($\alpha = .68$), and inappropriate ($\alpha = .81$) were reliable.

Goal prime. For the goal prime, I used a sentence unscrambling task; this is a

common manipulation that has been used in many psychological studies (e.g., McCoy &

Major, 2006). The task required participants to look at a list of 4-10 words and figure out

how to rearrange them to make a grammatically correct sentence (see Appendix B). For

each set of words, there was one word that was not needed in the sentence. So, for

example, if the list of words were "flew eagle the plain around," participants would

need to make the sentence "The eagle flew around" and recognize that the word "plain"

was not needed. In the *belonging goal condition*, the participants formed belonging-

themed sentences (e.g., "Jane feels close to Adam") and in the *fairness goal condition*,

the participants formed fairness-themed sentences (e.g., "Jane has earned her place"). In

the *no goal condition*, participants formed neutral sentences (e.g., "Jane likes to swim").

All participants were then instructed to read a version of the scenario below:

> Instructions: Please read the scenario below and then answer the
> questions that follow. Imagine that you are interviewing for a
> research assistant position. As a psychology major, it is very
> important for you to gain research experience, so you want to do
> well in this interview. You are being interviewed by a male (age
> 32) in an office on campus. [Your main objective is to…]
> Below are several of the questions that he asks you during the
> course of the interview. Please read each question and indicate
> how you would respond and feel. *Write how you think you would
> react, **not** how you think you should react.* Indicate how you would
> actually behave, think, and/or feel. [Remember, your primary
> concern is to…]

This scenario reflects an expansion of Woodzicka and LaFrance's (2001) instructions. First, the instructions include a statement about the importance of doing well in the interview. This change is an effort to create a stronger manipulation. Shelton and Stewart (2004) found that people are less likely to confront in situations that are socially costly. The inclusion of the statement "As a psychology major, it is very important for you to gain research experience, so you want to do well in this interview" establishes this social cost so that it more closely matches the social cost that would be present in a real situation.

Second, I added two sentences to reinforce the goal prime. The sentence stems are in the brackets at the end of each paragraph above. To reinforce the prime, participants received the same type of explicit instructions as the implicit prime they had just completed (i.e., both belonging primes, both fairness primes, or both neutral primes). The *no goal condition* instructions included the line "Your main objective is to communicate clearly with the interviewer" directly before the short break in the text of the instructions and also a reinforcing line at the end of the paragraph: "Remember, your primary concern is to clearly communicate with the interviewer." The *belonging-goal condition* instructions included the line "Your main objective is to make a favorable impression on the interviewer" directly before the short break in the text of the instructions and also a reinforcing line at the end of the paragraph: "Remember, your primary concern is to receive a positive evaluation from the interviewer." The *fairness goal condition* instructions included the line "Your main objective is to live up to your personal ideals and ensure that you are

treated fairly" directly before the short break in the text of the instructions and also

a reinforcing line at the end of the paragraph: "Remember, your primary concern is

to live up to your standards and make sure that you are treated fairly."

Response likelihood ratings. Participants rated the likelihood that they

would respond in the specific ways detailed by Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001)

(e.g., Tell the interviewer that the question was irrelevant, Refuse to answer the

question; 1 = *not at all likely*, 7 = *very likely*) (see Appendix E). The predicted

behaviors in Table 1 are in order of severity of response. The table begins with non-

assertive behavior and ends with highly assertive behavior. I averaged response

likelihood across all three questions to create a single variable for each response

likelihood. The scales for Ignore/ Do nothing ($M = 4.39$, $SD = 1.54$; $\alpha = .61$),

Refocus ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 1.45$; $\alpha = .58$), Ask why + answer ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 1.61$;

$\alpha = .67$), Ask why + no answer ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 1.64$; $\alpha = .81$), State question is

irrelevant ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 1.93$; $\alpha = .86$), "None of your business" ($M = 2.45$, $SD = 1.58$; $\alpha = .82$), "Tell off" ($M = 2.01$, $SD = 1.27$; $\alpha = .80$), Refuse to answer at least

one question ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 1.71$; $\alpha = .84$), Leave interview ($M = 2.26$, $SD = 1.84$;

$\alpha = .78$) and Report to supervisor ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 1.84$; $\alpha = .87$) were moderately

to strongly reliable[1].

Coded response predictions. All coding was based on Woodzicka and

LaFrance's (2001) original coding scheme, plus on additional item ("State question

---

[1] Scales with only modest reliabilities were retained for analysis for two reasons. First, this allows me to make a direct comparison to Woodzicka and LaFrance's (2001) results. Second, the pattern of results was similar across each individual item in the scales.

is inappropriate") that I added to capture an emerging theme in the response

predictions (see Table 1 for a list of predicted behaviors). Coders were instructed to

code each response that the participant gave for each question. For example, some

participants said they would do two things in response to the question. In such a

case, the coder would select a code for each response. Coders recorded a 1 if a

predicted behavior was present and a 0 if the predicted behavior was not present in

the open-ended response.

Of the 14,140 coding data points, there were 76 instances of disagreement

between coders (0.005%). For example, this could occur if coder 1 coded a

behavior as present (1) and coder 2 coded a behavior as not present (0). After

conducting the reliability analyses, I resolved any discrepancies to come up with a

single present (1) or not present (0) code for each question. Because each

participant answered three questions, my computed variable for each predicted

behavior ranges from 0 to 3, where a 0 indicates the participant did not predict

engaging in this behavior in response to any of the three questions and a 3 indicates

the participant predicted engaging in this behavior in response to all three questions.

Coder agreement for these responses ranged from $r = .78$ to $r = 1.00$, indicating a

high level of agreement across coders.

No counter. Woodzicka and LaFrance's (2001) coding scheme included

information about whether the participant gave a simple yes or no answer to the

question. A simple yes or no answer indicates that the participant either ignored or

chose to do nothing about the inappropriate nature of the question. I summed up the

number of simple yes or no answers across each question for each participant to create an "Ignore/Do nothing" variable ($M = 0.91$, $SD = 0.87$; see Table 2). The variable "Refocus" ($M = 0.23$, $SD = 0.44$) indicates that the participant made an effort to clarify or redirect the nature of the question (e.g., "I believe that I am desirable as a research assistant"). In Table 2, I group these two responses under the heading "No counter" because each response indicates that the participant either accepted the question as legitimate or ignored the inappropriate nature of the question.

Positive counter. All of the other predicted responses reflect some sort of discomfort with the question. Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001) conceptualized several responses as "positive counters," which indicate that the participants were unsure about the legitimacy of the question. Positive counters are considered positive because the participant response does not indicate that she is upset or angered by the question and still wants to present a positive attitude. For example, the participant might ask a question of clarification and then decide whether to answer the interviewer. I categorized three responses as positive counters: asking why and answering (e.g., "Yes, but why do you ask?"; $M = 0.08$, $SD = 0.31$); asking why and not answering (e.g., "Why do you need to know if people find me morbid?"; $M = 0.22$, $SD = 0.50$), and stating the question was irrelevant (e.g., "I don't think my relationship is relevant to this interview"; $M = 0.22$, $SD = 0.51$).

Negative counter. Negative counters indicate that participants regard the question as illegitimate and assertively respond to the interviewer. Negative

counters are considered negative because the participant response indicates that she

is upset or angered by the question. Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001)

conceptualized two responses as negative counters: telling the interviewer it was

"None of your business" ($M = 0.01$, $SD = 0.09$), and "Telling off" the interviewer

($M = 0.05$, $SD = 0.21$). I added a third response "State question is inappropriate"

(e.g., "You shouldn't ask people about God. You can't discriminate based on

religion"; $M = 0.08$, $SD = 0.31$).

  "Reasonable woman" counter. The last three behaviors included by

Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001) reflect assertive confrontational behavior that

many people consider appropriate responses for a woman to use in a professional

workplace (Fitzgerald et al., 1995). In essence, these behaviors reflect what a

"reasonable woman" would be expected to do in the face of sexual harassment. I

included three behaviors in this section, including "Refuse to answer at least one

question" ($M = 0.08$, $SD = 0.28$), "Leave interview" ($M = 0.03$, $SD = 0.18$), and

"Report to supervisor." I do not include "report to supervisor" in Table 2 because

none of the participants listed this behavior in their predicted responses.

  Emotion prediction ratings. Participants used a scale from 1 *not at all* to 7

very much to rate their likelihood of experiencing several emotions in response to

each question (see Appendix D). Following Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001), I

averaged each emotion across all three questions. The scales for Fear ($\alpha = .78$),

Anxiety ($\alpha = .77$), Guilt ($\alpha = .75$), Anger ($\alpha = .82$), Regret ($\alpha = .75$), and

Discomfort ($\alpha = .79$) were reliable.

Coded emotional valence. The coders also rated how offended ("Overall, how offended was the respondent?"; 1 = *not at all*, 4 = *extremely*) the participant seemed in her open-ended response as well as the overall affective tone ("Overall, what was the affective tone of the response?"; 1 = *very negative*, 4 = *very positive*; reverse scored) of the response. There was a high level of coder agreement for the level of offense ($r = .90$) and a moderate amount of coder agreement for the affective tone ($r = .57$). The coded values for offense and affective tone (reverse scored) for each question were highly correlated ($r = .88$), so I combined the two to form an emotional valence variable ($M = 1.91$, $SD = 0.56$). Higher numbers on this scale indicate greater negativity in the open-ended response.

Debriefing

After completing the survey, the participant answered several questions to assess suspicion (see Appendix G). Participants were then thanked by the experimenter and given a debriefing form that explained the purpose of the study (see Appendix H).

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Manipulation Checks

To test the effectiveness of the interview questions, participants answered how surprising, inappropriate, and sexually harassing they found the interview questions. As expected, participants who were in the sexually harassing questions condition rated the questions as more *sexually harassing* ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 1.43$) than participants in the surprising questions condition ($M = 1.40$, $SD = 0.77$), $t(234) = 20.87$, $p < .001$. Participants who were in the sexually harassing questions condition also rated the questions as more *surprising* ($M = 6.11$, $SD = 0.89$) than participants in the surprising questions condition ($M = 5.43$, $SD = 1.24$), $t(234) = 4.84$, $p < .001$[2]. As expected, participants who were in the sexually harassing questions condition rated the questions as more *inappropriate* ($M = 5.87$, $SD = 1.20$) than participants in the surprising questions condition ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 1.61$), $t(234) = 11.63$, $p < .001$. These results indicate that the manipulation contained in the interview questions was successful; participants in the sexually harassing questions condition had a more negative reaction to the questions than participants in the surprising questions condition.

---

[2] Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001) reported that they matched the sexually harassing and surprising interview questions on comparable levels of surprise, but it was not clear if the sexually harassing questions were considered more surprising than the control (surprising) interview questions.

Behavioral Response Predictions

  Response likelihood ratings. I expected that the type of goal prime would interact with the type of questions. When imagining the sexually harassing interview, women primed with the belonging goal should imagine they would respond just like participants actually responded to sexually harassing interview questions in Woodzicka and LaFrance's (2001) study (e.g., not say anything). In contrast, participants primed with the fairness goal should more closely resemble the way people imagine they would respond (e.g., tell the interviewer it is none of his business). Furthermore, women primed with the fairness goal should not differ from women in the no prime control condition. I did not expect the type of goal prime to affect responses to the surprising questions scenario.

  I used one-way ANOVA with planned comparisons to test this prediction instead of a traditional 3 x 2 ANOVA. A typical ANOVA is set up to test cross-over interactions and is less sensitive to other patterns of interaction (Abelson & Prentice, 1997). I created the following contrast variable to test my predicted interaction: I coded the sexually harassing/fairness condition as 1, the sexually harassing/belonging as 2, sexually harassing/no goal 3, surprising/fairness 4, surprising/belonging 5, and surprising/no goal 6. The first contrast (coefficients: 1 1 1 -1 -1 -1) tested the *main effect of type of question*; specifically, this contrast tested whether participants in the sexually harassing questions condition were more likely predict engaging in the confrontational behaviors than participants in the surprising questions condition. The second contrast (coefficients: 1 -2 1 1 -2 1) tested the *main effect of goal*; specifically, this contrast tested whether participants with a belonging

goal would be less likely to predict engaging in the behaviors than participants in the other two goal conditions. Finally, the third contrast tested my predicted *interaction* (coefficients: 1 -2 1 0 0 0); specifically, this contrast tested whether participants in the sexually harassing questions/belonging goal condition would be less likely to predict engaging in the behaviors than those in the other sexually harassing conditions.

To test for the predicted pattern, I first ran a one-way omnibus ANOVA. If the omnibus F-test was significant, I then looked at the planned contrast results to see if my specific predictions were supported.

No counter. The omnibus ANOVAs for both of the no counter responses were significant (see Table 1). As predicted, there was a main effect of type of questions for the no counter responses of Ignore/Do nothing and Refocus such that participants who viewed sexually harassing interview questions were more likely to imagine they would not counter the questions than participants who viewed surprising interview questions. Also as predicted, there was a main effect of goal for the Ignore/Do nothing response such that participants who were primed with a belonging goal were more likely to imagine that they would Ignore/Do nothing than participants who were primed with a fairness goal or no goal. Counter to predictions, there was not a main effect of goal for Refocus and there was no interaction for either no counter response.

Table 1. Response likelihood ratings

Behavior	Condition	*M*	*SD*	Omnibus ANOVA *F*(5, 230)	*p*	ME of Questions *t*(230)	*p*	ME of Goal *t*(230)	*p*	Interaction *t*(230)	*p*
No counter											
Ignore/ Do nothing	Harass/Fair	3.54	1.60	12.70	.01	-7.14	.01	-2.71	.01	-.87	.38
	Harass/Belong	3.88	1.47								
	Harass/None	3.75	1.25								
	Surprise/Fair	4.61	1.42								
	Surprise/Belong	5.53	1.11								
	Surprise/None	4.89	1.41								
Refocus	Harass/Fair	4.59	1.48	3.13	.01	3.68	.01	0.70	.48	0.54	.59
	Harass/Belong	4.23	1.40								
	Harass/None	4.18	1.45								
	Surprise/Fair	3.71	1.50								
	Surprise/Belong	3.57	1.39								
	Surprise/None	3.68	1.27								
Positive counter											
Ask why + answer	Harass/Fair	4.00	1.38	3.88	.01	4.10	.01	0.59	.56	-0.20	.84
	Harass/Belong	3.95	1.12								
	Harass/None	3.78	1.75								
	Surprise/Fair	3.33	1.66								
	Surprise/Belong	2.87	1.66								
	Surprise/None	3.03	1.69								

Behavior	Condition	M	SD	Omnibus ANOVA F(5, 230)	p	ME of Questions t(230)	p	ME of Goal t(230)	p	Interaction t(230)	p
Ask why + no answer	Harass/Fair	3.75	1.69	22.83	.01	10.23	.01	2.16	.03	1.42	.16
	Harass/Belong	3.23	1.61								
	Harass/None	3.44	1.79								
	Surprise/Fair	2.07	1.16								
	Surprise/Belong	1.39	0.67								
	Surprise/None	1.55	0.81								
State question is irrelevant	Harass/Fair	4.75	1.72	17.64	.01	8.97	.01	2.08	.04	1.31	.19
	Harass/Belong	4.08	1.64								
	Harass/None	4.26	1.96								
	Surprise/Fair	2.75	1.74								
	Surprise/Belong	2.08	1.28								
	Surprise/None	2.44	1.57								
Negative counter											
"None of your business"	Harass/Fair	3.61	1.53	18.08	.01	8.94	.01	2.36	.02	1.38	.17
	Harass/Belong	3.02	1.61								
	Harass/None	3.15	1.56								
	Surprise/Fair	2.03	1.38								
	Surprise/Belong	1.34	0.58								
	Surprise/None	1.68	1.23								
"Tell off"	Harass/Fair	2.82	1.36	17.40	.01	8.98	.01	0.99	.32	0.13	.90
	Harass/Belong	2.64	1.35								
	Harass/None	2.51	1.38								
	Surprise/Fair	1.66	1.01								
	Surprise/Belong	1.20	0.46								

Behavior	Condition	M	SD	Omnibus ANOVA F(5, 230)	p	ME of Questions t(230)	p	ME of Goal t(230)	p	Interaction t(230)	p
	Surprise/None	1.28	0.67								
Indirect counter											
Refuse to answer at least one question	Harass/Fair	3.92	1.66	23.66	.01	10.44	.01	2.40	.02	1.70	.09
	Harass/Belong	3.35	1.71								
	Harass/None	3.71	1.76								
	Surprise/Fair	2.13	1.25								
	Surprise/Belong	1.44	0.65								
	Surprise/None	1.67	1.11								
Leave interview	Harass/Fair	3.20	1.50	22.00	.01	10.23	.01	1.81	.07	1.05	.29
	Harass/Belong	2.92	1.50								
	Harass/None	3.13	1.46								
	Surprise/Fair	1.71	0.99								
	Surprise/Belong	1.24	0.56								
	Surprise/None	1.46	1.45								
Report to supervisor	Harass/Fair	4.14	1.59	26.20	.01	11.07	.01	1.47	.14	0.03	.98
	Harass/Belong	3.95	1.90								
	Harass/None	3.78	1.60								
	Surprise/Fair	2.19	1.53								
	Surprise/Belong	1.43	0.63								
	Surprise/None	1.83	1.39								

Positive counter. The omnibus ANOVAs for all of the positive counter responses were significant (see Table 1). As predicted, there was a main effect of type of questions for the three positive counters (asking why, with or without an answer and stating the question is irrelevant) such that participants who viewed sexually harassing interview questions were more likely to imagine engaging in all of these behaviors than participants who viewed surprising interview questions. Also as predicted, there was a main effect of goal for two of the three positive counters such that participants who were primed with a belonging goal were less likely to imagine that they would ask why but not answer and state the question was irrelevant than participants who were primed with a fairness goal or no goal. Counter to predictions, there was not a main effect of goal for asking why the question was asked and then answering the question, and there was no interaction for any of the positive counters.

Negative counter. The omnibus ANOVAs for all of the negative counter responses were significant (see Table 1). As predicted, there was a main effect of type of questions for both negative counter responses such that participants who viewed sexually harassing interview questions were more likely to imagine they would tell the interviewer it was none of his business and tell him off than participants who viewed surprising interview questions. Also as predicted, there was a significant main effect of goal for one of the negative counters such that participants who were primed with a belonging goal were less likely to imagine they would tell the interviewer it was none of his business than participants who were primed with a fairness goal or no goal. Counter to predictions, there was not a

main effect of goal for telling off the interviewer and there was no interaction for the negative counters.

"Reasonable woman" counter. The omnibus ANOVAs for all of the "reasonable woman" counter responses were significant (see Table 1). As predicted, and replicating past research, there was a main effect of type of questions for all three of the "reasonable woman" counters (refusing to answer, leaving the interview, and reporting the interviewer) such that participants who viewed sexually harassing interview questions were more likely to imagine they would engage in these behaviors than participants who viewed surprising interview questions. Also as predicted, there was a significant main effect of goal for refusing to answer and a marginally significant main effect of goal for leaving the interview such that participants who were primed with a belonging goal were less likely to imagine that they would engage in these two behaviors than participants who were primed with a fairness goal or no goal. Counter to predictions, there was not a main effect of goal for reporting the interviewer and there was no interaction for any of the "reasonable woman" responses.

Coded response predictions. To test for differences by condition in the open-ended responses, I used the same contrasts described above.

No counter. The omnibus ANOVA for refocusing was significant (see Table 2), but the omnibus ANOVA for ignoring or doing nothing was not significant. As predicted, there was a main effect of type of questions for refocusing such that participants who viewed sexually harassing interview questions were more likely to imagine they would refocus the interviewer than participants who

Table 2. Coded response predictions

Behavior	Condition	M	SD	Omnibus ANOVA F(5, 229)	p	ME of Questions t(229)	p	ME of Goal t(229)	p	Interaction t(229)	p
No counter											
Ignore/Do nothing	Harass/Fair	0.74	0.92	1.55	.18	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Harass/Belong	0.80	0.69								
	Harass/None	0.87	0.89								
	Surprise/Fair	1.08	0.89								
	Surprise/Belong	1.16	0.95								
	Surprise/None	0.82	0.83								
Refocus	Harass/Fair	0.32	0.47	4.13	.01	2.87	.01	-0.85	.40	-2.60	.01
	Harass/Belong	0.45	0.55								
	Harass/None	0.15	0.37								
	Surprise/Fair	0.16	0.37								
	Surprise/Belong	0.07	0.26								
	Surprise/None	0.21	0.47								
Positive counter											
Ask why + answer	Harass/Fair	0.13	0.34	1.23	.30	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Harass/Belong	0.18	0.45								
	Harass/None	0.10	0.31								
	Surprise/Fair	0.11	0.31								
	Surprise/Belong	0.05	0.21								
	Surprise/None	0.03	0.16								

Behavior	Condition	M	SD	Omnibus ANOVA F(5, 229)	p	ME of Questions t(229)	p	ME of Goal t(229)	p	Interaction t(229)	p
Ask why + no answer	Harass/Fair	0.53	0.76	7.41	.01	5.58	.01	1.15	.25	0.73	.46
	Harass/Belong	0.35	0.53								
	Harass/None	0.31	0.57								
	Surprise/Fair	0.05	0.23								
	Surprise/Belong	0.00	0.00								
	Surprise/None	0.11	0.31								
State question is irrelevant	Harass/Fair	0.55	0.69	7.36	.01	5.52	.01	0.86	.39	1.13	0.26
	Harass/Belong	0.33	0.53								
	Harass/None	0.31	0.66								
	Surprise/Fair	0.08	0.36								
	Surprise/Belong	0.05	0.21								
	Surprise/None	0.03	0.16								
Negative counter											
State question is inappropriate	Harass/Fair	0.18	0.46	2.22	.05	3.04	.01	0.12	.91	0.94	.35
	Harass/Belong	0.10	0.44								
	Harass/None	0.13	0.34								
	Surprise/Fair	0.00	0.00								
	Surprise/Belong	0.05	0.21								
	Surprise/None	0.00	0.00								

Behavior	Condition	M	SD	Omnibus ANOVA F(5, 229)	p	ME of Questions t(229)	p	ME of Goal t(229)	p	Interaction t(229)	p
"None of your business"	Harass/Fair	0.03	0.16	0.81	.55	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Harass/Belong	0.03	0.16								
	Harass/None	0.00	0.00								
	Surprise/Fair	0.00	0.00								
	Surprise/Belong	0.00	0.0								
	Surprise/None	0.00	0.00								
"Tell off"	Harass/Fair	0.18	0.39	4.99	.01	3.59	.01	1.90	.06	2.67	.01
	Harass/Belong	0.03	0.16								
	Harass/None	0.08	0.27								
	Surprise/Fair	0.00	0.00								
	Surprise/Belong	0.00	0.00								
	Surprise/None	0.00	0.00								
Indirect counter											
Refuse to answer at least one question	Harass/Fair	0.18	0.46	3.32	.01	3.84	.01	0.61	.54	1.29	.20
	Harass/Belong	0.10	0.30								
	Harass/None	0.15	0.37								
	Surprise/Fair	0.00	0.00								
	Surprise/Belong	0.02	0.15								
	Surprise/None	0.00	0.00								
Leave interview	Harass/Fair	0.05	0.23	2.13	.06	2.92	.01	0.56	.57	0.79	.43
	Harass/Belong	0.05	0.22								
	Harass/None	0.10	0.31								
	Surprise/Fair	0.00	0.00								
	Surprise/Belong	0.00	0.00								
	Surprise/None	0.00	0.00								

viewed surprising interview questions. Counter to predictions, there was not a main effect of goal for Refocus. Also predicted, there was an interaction for refocusing. When participants viewed sexually harassing interview questions, those who were primed with a belonging goal ($M = 0.45$, $SD = 0.55$) were more likely to imagine they would refocus than participants who were primed with a fairness goal ($M = 0.32$, $SD = 0.47$) or no goal ($M = 0.15$, $SD = 0.37$). As demonstrated with the first contrast, participants who viewed surprising interview questions were less likely to imagine they would refocus than participants who viewed the sexually harassing questions.

Positive counter. The omnibus ANOVAs for asking why but not answering the question and stating the question was irrelevant were significant (see Table 2), but the omnibus ANOVA for asking why but answering the question was not significant. As predicted, there was a main effect of type of questions for both positive counters. Participants who viewed sexually harassing interview questions were more likely to state that they would ask why the question was asked but not answer and state the question was irrelevant than participants who viewed surprising interview questions. Counter to predictions, there was not a main effect of goal for either positive counter, nor was there an interaction.

Negative counter. The omnibus ANOVAs for stating the question was inappropriate and telling off the interviewer were significant (see Table 2), but the omnibus ANOVA for telling the interviewer it was none of his business was not significant. As predicted, there was a main effect of type of questions for two of the negative counters such that participants who viewed sexually harassing interview

questions were more likely to imagine they would state the question was inappropriate and tell off the interviewer than participants who viewed surprising interview questions. Also as predicted, there was a marginally significant main effect of goal for telling off the interviewer such that participants who were primed with a belonging goal were slightly less likely to say they would tell off the interviewer than participants who were primed with a fairness goal or no goal. Counter to predictions, there was not a main effect of goal nor was there an interaction for stating the question was inappropriate. But, as predicted, there was an interaction for telling off the interviewer. For participants who viewed sexually harassing interview questions, those who were primed with a belonging goal ($M =$ 0.03, $SD = 0.16$) were less likely to imagine they would tell off the interviewer than participants who were primed with a fairness goal ($M = 0.18$, $SD = 0.39$) or no goal ($M = 0.08$, $SD = 0.27$). As demonstrated with the first contrast, participants who received surprising interview questions were less likely to imagine they would tell off the interviewer than participants who viewed the sexually harassing questions.

"Reasonable woman" counter. As predicted, the omnibus ANOVAs for refusing to answer and leaving the interview were significant (see Table 2). I could not run an omnibus ANOVA on report to supervisor because none of the participants imagined that they would engage in such a response. As predicted, there was a main effect of type of questions for two of the "reasonable woman" counters such that participants who viewed sexually harassing interview questions were more likely to state that they would refuse to answer and leave the interview than participants who viewed surprising interview questions. Counter to predictions,

there was not a main effect of goal and there was no interaction for either "reasonable woman" counter.

Emotional Responses

   Emotion prediction ratings. To test for differences by condition for the emotion prediction ratings, I used the same contrasts described above. The omnibus ANOVAs for all emotions were significant (see Table 3). There was a main effect of the type of questions for all of the emotion prediction ratings. As predicted, participants in the sexually harassing questions condition imagined they would feel more fear, anxiety, guilt, anger, regret, and discomfort than participants in the surprising questions condition. There was only a main effect of goal for fear. As predicted, participants in the belonging goal condition were more likely to predict that they would experience fear than participants in the fairness or no goal conditions. Finally, there was a significant interaction for regret, and a marginally significant interaction for guilt (see Table 4). As predicted, for participants who viewed sexually harassing interview questions, those who were primed with a belonging goal were more likely to predict they would feel regret ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 1.31$) and slightly more likely to predict they would feel guilt ($M = 2.24$, $SD = 1.16$) than those who were primed with a fairness goal ($M = 2.24$, $SD = 1.19$, $M = 1.77$, $SD = 0.92$, regret, guilt, respectively) or no goal ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.47$, $M = 2.03$, $SD = 1.14$, regret, guilt, respectively). As demonstrated with the first contrast, participants who received surprising interview questions also imagined they would feel less regret and guilt than participants who viewed the sexually harassing questions.

Table 3. Emotion prediction ratings

Emotion	Condition	M	SD	Omnibus ANOVA F(5, 230)	p	ME of Questions t(230)	p	ME of Goal t(230)	p	Interaction t(230)	p
Fear	Harass/Fair	3.36	1.62	12.73	.01	7.66	.01	-2.35	.02	-1.63	.11
	Harass/Belong	3.73	1.42								
	Harass/None	3.28	1.42								
	Surprise/Fair	2.05	1.18								
	Surprise/Belong	2.44	1.15								
	Surprise/None	1.99	0.87								
Anxiety	Harass/Fair	4.17	1.56	13.10	.01	7.93	.01	-1.65	.10	-1.34	.18
	Harass/Belong	4.53	1.29								
	Harass/None	4.15	1.56								
	Surprise/Fair	2.79	1.53								
	Surprise/Belong	3.00	1.37								
	Surprise/None	2.68	1.09								
Guilt	Harass/Fair	1.77	0.92	2.46	.03	2.71	.01	-1.19	.24	-1.81	.07
	Harass/Belong	2.24	1.16								
	Harass/None	2.03	1.14								
	Surprise/Fair	1.73	0.93								
	Surprise/Belong	1.65	0.76								
	Surprise/None	1.63	0.87								

Emotion	Condition	M	SD	Omnibus ANOVA F(5, 230)	p	ME of Questions t(230)	p	ME of Goal t(230)	p	Interaction t(230)	p
Anger	Harass/Fair	4.00	1.67	17.24	.01	8.75	.01	-0.34	.74	-0.27	.79
	Harass/Belong	3.63	1.62								
	Harass/None	3.08	1.69								
	Surprise/Fair	2.15	1.12								
	Surprise/Belong	2.02	1.08								
	Surprise/None	1.80	0.90								
Regret	Harass/Fair	2.24	1.19	6.53	.01	5.07	.01	-1.04	.30	-2.02	.05
	Harass/Belong	2.83	1.31								
	Harass/None	2.50	1.47								
	Surprise/Fair	1.93	1.18								
	Surprise/Belong	1.67	0.83								
	Surprise/None	1.68	0.82								
Discomfort	Harass/Fair	5.47	1.41	21.79	.01	10.36	.01	-0.02	.98	.41	.68
	Harass/Belong	5.30	1.48								
	Harass/None	5.35	1.32								
	Surprise/Fair	3.62	1.58								
	Surprise/Belong	3.55	1.43								
	Surprise/None	3.24	1.22								

Coded emotional valence. To test for differences by condition for the coded emotional valence of open-ended responses, I used the same contrasts described above. The omnibus ANOVA was significant (see Table 4). As predicted, there was a main effect of type of questions such that participants in the sexually harassing condition expressed more negativity in their open-ended responses than participants in the surprising condition. There was no main effect of goal, nor was there an interaction.

Table 4. Coded emotional valence

Condition	M	SD	Omnibus ANOVA $F(5, 229)$	p	ME of Questions $t(229)$	p	ME of Goal $t(229)$	p	Interaction $t(229)$	p
Harass/Fair	2.34	0.61	15.16	.01	8.32	.01	1.21	.23	.32	.10
Harass/Belong	2.08	0.59								
Harass/None	2.13	0.63								
Surprise/Fair	1.68	0.29								
Surprise/Belong	1.64	0.42								
Surprise/None	1.61	0.29								

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

Why do people choose not to speak up when faced with injustice? The present research tested the idea that people may mistakenly believe that they would publicly respond to discrimination because they do not successfully anticipate the goal they would have in mind during the social interaction. More specifically, this study tests the idea that targets of discrimination may choose not to confront discrimination because, in the context of a face-to-face interaction, they have a strong motivation to be liked by the perpetrator and to follow social rules (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Pickett, Gardner, & Knowles, 2004). My study found that women imagined that they would have stronger emotional and behavioral responses after they viewed sexually harassing versus surprising interview questions. Furthermore, I found some evidence that women who were primed with belonging goals imagined engaging in fewer confrontational behaviors and reported heightened negative affect compared to women who were primed with a fairness goal or no goal.

Women Imagine Assertive Responses to Sexual Harassment

A decade has passed since Woodzicka and LaFrance's (2001) original work, and my results indicated that women today are just as likely to imagine that they will stand up for themselves if they experience sexual harassment. More specifically, I found that

women who viewed sexually harassing interview questions were more likely to predict engaging in confrontational behavior and less likely to imagine they would ignore the inappropriate nature of the questions than women who viewed surprising interview questions. It could be that while the surprising questions were inappropriate for a research assistantship interview, women who thought their interview questions were *sexually* inappropriate were more likely to label the interviewer as discriminatory. Therefore, once women believed they were being treated unfairly on the basis of their sex, they were more likely to imagine that they would assertively confront the interviewer.

The present study also replicated Woodzicka and LaFrance's (2001) finding that women who viewed sexually harassing interview questions are more likely to predict they would experience negative emotions than women who viewed surprising interview questions. For instance, women in the sexually harassing questions condition rated themselves as more likely to experience negative emotions, such as anger and discomfort, and coders rated the emotional valence of their open-ended responses as more negative than women in the surprising questions condition. Women may have emotionally reacted more negatively to the sexually harassing interview questions because they labeled the questions as more discriminatory and threatening. If women believed that they were being treated unfairly, they may have felt less in control and therefore experienced heightened negative affect (Kaiser & Miller, 2001).

While women do predict experiencing anger in response to sexually harassing questions, the other negative emotions that they anticipate experiencing may stifle assertive confrontational behavior. For example, if a woman is fearful and anxious about her behavior during a job interview, she is unlikely to engage in assertive confrontational

behaviors (e.g., telling off the interviewer). Our emotions direct our behavior in an intergroup context (Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000).When one's group membership is made salient via discrimination, people who experience anger are motivated to approach the outgroup, perhaps by confronting the out-group member, while people who experience fear are motivated to avoid the outgroup, and therefore avoid confrontation.

Belonging Goals Attenuate Predicted Confrontation and Increase Fear

The present study sought to extend Woodzicka and LaFrance's (2001) original research by testing whether priming a belonging versus fairness goal would influence how participants predicted they would respond. I found some support for the impact of goals on predicted behavior. I hypothesized that, in comparison to women who were primed with a fairness goal or no goal, women who were primed with a belonging goal would more closely resemble how women actually responded in Woodzicka and LaFrance's (2001) real life interview. That is, I predicted that women with a belonging goal would be less likely to imagine that they would assertively confront and more likely to imagine that they would experience negative emotions than women with a fairness goal or no goal. Effectively, providing the belonging goal should bring expectations of how one would behave in line with how women actually behaved in the face-to-face interview.

Under current law, the "reasonable woman" standard is based on what people imagine they would do when faced with sexual harassment. However, people rarely respond to discrimination as they imagine. As predicted, women who were primed with a belonging goal imagined they would be more likely to ignore the inappropriate nature of the question and imagined they would be less likely to engaging in several positive and

"reasonable woman" counters than women who were primed with a fairness goal or no goal. Thus, when women are primed with a belonging goal they appear to be more psychologically similar to women who actually experienced a sexually harassing interview (Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001). My research highlights that providing people with a context in which they should imagine their response could provide compelling data to change the legal standard.

The impact of goals on several confrontational behaviors highlights an important fallacy in the "reasonable woman" argument. The original definition of a "reasonable woman" relied on the presumption that women should be primarily concerned with fairness in the face of sexual harassment. However, we should not presume that fairness would be the primary goal, or indeed the only goal, of women in such a situation. The need to belong is a primary concern during many social interactions (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), thus we should presume that women who face sexual harassment in a workplace setting would be primarily concerned with belonging, and will probably fear the ramifications of speaking up.

Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001) also found that when participants actually experienced a sexually harassing interview, they reported more fear than participants who only imagined how they would feel. I found that participants with a belonging goal had more accurate predictions of fear than participants with a fairness goal or no goal – that is, their imagined responses matched the actual responses of women who experienced a sexually harassing interview. The belonging goal could have exerted this corrective force by helping participants more fully anticipate the constraints of the social situation in the imagined interview. Instead of focusing on fairness, women who interview for a research

position may be primarily concerned with making a good impression on the interviewer, monitoring their self-presentation, and gaining approval from the interviewer. The belonging goal may have helped make these considerations more apparent, while the fairness goal and no goal conditions may have obscured those considerations in women's predicted emotional reactions.

The coded open-ended responses did not show support for the hypothesized effect of goals on imagined behavioral responses. There are a couple of reasons why the open-ended coding might not have revealed a similar pattern. First, it is possible that the primed goal did not influence answers in the spontaneous, open-ended response section, but did influence predictions for the more deliberate response likelihood ratings. Research has shown that participants are more likely to skip over or provide incomplete answers to open-ended questions versus closed-ended questions (Griffith, Cook, Guyatt, & Charles, 1999). Participants may have moved quickly through the open-ended responses, thereby not fully detailing how they would respond to the interview questions. Additionally, participants may have overestimated the likelihood of their responses on the closed-ended questions. Future research should investigate the differences in how women spontaneously predict they would behave versus their rated behavior likelihoods.

Second, I did not include a manipulation check to assess how effective the sentence unscrambling task or explicit goal instructions were for priming a goal. It is possible that the goal prime was ineffective, too weak, or did not last long enough. Although previous research has demonstrated that sentence unscrambling tasks are effective at priming motivations (e.g., McCoy & Major, 2006), it would be useful for future research to check the effectiveness of the goal prime. There is a major caveat,

however, if one should choose to include a manipulation check for goal. It is possible that

by completing explicit checks for goal prime effectiveness (e.g., by agreeing with the

statement "My goal is to get along with the experimenter"), participants may fulfill their

motivation to achieve the goal. If participants felt satisfied that they had successfully met

their goals, the goal prime may no longer be accessible as they complete the survey,

thereby washing out any effect of goal.

Lack of Confrontation May Increase Guilt

I found some support for the hypothesized interaction between type of questions

and goal. The hypothesized interaction emerged for open-ended predictions of refocusing

and telling off the interviewer. Of the participants in the sexually harassing condition,

those with a belonging goal were more likely to imagine they would refocus the question

and less likely to imagine they would tell off the interviewer than those with a fairness

goal or no goal. That is, they imagined they would interpret the question as legitimate and

avoid rude behavior towards the interviewer. I might not have found evidence of the

interaction for some of the more confrontational open-ended responses if participants

were unable to spontaneously think of a confrontational response. The social script of a

job interview may have made forming a spontaneous assertive confrontational response

more difficult than forming polite responses.

I also found support for the hypothesized interaction for some of the predicted

emotions. Specifically, when participants who viewed the sexually harassing interview

questions were primed with a belonging goal, they were more likely to predict that they

would experience guilt and regret than participants in the other goal conditions. Perhaps

this interaction emerged for these particular emotions because participants were

dissatisfied with their predicted responses. Dissatisfaction with one's predicted response (e.g., simply answering the question) could lead to guilt and regret for not responding more assertively. In support of this argument, Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001) found that women predicted engaging in confrontational behavior, yet those who actually experienced a sexually harassing interview rarely confronted the interviewer. If participants in the belonging goal condition were more likely to anticipate the actual circumstances of being in a sexually harassing situation, they may have experienced more guilt and regret because they wanted to confront, but realized they could not. One way to test this idea would be to ask how women felt about specific predicted responses (e.g., refocusing, telling off the interviewer). Suppressing one's desired response may have led women with a belonging goal to feel guilty and regretful about their decision to not address the inappropriate nature of the question.

I found some evidence of an interaction between type of question and goal for some of the open-ended responses, but I did not find an interaction for any of the response likelihood ratings. One reason may be because the open-ended response section created a format for responding that is similar to real life. In real life, we have to search our memory in order to arrive at a behavior that we then decide whether or not to engage in; we generally do not have several behavioral options presented from an external source for us to consider. Therefore, the closed-ended response likelihood rating section created a format for responding that is very dissimilar to real life. The combined influence of both type of questions and goal may have had a more profound effect on open-ended responses. People may have rated the behavior likelihoods comparatively, overestimated their likelihood for engaging in each behavior, or rushed through the likelihood ratings

without careful consideration of their likelihood for engaging in each one. All of these ways of reacting to the response likelihood ratings may have lessened the combined impact that goal and type of questions would actually have had on behavior.

Future Research

The role of goals in the decision to confront sexual harassment also needs to be examined in the context of an actual job interview. The present study investigated whether bringing to mind certain goals can help women to better anticipate how they would feel and behave when actually experiencing sexual harassment. However, goals may operate differently during a face-to-face interaction than when one simply imagines having a goal. Given that an interview environment poses a potentially costly situation with inherent power dynamics, a woman who is primed with a fairness goal may still be unlikely to assertively confront. In other words, even with a strong fairness motivation, the social pressure to be liked by the interviewer may be so strong during a job interview that the motivation to belong supersedes all other motivations.

The present study gave women a range of potential responses, from polite confrontation (e.g., ask why the question was asked and then answer) to aggressive confrontation (e.g., tell off the interviewer). Even in the most offensive of circumstances, it is hard to imagine actually breaking social interaction norms and telling off a fellow employee or supervisor. Women in the midst of a discriminatory interaction may wish to confront the perpetrators, but actively "bite their tongues" and resist confrontation due to social constraints. Therefore, a woman primed with a fairness goal may experience more negative emotions is she fails to confront sexual harassment because she might be disappointed in herself for not fulfilling her fairness goal.

Conclusion

Current federal law uses the "reasonable woman" standard to evaluate whether sexual harassment has occurred (EEOC, 2010). Under this heuristic, it is assumed that if sexual harassment has occurred, a "reasonable woman" would publicly address the behavior in question. Absence of such a reaction is seen as evidence that the behavior may not qualify as sexual harassment. Taken with Woodzicka and LaFrance's (2001) research, this study indicates that the "reasonable woman" would probably not report sexual harassment to her supervisor. In the present research, the most popular predicted response was to simply answer the question. Under the current "reasonable woman" standard, providing a simple answer to a sexually harassing interview question would be considered an unreasonable response to sexual harassment. The legal system would probably conclude that women who simply answered the question considered the question as acceptable because they did nothing to question its legitimacy.

Thus, the "reasonable woman" standard appears to be flawed. Sexual harassment in the workplace occurs within an environment where confrontation is costly. People have a fundamental need to be liked (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), but people dislike confronters (Czopp et al., 2006). The present research supports the claim that when the need to belong is high, women are less likely to predict that they will engage in several confrontational behaviors. Furthermore, the present study supports the claim that the sexual harassment situation sets women up to experience negative emotions not only due to the nature of the sexual harassment, but also due to the situational constraints on their behavior and the possible inability to confront due to the nature of the situation. Women are therefore doubly affected by the sexual harassment; they have been demeaned by

someone within their workplace, and may experience guilt, regret, and a sense of

powerlessness by their inability to rectify the situation and confront their harasser.

In light of these results, it is important to consider several key changes to social

policy. First, the onus to report inappropriate behavior should be taken off the target of

sexual harassment. Supervisors, managers, and human resources personnel should

conduct routine monitoring of the workplace and report inappropriate conduct on a

regular basis. For example, human resource liaisons should have a presence in the

workplace so that they would be more likely to observe sexual harassment. These liaisons

should be chosen by the personnel to insure that they are sympathetic to employee needs

and concerns. They should also be highly accessible so that employees would feel

comfortable and encouraged to seek out their help without fear of retaliation.

Second, routine assessments of the workplace climate could help instill a norm of

fairness. If women are allowed to anonymously report the general atmosphere of their

workplace, they may be more likely to report sexual harassment and to incorporate a

fairness goal into their workplace mindset. Organizations could conduct a simple paper-

and-pencil or online survey to assess how comfortable their employees are in the

workplace, the nature of the relationships among employees and between employees and

managerial staff, and if they have experienced or observed any objectionable behavior. A

survey of this nature could contain less than 10 questions and easily be conducted on a

weekly or biweekly basis. Regular workplace climate surveys would not only give

employees a chance anonymously report sexual harassment, but also act as a deterrent for

sexual harassment. People may be less likely to engage in harassing behavior if they

know that it would be likely that someone would report their conduct in an anonymous climate survey.

Third, organizations should take into account how pressing the need to belong is on behavior when setting up standards for reporting harassment. Lack of immediate action should not be taken as an indication that harassment was welcome or tolerated. Time limits on reporting should be generous in light of the power that the need to belong asserts on our behavior. Some might argue that generous time limits on filing formal sexual harassment claims could increase false reporting. However, given the high cost associated with reporting sexual harassment, it is unlikely that women would put themselves through the discomfort of the sexual harassment claims process without cause. One could also argue that if a person is inclined to file a false claim, a generous versus narrow time frame would matter little to a person who is already willing to lie on record—fabricating an incident that happened last month is not qualitatively different from fabricating an incident that happened yesterday. On the contrary, generous time-limits would probably increase the number of valid claims because it would allow women to have more time to build their case, seek social support and guidance within the workplace, and ensure that their claim is accurate and filed correctly.

APPENDIX A:

INFORMED CONSENT SHEET

Consent to Participate in Research

Project Title: Imagined Interactions   **Researcher**: Kala Melchiori

Introduction: You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted by Kala Melchiori for the purpose of her Master's thesis. The thesis is supervised by Dr. Mallett in the Department of Psychology at Loyola University of Chicago. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study.

Purpose: You are invited to participate in research investigating either how you interpret other people participating in an imagined interaction or imagine yourself responding to a social interaction. The purpose of the study is to examine how people believe they experience various scenarios. Please know that you will not be informed of the full scope or hypotheses of the present study until after your participation.

Procedures: Participants will read a short scenario that describes a social interaction. Participants will then answer a series of questions either about the interaction they read about or how they imagine themselves responding in the interaction and how they feel about the scenario. Participants also may be asked to complete a word-sorting task. Lastly, they will be asked questions about themselves.

Risks and Benefits: There are minimal risks that do not exceed a level that you may encounter during your normal daily activities. There are no direct benefits to you participation, however if you have not participated in a psychological study before, this is a good opportunity to experience how psychological research is conducted.

Time Commitment: The experiment will take about 45 minutes to complete.

Compensation: You will receive one credit hour for the study that counts toward the fulfillment of the research participant component of your introductory psychology course.

Confidentiality: Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data from the study. Your name will not be connected to the information you provide, nor will your individual responses be identified in any research reports describing the study. All information obtained during the study will remain confidential. We will retain an electronic copy of your data on a secure (password-protected) computer for 10 years, after which point it will be deleted. Only the researchers will have access to your data.

Joining of your own free will: Your participation is voluntary. You may withhold information that you do not wish to disclose, and you do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer. You may choose not to serve as a participant or withdraw from this study at any time without penalty.

This study has been approved by the Loyola Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689. If you have any questions about the study, please contact Dr. Mallett (phone: 773.508.3028 email: rmallett@luc.edu).

Participant Statement: I have read the explanation provided to me and all of my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that by signing this consent form I am agreeing to participate in the study. I am at least 18 years of age and I agree to participate in this study (please sign below):

Participant Signature: _____ Date: _____

Researcher Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX B:

SENTENCE UNSCRAMBLING TASKS

Belonging Goal Prime

For each set of words below, make a grammatical sentence and write it down in the space provided. For each set of words, there is **one** word that is <u>not</u> needed in the sentence.

For example: Flew   eagle   the   plain   around   Answer: <u>The eagle flew around</u>

1. close   can   to   Jane   Adam   feels

2. I   to   her   get   along   considered   wanted   with

3. like   I   life   outlook   Rachel's

4. Peter   sword   occasionally   television   watches

5. I   feel   Joey   comfortable   guess   with

6. sent   I   email   it   over   letter

7. maintain   others   I   get along   to   with   want

8. Lisa   friend   Mary's   wants   story   to   be

9. sky   Lauren   is   friend   good   a

10. eating   like   together   I   with   friends

11. likes   Joe   really   going   jam

12. birds   she   with   me   cooperates

13. Christine   feels   Joey   close   guess   to

14. I   a   smooth   blimp   interaction   with   want   to   have   him

15. know   to   she   travel   wanted   him   with

16. Lisa   friend   Mary's   wants   story   to   be

17. a   Lauren   is   style   cook   bad

18. to   Sally   is   Harry   similar   style

19. I   relate   that   can   to   today

20. bond   I   with   him   picture   want   to

Fairness Goal Prime

For each set of words below, make a grammatical sentence and write it down in the space provided. For each set of words, there is **one** word that is <u>not</u> needed in the sentence.

For example: Flew   eagle   the   plain   around   Answer: <u>The eagle flew around</u>

1. test   chocolate   fair   the   was

2. can   has   Jane   place   her   earned

3. treats   Phil   equally   his   bird   children

4. Peter   sword   occasionally   television   watches

5. people   merit   are   judge   on

6. she   hobbit   me   treated   fairly

7. equal   ran   Heather   his   was

8. prosperity   leads   rabbit   effort   to

9. likes   Joe   really   going   jam

10. ruling   it   was   marker   fair   a

11. worked   her   for   lovely   promotion   Ann

12. jump   it   deserve   we   really

13. sent   I   email   it   over   letter

14. they   equality   maintain   fought   for

15. square   he   circle   fair   and   won

16. a   Lauren   is   style   cook   bad

17. teacher   our   impartial   was   kite

18. best   man   the   win   miser   may

19. unbiased   try   to   favor   be   we

20. two   the   were   ruler   equal   candidates

No Goal Task

For each set of words below, make a grammatical sentence and write it down in the space provided. For each set of words, there is **one** word that is <u>not</u> needed in the sentence.

For example: Flew   eagle   the   plain   around   Answer: <u>The eagle flew around</u>

1. ball   throw   toss   silently   the

2. he   sword   occasionally   people   watches

3. ate   she   it   selfishly   all

4. prepare   the   gift   wrap   neatly

5. the   push   wash   frequently   clothes

6. somewhat   prepared   I   was   refer

7. picked   throw   apples   hardly   the

8. they   obedient   him   often   know

9. helpless   it   hides   there   over

10. send   I   mail   it   over

11. a   smile   what   parrot   great

12. ball   the   hoop   toss   normally

13. saw   hammer   the   train   he

14. maintain   she   to   composure   try

15. Jane   swim   today   to   likes

16. sky   the   seamless   red   is

17. a   have   June   holiday   wedding

18. salad   I   make   green   tasty

19. she   line   leads   the   guess

20. have   wing   a   butterfly   I

APPENDIX C:

RESPONSE PREDICTIONS

The interviewer asks: Do you have a [boyfriend or best friend]?
How would you respond?

The interviewer asks: Do people find you [desirable or morbid]?
How would you respond?

The interviewer asks: Do you think it is important for [women to wear
bras to work or people to believe in God]?
How would you respond?

APPENDIX D:

EMOTION PREDICTION RATINGS

To what extent would you feel each of these emotions?	not at all				very much		
Anxiety	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Guilt	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Anger	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Fear	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Regret	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Discomfort	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX E:

RESPONSE LIKELIHOOD RATINGS

What is the likelihood that you would respond in the following ways after the interviewer asked you this question?

	not at all likely					very likely	
Simply answer the question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
State a clarification of the question before you answer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ask why the question was asked and then answer the question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ask why the question was asked and then refuse to answer the question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tell the interviewer that the question is irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tell off the interviewer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tell the interviewer it is none of his business	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Leave the interview after this question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Report the interviewer to his supervisor due to this question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Simply refuse to answer the question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX F:

MANIPULATION CHECKS

To what extent do you find this question…	not at all						very
…sexually harassing?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
…surprising?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
…inappropriate?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX G:

DEBRIEFING QUESTIONS

What was your overall impression of the study?

A lot of people in psychology experiments are suspicious that we're hiding something from them or that we are looking at something other than what we said we were looking at. Were you suspicious at all in this study?

If you had to guess, what would you say this study was trying to figure out? What was our hypothesis?

APPENDIX H:

DEBRIEFING FORM

By adolescence, the vast majority of American females have experienced some form of sexism ranging from being objectified to being sexually harassed in the workplace. Most women imagine that they would overtly confront perpetrators of discrimination, yet research shows that women are hesitant to confront sexism (Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001). This is problematic because people generally believe that by not responding to or reporting discrimination, women are consenting to the prejudicial treatment they have received (Fitzgerald, Swan, & Fischer, 1995). The present study is part of a program of research that explores how women respond to discrimination. Specifically, we are interested in the conditions that promote or reduce the likelihood that women will respond to discrimination. With this research, we hope to help people understand why people do not always respond to discrimination.

The current study seeks to examine why women predict that they will respond to discrimination but usually either do not respond, or respond in subtle, nonconfrontational ways. Women may choose not to respond to discrimination for several different reasons. For example, people generally dislike those who publicly confront discrimination (Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006) and mispredict how they feel after being discriminated against (Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001). Additionally, people are not consciously aware of all the ways they are influenced to behave they way they do (Nesbitt & Wilson, 1977). Goals are one such motivator of behavior that are not always consciously understood. It is likely that women do not anticipate what goal they will have when they are in a discriminatory situation. We predict that the goals a woman has in mind will influence whether or not she overtly responds to discrimination. In order to test this hypothesis, we may have had you read a scenario and then complete a task that required you to sort words or non-words. That task measured what type of goal you had after reading the scenario. We also may have had you perform a sentence unscrambling task that primed you with one of two goals (to belong or to be treated fairly), or no goal at all. We expect that women who are primed with the idea of belonging will be less likely to overtly confront than women who are primed with the idea of sticking to their principles.

If you would like to learn more about the research that inspired the present studies, please contact Dr. Robyn Mallett, rmallett@luc.edu or Kala Melchiori, kmelchiori@luc.edu.

You may also wish to read the following articles:

Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (1999). Excuse me – what did you just say ?!: Women's public and private responses to sexist remarks. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 35*, 68-88.

Swim, J. K., & Thomas, M. A. (2006). Responding to everyday discrimination: A synthesis of research on goal-directed, self-regulatory coping behaviors. In C. Levin & C. van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and group inequality: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 105-126). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Eribaum Accociates.

Woodzicka, J. A., & LaFrance, M. (2001). Real versus imagined gender harassment. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 15-30.

REFERENCES

Abelson, R. P., & Prentice, D. A. (1997). Contrast tests of interaction hypotheses. *Psychological Methods, 2*, 315-328.

Ayres, M. M., Friedman, C. K., & Leaper, C. (2009). Individual and situational factors related to women's likelihood of confronting sexism in their everyday lives. *Sex Roles, 61*, 449-460.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497-529.

Carvallo, M., & Pelham, B. W. (2006). When fiends become friends: The need to belong and perceptions of personal and group discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 94-108.

Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 532-544.

Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 784-803.

Devine, P. G., Monteith, M. J., Zuwerink, J. R., & Elliot, A. J. (1991). Prejudice with and without compunction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 817-830.

Dunn, E. W., Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2003). Location, location, location: The misprediction of satisfaction in housing lotteries. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 1421-1432.

EEOC. (2010). *Sexual harassment charges: EEOC & FEPAs combined: FY 1997 – FY 2009*. Retrieved from http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/sexual_harassment.cfm.

Elliott, E. S. & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 5-12.

Fishback, A., & Ferguson, M. J. (2007). The goal construct in social psychology. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles* (2nd ed., pp. 490-515). New York: The Guilford Press.

Fiske, S. T. (2004). *Social beings: A core motives approach to social psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Fitzgerald, L.F., Swan, S., & Fischer, K. (1995). Why didn't she just report him? The psychological and legal implications of women's responses to sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*, 117-138.

Gilbert, D. T., Pinel, E. C., Wilson, T. D., Blumbert, S. J., & Wheatley, T. P. (1998). Immune neglect: A source of durability bias in affective forecasting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 617-638.

Griffith, L. E., Cook, D. J., Guyatt, G. H., & Charles, C. A. (1999). Comparison of open and closed questionnaire formats in obtaining demographic information from Canadian general internists. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 52*, 997-1005.

Hiene, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1999). Culture, self-discrepancies, and self-satisfaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25,* 915-925.

Jones, E. E. (1979). The rocky road from acts to dispositions. *American Psychologist, 34*, 107-117.

Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop complaining! The social costs of making attributions to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 254-268.

Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2003). Derogating the victim: The interpersonal consequences of blaming events on discrimination. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 6,* 227-237.

Kawakami, K., Dunn, E., Karmali, F., & Dovido, J. F. (2009). Mispredicting affective and behavioral responses to racism. *Science, 323*, 276-278.

Leaper, C. & Brown, C. S. (2008). Perceived experiences with sexism among adolescent girls. *Child Development, 79*, 685-704.

Mackie, D.M., Devos, T., & Smith, E.R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 602-616.

Mallett, R. K., & Swim, J. K. (2005). Bring it on: Proactive coping with discrimination. *Motivation and Emotion, 29*, 411-441.

Mallett, R. K., & Swim, J. K. (2009). Making the best of a bad situation: Proactive coping with racial discrimination. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 31*, 304-316.

Mallett, R.K., Wagner, D., & Harrison, P. (in press). Understanding the Intergroup Forecasting Error. In L. R. Tropp & R. K. Mallett (Eds.). *Beyond Prejudice Reduction: Pathways to Positive Intergroup Relations.* APA Books: Washington, DC.

Mallett, R. K. & Wilson, T. D. (2010). Increasing positive intergroup contact. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*, 382-387.

Mallett, R. K., Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2008). Expect the unexpected: Failure to anticipate similarities leads to intergroup forecasting error. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*, 265-277.

McCoy, S. K., & Major, B. (2006). Priming meritocracy and the psychological justification of inequality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 43*, 341-351.

Migacheva, K. & Tropp, L. R. (in press). Focusing Beyond the Self: Goal Orientations in Intergroup Relations. In L. R. Tropp & R. K. Mallett (Eds.). *Beyond Prejudice Reduction: Pathways to Positive Intergroup Relations.* APA Books: Washington, DC.

Miller, C. T. & Major, B. (2000) Coping with Stigma and Prejudice. In T. F. Heatherton, R. E. Kleck, M. R. Hebl, & J. G. Hull (Eds.) *The Social Psychology of Stigma*. The Guilford Press: New York.

Pelham, B. W. & Swann, W. B. (1989). From self-conceptions to self-worth: On the sources and structure of global self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 672-680.

Pickett, C. L., Gardner, W. L., & Knowles, M. (2004). Getting a cue: The need to belong and enhanced sensitivity to social cues. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 1095-1107.

Plant, E. A. & Butz, D. A. (2006). The causes and consequences of an avoidance-focus for interracial interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 833-846.

Richeson, J. A. & Trawalter, S. (2005). Why do interracial interactions impair executive function? A resource depletion account. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 934-947.

Rokeach, M., & Cochrane, R. (1972). Self-confrontation and confrontation with another as determinants of long-term value change. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2*, 283-292.

Ruggiero, K. M., & Taylor, D. M. (1995). Coping with discrimination: How disadvantaged group members perceive the discrimination that confronts them. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 826-838.

Ruggiero, K. M., & Taylor, D. M. (1997). Why minority group members perceive or do not perceive the discrimination that confronts them: The role of self-esteem and perceived control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 373-389.

Shelon, J. N. & Stewart, R. E. (2004). Confronting perpetrators of prejudice: The inhibitory effects of social costs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*, 215-223.

Sisk, R. (2009, August 11). Who wears the pantsuit?. I am the secretary of state, exasperated Hil tells crowd. *Daily News*, p. 7.

Stangor, C., Swim, J. K., Van Allen, K. L., & Sechrist, G. B. (2002) Reporting discrimination in public and private contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 69-74.

Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (1999). Excuse me – what did you just say ?!: Women's public and private responses to sexist remarks. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 35*, 68-88.

Swim, J. K., & Thomas, M. A. (2006). Responding to everyday discrimination: A synthesis of research on goal-directed, self-regulatory coping behaviors. In S. Levin & C. van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and group inequality: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 105-126). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tyler, T.R. (1994). Psychological models of the justice motive: Antecedents of distributive and procedural justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 850-863.

van den Bos, K., Bruins, J., Wilke, H. A. M., & Dronkert, E. (1999). Sometimes unfair procedures have nice aspects: On the psychology of the fair process effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 324-336.

Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2003). Affective forecasting. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 35, pp. 345-411). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2005). Affective forecasting: Knowing what to want. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*, 131-134.

Woodzicka, J. A., & LaFrance, M. (2001). Real versus imagined gender harassment. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 15-30.

VITA

Kala J. Melchiori was raised in Moundsville, WV. She received her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology, Summa Cum Laude, from Marshall University in Huntington, WV, in 2008. Kala identifies as a social science activist; she hopes to bridge her interests in feminist activism with her scholarly research. Kala's research interests include gender, prejudice, and responses to discrimination. After receiving her Master of Arts degree, Kala will continue pursuing a doctorate in Applied Social Psychology from Loyola University Chicago.