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ABSTRACT

EXAMINING EFFECTS OF HEARING AIDS IN JOB INTERVIEWS
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This study attempted to examine the underlying processes of discrimination towards people with hearing disabilities in the hiring context. Previous research has used social identity theory, social categorization theory, social dominance theory, and social motives to explain discrimination toward others. Newer research has suggested that discrimination can be caused by distraction interfering with cognitive processes. There are instances in which both discrimination theories and distraction can be used to explain discrimination. This study tests a model that combines these two lines of research. The results of the study did not find support for this model. However, the results did find support for a conceptually related exploratory model. Future research should attempt to find support for this exploratory model.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It is the call you have been waiting for -- you are finally going to find out if you got the job. Anticipating good news, you answer it eagerly. But it is not the news you were expecting. They thank you for applying; however, they regret to inform you that they extended an offer to someone else. The initial shock fades away, and you are left confused. You displayed all the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities during the interview to do the job well. As you think about what could have gone wrong, you remember how the interviewer could not stop staring. You ask yourself, “Was it the hearing aids?”

This situation is one that people with hearing disabilities might find themselves in after applying for a job. If the hearing aids did impact the interviewer’s decision to hire them, an important question to answer is “Why?”

A lack of job opportunities is just one of the negative effects associated with being the member of a stigmatized group. A stigma is an “attribute or characteristic that conveys a social identity that is devalued in a particular social context” (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998, p. 505). Other negative effects include, but are not limited to, social rejection, a lack of educational opportunities, poverty, and poor mental and physical health (Clark, Anderson, Clark, & Williams, 1999; Crocker et al., 1998; Major & O’Brien, 2005). Major and O’Brien (2005) suggest that these adverse effects can result from one of the mechanisms of stigmatization -- discrimination. Broadly, there are three dominant perspectives in the literature that explain why
one person or a group of people would discriminate against another person or group of people: social identity theory, social dominance theory, and social categorization/group cognition (Richeson & Sommers, 2016). However, newer research suggests an alternative mechanism.

In 2012, Madera and Hebl found support for a model proposing that discrimination against facially stigmatized (e.g., scar or port wine stain) applicants can be attributed to visual attention, self-regulatory focus, and memory. They examined whether increased visual attention on a stigmatized area led to a decrease in memory that would then lower ratings of an applicant (Madera & Hebl, 2012). The researchers found that lower applicant ratings resulted from a lower memory of the applicant’s positive job qualifications, which itself stemmed from high visual attention on the stigmatized area. They also tested whether a depletion of self-regulatory resources caused by an interviewer’s attempt to shift their focus away from a stigmatized area would negatively impact memory, which would then adversely impact an applicant’s ratings (Madera & Hebl, 2012). The researchers found that participants’ self-regulatory resources were depleted when an applicant had a facial stigma. The presence of a stigma also adversely affected their memory of the applicant’s qualifications and resulted in lower applicant ratings. Both of the findings are critical, as they provide further evidence for a new explanation for the occurrence of discrimination against people with a visible stigma. This new perspective suggests that there is a second cognitive mechanism of discrimination -- a mechanism that is driven by distraction rather than activation of one’s group knowledge structure as the social categorization/group cognition perspective would suggest (Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2000).
Madera and Hebl’s (2012) research serves as a starting point for the current thesis as the mechanisms described in the study can be extended towards people with hearing disabilities. It also provides evidence towards the existence of a second cognitive mechanism of discrimination when the target (i.e., applicant) in question has a visible sign of a stigma, such as would be the case with a hearing aid. Yet the aforementioned article is not without limitations. The conclusions drawn from the article suggest that the cognitive mechanism of discrimination was triggered specifically by the distraction from the facial scar. However, the cause becomes less clear when one considers that there are factors such as previous experience and attitudes towards the stereotype associated with the visible stigma. Advancing the literature on discrimination and hearing impairments would require further investigation into the precise mechanisms at work in the Madera and Hebl study. More specifically, a pure (non-stigma) distraction condition would aid in differentiating factors associated with the stigma from the distraction mechanism. If the distraction mechanism were truly the reason behind the discrimination towards the stigmatized individual, then one would expect lower applicant ratings for the pure distraction condition compared to the control condition. Furthermore, having a condition in which the target has a hearing aid would allow one to examine the extent to which previous experience and attitudes towards a stigma affect ratings in addition to a distraction. Additionally, a hearing aid condition would inform whether or not a rater’s concern about being perceived as prejudiced towards a person with a disability would impact their level of distraction.

The current research is a methodological replication and a conceptual extension of Madera and Hebl (2012) as the group of interest shifts from facially stigmatized people to those with a hearing disability. Both groups are comparable as they both belong to a stigmatized group,
and they both have visible indicators that connect them to their groups (i.e., scar, hearing aids). However, there is a key difference between the two groups in that an interviewer would not think of a scar as being relevant to job performance while they might consider having a hearing impairment to be job relevant. This could impact the hiring decision of a person with a hearing impairment as interviewers might be skeptical of that person’s ability to perform a job despite an applicant’s use of corrective hearing device(s). The goal of the study is to determine whether the discrimination that people with hearing disabilities face during interviews can be attributed to the rater being distracted by their devices.

Additionally, a further goal is to examine how previously accepted discrimination factors can contribute to distraction of the rater. In meeting these goals, the study makes contributions to research on hearing disabilities, research on stigma, and organizational practice. First, the study provides further support that people with hearing disabilities are discriminated against in the hiring process. Second, the study provides support for a novel discrimination mechanism, which may expand researchers’ understanding of the discrimination mechanism of stigmatization. Finally, the study may change how recruiters are trained to conduct interviews. If discrimination results from distractions, recruiter focus should be highlighted both in interview training and practice. The following pages include a brief review of the prior literature on hearing disabilities in the workplace and theoretical perspectives. This review will provide a clearer background for testing the role of distraction in discrimination towards people with hearing impairments.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Workplace Discrimination Towards People with Disabilities

The Americans with Disability Act (ADA) of 1990 is a fairly recent piece of civil rights legislation that made it illegal for an organization to discriminate against an employee or potential employee because of their disability status. An amendment to the ADA was passed in 2008 that required organizations to provide reasonable accommodation to employees with disabilities. The 2008 amendment to the ADA also changed how disability is defined according to the law. An individual with a disability under the ADA is defined as a person who has a mental impairment or physical impairment that limits at least one major life function or is thought of as having such an impairment. Despite the laws in place protecting people with disabilities, there is evidence that organizations are discriminating against them.

According to the United States Department of Labor, there is a large employment disparity between individuals with disabilities and individuals without disabilities. For instance, in 2015 the unemployment rate for people with disabilities was more than double that of people without disabilities (10.7% compared to 5.1%). Furthermore, the gap was much larger for the employment-to-population ratio for people with disabilities (17.5%) compared to people without disabilities (65%). Additionally, in 2011 it was found that employees with disabilities get paid 37% less than employees without disabilities (Yin, Schaewitz, & Megra, 2014). Furthermore, these large pay disparities existed no matter the level of education. McCaughey and Strohmer
(2005) believe that the negative views toward people with disabilities can result in lowered role expectations, reluctance to form interpersonal relationships, and an opposition to hire well-qualified applicants with disabilities. These statistics and countless studies in the literature make it quite clear that individuals with disabilities are discriminated against in the workplace (Miceli, Harvey, & Buckley, 2001; Ravaud, Madiot, & Ville, 1992). Furthermore, Baldridge, Beatty, Bohm, Kulkarni, and Moore (2015) suggest several practical reasons for discrimination towards people with disabilities, including concerns about the cost of paying health insurance, coworker acceptance, safety, attendance, dependability, productivity, and performance.

Detecting Discrimination

Though discrimination is ever present in the workplace, Baldridge and colleagues (2015) speculated that discrimination against a person with any type of disability occurs more in the hiring stage. They believe this is because of the legal consequences (i.e., the protections that people with disabilities are afforded) associated with hiring an employee with a disability. Furthermore, a recent meta-analysis that consolidated research from several fields found that the presence of a disability negatively affected the expected performance of an applicant and the decision of hiring the applicant (Ren, Paetzold, & Colella, 2008).

The previous studies that have looked at discrimination in applicant selection mostly focused on two methods of detection: audit testing (also known as situation testing) and correspondence testing (Bursell, 2007). The main difference between the two methods is the use of confederates. Audit testing requires a pair of trained confederates (that differ only by the
demographic variable of interest) apply for the same position. To gauge discrimination, researchers examine the employer’s amount of encouragement to apply for the position. Additionally, researchers examine the number of callbacks, job offers, and salary offers the confederates receive (Bursell, 2007). Correspondence testing requires sending out a pair of similar job applications with the main difference between the applications being the demographic variable of interest. To gauge discrimination, researchers compare either the number of callbacks or job interview offers (Bursell, 2007).

People with Hearing Disabilities

Whereas people with disabilities are discriminated against as a whole, an argument can be made that people with some types of disabilities are impacted more than others. Specifically, people with hearing disabilities complain the most about harassment, training, assessment, and hiring than people with other types of disabilities (Baldridge & Swift, 2016). This finding is particularly important because 15% of the adult population in the world meets the required criteria of having a hearing disability (World Health Organization, 2013). According to past United States census information, hearing disabilities account for 1.5% of all the disabilities in the workplace (Braddock & Bachelder, 1994). Furthermore, people with hearing disabilities seem to be highly impacted both physically and psychologically; for example, one study found that people with hearing disabilities have to take sick leave due to stress five times more than employees without hearing disabilities (Kramer, Kapteyn, & Houtgast, 2006).
Hearing Disability Characteristics

One possible reason why people with hearing disabilities are highly impacted in the workplace could be because hearing impairments are rated among the top half of disabilities that make people uncomfortable (Jones & Stone, 1995). To understand why hearing disabilities could make a person uncomfortable in comparison to other disabilities, one has to understand how various disabilities differ. Jones et al. (1984) suggested that there are characteristics that vary across stigmatized groups that affect people’s reactions to them. These characteristics can be applied to disabilities and include danger, origin, course, aesthetic qualities, disruptiveness, and concealability.

Danger is described as the extent to which the disability is thought of as being contagious, dangerous, or threatening. Origin is described as the extent to which a person with a disability is thought of as having contributed to their disability. Course is described as the extent to which the disability is progressive versus temporary and irreversible versus reversible. Aesthetic qualities are described as the degree to which the disability affects the person’s attractiveness, repulsiveness, and ability to upset someone. Disruptiveness is described as the degree to which the disability affects certainty during interactions, strain, or the stream of communication. Concealability refers to the degree to which the disability is apparent to other people or the ability for the disability to be hidden.

One might consider a hearing disability to be dangerous, particularly in the workplace, as it could contribute to an accident or it might be limiting during one. People associate a hearing
impairment as either being hereditary or being caused by an injury (McCaughey & Strohmer, 2005). If it is the latter, it is possible for people to think that the person with the hearing disability caused it (e.g., listened to music loudly). People might believe that a hearing disability is progressive as people’s hearing tends to get worse as we age. Others might consider wearing assistive hearing devices as unattractive and thus view those with hearing disabilities as aesthetically displeasing. People believe that having a hearing disability is disruptive as people tend to associate hearing impairment with difficulty in communication (McCaughey & Strohmer, 2005). The degree to which a hearing disability is concealable depends on whether a person chooses to wear an assistive hearing device. If they do not, then certain cues such as leaning in everytime someone talks would make a hearing disability less concealable. Though there is a debate as to which characteristics are the most influential to the interaction between a stigmatized and a non-stigmatized individual, it is likely that all of them factor into making a nondisabled person uncomfortable and could explain why people with hearing disabilities face discrimination at work.

Understanding Discrimination

The most common theories that have been used to understand discrimination are social identity theory (SIT), social categorization theory (SCT), and social dominance theory (SDT). The following subsections will describe these theories in detail and discuss relevant research.
Social Identity Theory

According to SIT, people classify others and themselves into social categories (Allport, 1954). This creates an in-group and an out-group. An in-group is a group that one identifies with and an out-group is a group with which one does not. This social categorization process occurs as a means to enhance one’s self-esteem (Hogg & Turner, 1985). Ashforth and Mael (1989) suggest that categorizing people and comparing groups allows individuals to view the status and accomplishments of the in-group as their own. Furthermore, in-groups with more social advantages look to sustain or increase comparisons that make the group seem favorable.

Biased intergroup comparisons can have potentially negative effects. First, one could form unfavorable stereotypes of the out-group (Horwitz & Rabbie, 1982). Second, it can create a justification for subordinating the out-group (Sunar, 1978). Third, it can lead to unjustified group hostilities and competition (Horwitz & Rabbie, 1982). Worst of all, in-group favoritism and lack of favoritism toward the out-group can lead to discrimination (Brewer, 1999). Considering that classifications are often formed on the basis of demographics (Tajfel & Turner, 2004), it is likely that a fully abled person categorizes a person with a disability as an out-group member and discriminates against them as a means to enhance their own self-esteem.
Social Categorization Theory

SCT operates similarly to SIT. However, this theory emphasizes the cognitive processes behind discrimination. As a means to simplify a complex and cognitively demanding social world, humans rely on social categories (Macrae & Bodenhausen, 2000). This is especially the case when a person lacks time, motivation, or cognitive capacity (Allport, 1954; Bodenhausen, Macrae, & Sherman, 1999). One type of social category that people often rely on is stereotypes. People are more likely to rely on stereotypes when their cognitive resources are depleted or when they find the environment to be taxing on their cognitive resources (Macrae, Milne, & Bodenhausen, 1994). These stereotypes can then influence how later information is processed (Olson, Roese, & Zanna, 1996). For instance, people can look for stereotype-consistent information, as it is more easily and rapidly encoded into their existing knowledge structure (Neisser, 1976; Von Hippel, Sekaquaptewa, & Vargas, 1995). This could lead to people asking questions that are in line with their stereotypes in a situation in which a fully abled person interviews a person with a disability.

The implication of people seeking expectation-consistent information is that people have a preference for information that confirms similarity towards one’s in-group and dissimilarity towards one’s out-group (Wilder, 1986; Yzerbyt & Leyens, 1991). Furthermore, people will neglect information that is either ambiguous or neutral (Krueger & Clement, 1994; Macrae, Milne, & Bodenhausen, 1994). A fully abled interviewer would neglect information during the interview that is contrary to their stereotype of individuals with disabilities. A preference for
stereotype consistency is also present in memory, particularly under a high cognitive load (Macrae, Hewstone, & Griffiths, 1993). This suggests that an interviewer would remember details from the interview that is consistent with the stereotype of a person with a disability.

Social Dominance Theory

SDT suggests that humans organize themselves in terms of social hierarchies in which people at the top have the most resources and people at the bottom have the least (Sidanius, Pratto, Van Laar & Levin, 2004). Several social hierarchies exist at the same time. For instance, people can hierarchically organize themselves by demographic characteristics such as age, gender, or disability status. The crux of SDT is the desire to maintain social hierarchies. People in power use the resources available to them to ensure that they stay in power (Richeson & Sommers, 2016). The use of social hierarchies and the desire to maintain them can lead to discrimination towards people with hearing disabilities. Kiger (1997) would suggest that people see those with disabilities as low in the hierarchy. Specifically, the researcher believed that his participants used non-threatening words to describe deaf people because they do not pose a threat in the domain of politics, economics, or society. By extension, an interviewer could offer a fully abled candidate a position over a candidate with a disability to ensure that fully abled people stay on top of the social hierarchy.
Industrial-organizational (I/O) psychologists can refer to the social psychology literature for insight into more recently proposed causes of discrimination. According to Fiske (2000), there are several social motives that explain why people discriminate against others. Any one of the following social motives can lead to discrimination towards individuals with a hearing disability: controlling, belonging, self-enhancing, and understanding. The following subsections will describe the social motives in detail and discuss relevant research.

**Controlling**

People are motivated to take control of their social environment (Stevens & Fiske, 1995). This motive can have potentially harmful consequences, especially if one tries to satiate one’s control motive by asserting control over others. For instance, people with a high amount of control over others are not motivated to provide attention to information that individuates their dependents. Instead, they can rely on automatic categorization such as stereotypes (Fiske, 2000). Croizet and Fiske (2000) suggest that powerful people not only rely on stereotypes but seek out information that confirms them. A disparity in control also leads to the reinforcement of social hierarchies. A person with a high control motive would want to maintain the social hierarchy. Thus, a fully abled interviewer with a high control motive would not extend a job offer to a person with a disability for a job that could move someone up the social hierarchy.
Belonging

When people are motivated to belong, they try to form and maintain bonds with others. This can result in individuals following group norms, repeating group behaviors, and echoing the stereotypic beliefs of the group (Fiske, 2000). A person will suppress one’s personal stereotypes in instances when they contradict the group’s stereotypes (Blanchard, Lilly, & Vaughn, 1991; Mackie, Hamilton, Susskind, & Rosselli, 1996). An interviewer could discriminate against an applicant with a hearing aid for any of the reasons related to the interviewer’s social motive to belong. For instance, the interviewer could be mimicking the discriminatory behavior of their group. Belonging also results in interdependence between the members. Interdependence increases one’s motivation to be accurate, which allows a person to individuate members of the in-group (Fiske & Depret, 1996). This suggest that a fully abled interviewer would rely on stereotype-confirming information for an applicant with a hearing aid but would seek counter-stereotypic information for an applicant without a disability.

Self-Enhancing

People are motivated to either maintain their level of self-esteem or to improve it. One way in which people serve to maintain and even enhance their self-esteem is to identify with a group (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy & Flament, 1971). It is possible for people to have an overly high self-esteem. This is problematic as an inflated self-esteem is fragile (Fiske, 2000). When that
inflated self-esteem is threatened, a person will be motivated to protect it, which has harmful consequences for people outside of the group. Specifically, a threat to one’s self-esteem could lead to discrimination of the out-group (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990). An interviewer with an inflated self-esteem might discriminate against a candidate with a hearing aid to protect their fragile self-esteem.

**Understanding**

To maintain harmony with an in-group, its members must have a commonly shared understanding of the world (Stevens & Fiske, 1995). A necessary component of having a shared understanding is automatic categorization. Research by Zarate and Smith (1990) suggests that it takes people less than a second to detect a person’s demographic characteristics and identify whether that person is a member of one’s group. Once these characteristics are identified, people sort others using a categorization process (McCann, Ostrom, Tyner, & Mitchell, 1985). Macrae, Hewstone, and Griffiths (1993) suggest that automatic categorization is advantageous as it allows a person to save mental resources and work under a cognitive load. Many studies, such as Blair and Banaji (1996), have shown that people quickly match stereotypes to a person. An interviewer who automatically categorizes a person with a hearing aid as having a disability and assigns a negative stereotype to them could discriminate against a candidate with a hearing aid.

To recap, people with disabilities face high unemployment rates and unequal pay compared to fully abled people. In comparison to other groups of people with disabilities, there is evidence that people with hearing disabilities face greater difficulties in terms of employment
and their experiences once employed. The large amount of discrimination they face could be due
to discomfort that nondisabled people feel when interacting with individuals with disabilities.
Traditionally, discrimination is attributed to our social identities, social categories, and social
dominance. More contemporary research suggests that discrimination is caused by our social
motivations. While these explanations have contributed to the field’s understanding of
discrimination, another possibility remains to be explored.

Gaps in Previous Research

There are situations in which both distraction and motives may play a role in
discrimination. For example, the self-enhancing motive would suggest that people can be so
motivated to protect their self-esteem that they can hold prejudiced beliefs and discriminate
against others. However, there are times when appearing prejudiced could be harmful to one’s
self-esteem. In that event, people would want to not appear prejudiced towards others. Not
appearing prejudiced towards others could be seen as a positive outcome of this social motive
and thus could be considered a positive social motive. However, trying to not appear prejudiced
could be one of the factors that impact the interaction between a fully abled person and a person
with a hearing disability. Specifically, people could put so much effort and attention on not
appearing prejudiced that it becomes demanding and they become distracted in the process. The
findings of Madera and Hebl (2012) regarding distraction’s role in discrimination make it
imperative that prejudice concerns be examined. Thus, this thesis will examine the potential
impact prejudice concerns can have on discrimination towards individuals with a hearing disability.

As previously mentioned, discrimination theories have added a great deal to the field. As such, that line of research will not be discounted in this thesis. It is known from theory on social motives and SIT that an interviewer could perceive hiring someone with a hearing disability as threatening. These threats can be emotional, interpersonal, or professional. Livneh (1982) suggests that people feel anxiety from interacting with a person with a disability as it elicits a fear of obtaining a disability or even dying. According to Stone and Colella (1996), working with an individual with a disability might cause uncertainty of workplace norms. This uncertainty could lead to added stress as they have feelings of ambivalence, discomfort, or awkwardness in the workplace. Additionally, some feel like working with a person with a disability could negatively impact their work outcomes (Colella & Stone, 2005). This could be because people with disabilities are stereotyped as being helpless and dependent (Fichten & Amstel, 1986). Because of these threats, an interviewer may favor hiring a fully abled applicant (i.e., an in-group member) to protect themselves from the potential threat. These threats to the self could cause one to hold negative attitudes towards individuals with disabilities. Therefore, it is important that attitudes and their impact on people with hearing disabilities are examined in this study.
This study aims to examine discrimination against individuals with hearing disabilities by researching variables that have not previously been combined in the literature. The first set of variables examines a mediated relationship between applicant condition and applicant ratings. These variables are drawn from new research that attributes discrimination to interference with an interviewer’s cognitive processes. The second group of variables examines potential moderating relationships. This group of variables are pulled from classic and more contemporary discrimination literature. See Figure 1 for a depiction of the theoretical model that was proposed for testing in this study. This section will provide background research and theoretical justification for the model, starting with the relationship between applicant condition and applicant ratings.

Figure 1. The proposed model of discrimination towards people with a hearing disability.
Madera and Hebl (2012) found that interviewers gave lower hiring ratings to facially stigmatized applicants than non-facially stigmatized applicants. In the present study, a hearing aid condition replaced the facial scar condition used in the Madera and Hebl study. Additionally, a third condition was added: a pure distraction condition. The distractor was an irrelevant stimulus that aimed to take attention away from the relevant task of listening to the qualifications of the applicant. Furthermore, the visual distractor was placed by the ear so that it was similar to the hearing aid condition. Based on the results of Madera and Hebl (2012):

*Hypothesis 1A:* Participants will give higher applicant ratings to applicants without a hearing aid than an applicant with a hearing aid and an applicant with a distractor.

A limitation with the Madera and Hebl study was that they did not use a pure distraction condition. This means that other confounds associated with a facial stigma could have influenced the outcome of their studies in addition to the distraction that was caused by the scar. An applicant with a disability can impact an evaluator in a way in which an applicant with a distraction cannot. For example, an employer’s belief in the misconception that people with disabilities are helpless and incompetent would only apply to a hearing aid condition and not a condition with a distractor. Further evidence that there are other factors that would affect a disability condition can be found throughout the literature. According to Robert and Harlan (2006), applicants with disabilities are often steered towards lower level jobs that they are overqualified for but employers believe better match their abilities. Additionally, employees with disabilities are either discouraged from applying for promotions by employers or are passed over for a promotion in favor of an equally qualified fully abled employee (Robert & Harlan, 2006).
The distraction condition added to this study aimed to parse apart whether the lower ratings applicants with hearing aids received would be due to other factors associated with a disability or as a result of a distraction. However, this is assuming that Hypothesis 1A was supported and applicants without a hearing aid were given higher ratings than the other conditions. If distraction were not the only factor that led to poor applicant ratings then the following can be hypothesized:

*Hypothesis 1B:* Participants will give lower applicant ratings to applicants with a hearing aid than an applicant without a hearing aid and an applicant with a distractor.

**Cognitive Factors**

The mediating cognitive factors that lead to discrimination will be explained in greater detail in the following subsections. Specifically, the following paragraphs will cover research on self-regulated attention and memory.

**Self-Regulatory Attention**

As previously mentioned, a hearing aid can be distracting as people’s attention can be drawn towards them. There are several reasons why people would focus on a hearing aid. The first reason is that a hearing aid signals the possession of a physical disability, which is a negative social category to possess. Many researchers, such as Smith, Cacioppo, Larsen, and Chartrand (2003), have found that it is easy for people to detect negative stimuli.
Additionally, a person’s attention is biased towards negative stimuli over positive stimuli (Smith et al., 2003). Novel stimuli also draw people’s attention (Langer, Fiske, Taylor, & Chanowitz, 1976). Hearing aids might be novel to some because, as previously mentioned, 85% of the world’s population does not have a hearing disability. For those with a hearing disability, not all choose to wear a hearing aid or might choose to wear a more discrete hearing aid. Langer and colleagues (1976) found that people tended to stare at the picture of a person with a disability when they were by themselves. However, when someone else was present, participants tended to look away from the picture. This finding would suggest that in a social situation people divert their attention away from a disability; in other words, people self-regulate.

Self-regulation is an effort to change or overturn one’s behaviors, feelings, or thoughts (Barkley, 1997). Schmeichel (2007) likened executive control to self-regulation. Executive control is a set of related functions that allows people to change their behaviors and thoughts (Baddeley, 1986). According to Miyake et al. (2000), some of these functions include inhibiting one’s responses, shifting between tasks, and revising working memory. Schmeichel (2007) suggests that these three functions are required when persisting in a task. Furthermore, the researcher found that using one’s executive control on a task depreciates one’s ability to use executive control on a subsequent task. This means that inhibiting one’s tendency to stare at a person with a disability could impact their ability to shift to the task of paying attention to the interview. All this research leads to the following hypothesis:

_Hypothesis 2:_ Participants will have lower self-regulatory attention of an interview for an applicant with a hearing aid than an applicant without a hearing aid.
Madera and Hebl (2012) showed that attention mediates the relationship between applicant stigma (i.e., facial scar) and memory. Kane, Bleckley, Conway, and Engle (2001) lend more support for the mediation. They found that people who had shorter memory spans were slower at shifting their attention (and eye movement) away from attention-capturing stimuli. It is necessary to have a basic understanding of the memory system to understand the effect attention has on memory. Before incoming information can be stored in long-term memory, it is a part of working memory. Baddeley and Hitch (1974) define working memory as the ability to assert control over attention and direct it. Cowan (1993) adds that focus of attention is an active subcomponent of long-term memory.

As working memory is a part of long-term memory, its capacity is limited. Different sources of information could compete for attention and affect working memory. More specifically, load theory suggests that high-perceptual-load tasks will result in people perceiving only the information that has their attention (Lavie, 2010). Baddeley, Lewis, Eldridge, and Thomson (1984) would also suggest that dividing attention leads to poorer recall of information. A hearing aid capturing a person’s attention would mean that hearing aids should have an impact on memory similar to the scar condition in Madera and Hebl (2012). Specifically, more focus on the hearing aids would mean that people would have fewer cognitive resources available for remembering the interview and the reasons why the interviewee is a good applicant. Taken together the literature leads to the following hypotheses:
Hypothesis 3: Participants will have lower memory of the interview for an applicant with a hearing aid than an applicant without a hearing aid.

Hypothesis 4: Applicant condition will be indirectly related to memory through self-regulatory attention.

Hypothesis 5: Self-regulatory attention will be indirectly related to applicant ratings through memory.

Moderators

As previously mentioned, a hearing aid would signal that an applicant possesses a disability. A disability would introduce factors that could impact the model. Furthermore, these factors would not have been present in the Madera and Hebl study because a scar does not signal that a person has a disability. The following section will discuss potential moderators of the theoretical model. These moderators include concerns over appearing prejudiced, previous experiences interacting with individuals with disabilities, and attitudes towards people with disabilities. The subsections will cover past research on the specific moderator and people with disabilities.

Prejudice Concerns

There is a significant amount of research that suggests people are prejudiced towards individuals with disabilities. However, few people would outwardly express their prejudice as
our society looks negatively upon those who do (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004). Furthermore, the social pressure to not appear prejudiced can be self-threatening (Plant, 2004). By extension, the would-be target of prejudice might be considered threatening. Research suggests that when individuals engage with a threatening stimulus, their attention toward the stimulus will initially increase (Fox, Russo, & Dutton, 2002). Furthermore, using an eye tracker, Bean et al. (2012) found that people exhibited visual attention consistent with viewing a threatening stimulus when they were high in external motivation not to appear prejudiced. In both of the previous studies the initial increased attention was followed by avoidant behaviors. Inhibiting the initial response of staring at a threatening stimulus is an example of using executive control.

Shelton, West, and Trail (2010) found that people high on prejudice concerns were able to initially hide their anxiety during an intergroup interaction. However, as the intergroup interaction continued, their anxiety became increasingly apparent through their behaviors. Unfortunately, self-regulating behavior depletes executive attention, which leads to poorer performance on subsequent tasks that require self-regulating (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). This was supported by Richeson and colleagues (2003), as they found the parts of the brain associated with inhibiting dominant responses (or habitual responses) were activated when White participants looked at a picture of a Black male. Furthermore, this activation was predictive of poor performance on a Stroop task (an administrative attention task that assesses executive control) after that individual had an interracial interaction. Additionally, Trawalter and Richeson (2006) found that people who tried to avoid being perceived as prejudiced performed poorly on a Stroop task. All of this research seems to indicate that efforts to appear non-prejudiced leads to cognitive depletion of executive control.
Research focused on interracial interactions can be applied to disability research. Livneh (1982) suggests that people with disabilities are comparable to ethnic minorities as they are both marginalized groups. By extension, fully abled people should be concerned with not appearing prejudiced towards individuals with disabilities just as ethnic majority members are concerned with not appearing prejudiced towards ethnic minorities. The cognitive depletion from inhibiting one’s attention on the hearing aid, attempting to shift attention to the task of listening to the interview, coupled with the cognitive depletion from the efforts to appear non-prejudiced should altogether have a large impact on the attention towards the interview. However, this impact would only be the case if someone were high on prejudice concerns. Thus, this leads to the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 6*: Prejudice concerns will moderate the relationship between applicant condition and self-regulatory attention such that the difference between conditions on self-regulatory attention will be greater for those high on prejudice concerns than those low on prejudice concerns.

**Past Experiences with People with Disabilities**

The results of Kiger (1997) have an interesting implication for a potential mediated moderator. It was found that attitudes towards people who are deaf can be affected by past experience. Past experience referred to the degree that participants had interacted with people who were deaf and how negative or positive they would characterize those past interactions. The implication is that attitudes can be affected by whether or not someone has a high interaction
with a group and whether or not the interactions were positive. Phillips (1975) suggests that employers with previous experience working with employees who are deaf are more likely to have favorable attitudes toward hiring deaf employees. However, if employers had little to no experience working with a deaf employee, then they had less favorable attitudes toward hiring deaf employees. All of the literature on attitudes towards people with disabilities and more specifically people with hearing disabilities leads to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 7:** There will be a direct relationship between past experiences and attitudes towards people with a hearing disability such that frequent positive past experiences will lead to positive attitudes and frequent negative past experiences will lead to negative attitudes.

**Attitudes**

Attitudes can predispose people to have either unfavorable responses or favorable responses towards others (Ajzen, 1989). There is a large body of research that suggests that fully abled people hold negative attitudes towards individuals with disabilities. An example of a negative attitude held by fully abled people is that people with disabilities are emotionally unstable, isolated, and dependent (Goddard & Jordan, 1998). Wright (1988) believes that the fundamental negative bias, which states that a salient negative feature can guide a person’s feelings, perceptions, and thoughts toward another person while in a low-information context, can be used to explain these negative attitudes. Therefore, one can form a negative attitude towards a person with a disability because the disability label has a negative connotation.
Negative attitudes towards people with disabilities can also be explained by social motives and discrimination theories. SCT and SIT would suggest that people can hold negative attitudes towards people with disabilities by simple virtue of being a member of an out-group. Wilder (1986) suggests that in-group favoritism is likely to emerge for several reasons. First, favoring one’s in-group provides cognitive consistency (or in other words, it satisfies our understanding motive; Fiske, 2000). Second, one’s social identity is seen as more favorable when expressing in-group favoritism (or in other words, it satisfies our self-enhancing motive). Third, showing in-group favoritism is in line with our intergroup behavior social script (which also satisfies one’s understanding motive; Fiske, 2000). Furthermore, it is socially undesirable to have the features that are associated with a disability. McCaughey and Strohmer (2005) believe that people’s reliance on prototypes could lead to negative attitudes towards individuals with disabilities. Prototypes are one’s mental representation of others and are used to simplify a complex world. Fiske (2000) would suggest that prototypes help with our social understanding. Mental representations are composed of varying levels of characteristics that group together. Mental representations based on negative characteristics can be harmful as people make predictions about others and also behave based on their prototypes (Cantor & Mischel, 1979).

Livneh (1982) summarizes several other reasons why fully abled people have negative attitudes towards people with disabilities. The first is due to the standards that exist in our culture. This includes but is not limited to people with disabilities not meeting the ideal body standard and threatening the body images of nondisabled people, being seen as non-economically competitive or non-socially competitive, and the lower status associated with possessing a stigma (Gellman, 1959; Goffman, 1963; Safilios-Rothschild, 1970; Siller,
Chapman, Ferguson, & Vann, 1967). The second is due to the psychological processes of the fully abled. These processes include but are not limited to a belief that an individual with a disability is accountable for their condition, the fear that associating with someone with a disability will lead to social ostracism, and feelings of guilt for being able-bodied (Safilios-Rothschild, 1970; Siller et al., 1967). All of this research on attitudes leads to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 8:** Attitudes towards people with a hearing disability will moderate the relationship between applicant condition and applicant ratings such that those holding negative attitudes will highly differentiate between conditions based on ratings as compared to those who hold positive attitudes.
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METHOD

Participants

The aim was to collect data from 200 participants. Participants were recruited from Introduction to Psychology courses (see Appendix A for the recruitment script) and upper-level psychology courses at a large midwestern university. In exchange for their participation, all students received credit toward their respective classes. In total, data were collected from 381 participants across two semesters. A round of data cleaning was conducted after each semester. After the first round of data cleaning, it was observed that participants from the Distraction condition were failing the manipulation check at a high rate. Participants in the Hearing Aid condition and the Control condition were passing the manipulation check at a relatively high and comparable rate. This had three consequences. First, the distraction stimulus was altered.

Second, all of the data collected from participants during the first semester in the Distraction condition (N = 62) were dropped. All of the data collected from participants in the Hearing Aid condition and the Control condition remained to be analyzed as long as the participants passed their respective manipulation check. Third, the Distraction condition was oversampled during the second semester of data collection to compensate for the data that were lost from the first semester.

Another 100 participants were dropped for not passing the manipulation check. This left 219 participants: 73 in the Control condition, 73 in the Hearing Aid condition, and 73 in the
Distraction condition. There were an equal number of female and male participants (i.e., 107 each) and an equal number of trans male and trans female participants (i.e., 1 each). Ninety-seven participants were Caucasian, 53 Black, 47 Hispanic, 9 Asian, 1 Native American, and 8 reported “other.” The average age of participants was 19.26 years ($SD = 8.58$ years). Of the participants who reported their employment, 114 were employed, and 97 were unemployed. From the participants who were employed, 9 reported being full-time employees and 103 reported being part-time employees. Finally, 72 participants reported making hiring recommendations. These were relatively equal across conditions ($N_{\text{Control}} = 27$, $N_{\text{Hearing Aid}} = 23$, $N_{\text{Distraction}} = 22$).

Design and Procedure

The study was a three-condition (Hearing Aid, Control, or Distraction) between-subjects design. Participants were sat at individual computers and were given a consent form to read and sign (see Appendix B). They were informed that they would listen to the reading of an interview for the purpose of understanding the factors that influence hiring decisions. Please see Appendix C for the transcript of the interview. Participants were then told that after listening to the interview they would complete a questionnaire that contained memory questions, a vignette with accompanying questions, previous-experience questions, perception questions, evaluation questions about the applicant, and demographic questions.

After reading and signing the consent form, participants tested the headphones that they would use for the study. Participants were asked if the headphones were functioning properly or
not. They were provided with another pair of headphones if they had issues with the original pair. Participants were also asked if the volume was at an acceptable level. The volume was set to 45 unless participants indicated that the volume was too loud or not loud enough. In these instances, the volume was increased or decreased by increments of 5 (e.g., 45 or 50). The volume was adjusted outside of the increments of 5 if the participants made such a request. The participants could adjust the volume as they saw fit once they started listening to the audio of the interview.

The study began once participants ensured that the headphones were functioning adequately and that the volume was at an acceptable level. Using the computers, participants listened to the interview while looking at a static image of the “applicant.” Participants were randomly placed into one of three conditions (i.e., Control, Distractor, Hearing Aid). See Appendices D, E, and F for the applicant images.

After listening to the interview for 8 minutes, participants completed the questionnaire. Participants completed a self-regulatory attention measure, took a memory test, rated the applicant, completed a prejudice concerns measure, indicated their previous experience with people with disabilities, completed the attitudes towards people with disability measure, responded to the manipulation checks, completed a self-esteem measure, and provided their demographic information.
Manipulation

Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions such that participants would be equally distributed across conditions. Participants in the Hearing Aid condition were shown an image of the applicant with an in-the-ear hearing aid. Participants in the Control condition were shown an image of the same applicant without the hearing aid. Finally, participants in the Distraction condition saw the same applicant with a distractor. The distractor was a blue dot behind the ear of the applicant. It was selected based on a pretest of potential distractors. Data for the pretest was collected from a convenience sample. Specifically, a link to the pretest was posted on the social media networks of the author and the author’s advisor. Thirty-three participants agreed to complete the pretest for no compensation. There were 20 female respondents and 10 male respondents. Twenty participants were Caucasian, six Hispanic, two Asian, and two indicated “other.” Participants’ average age was 34.93 years ($SD = 10.66$ years). Of the participants who reported their employment, 21 were employed and 8 were unemployed. From the participants who were employed, 19 reported being full-time employees and 2 reported being part-time employees. Finally, 21 participants reported making hiring recommendations. The pretest included three potential distraction stimuli and the hearing aid stimuli. See Appendices G, H, I, and J for the other potential distraction stimuli. The intent of the Distraction condition was to have a distraction that was comparable to the hearing aid. Specifically, the location of the distraction would be located close to the right ear of the “applicant” and would be as similarly distracting as the hearing aid. During the pretest,
participants were told to write the first three features that they noticed. Then they were told to rate how distracting they found each feature. The stimulus was chosen because the blue dot was found to be comparably as noticeable and distracting as the photo of the applicant with the hearing aid. Unfortunately, the distraction stimulus needed to be changed due to the lower number of participants passing the manipulation check. The distractor was changed by increasing the size of the dot and changing the color to both black and yellow.

Measures

**Self-Regulatory Attention**

To assess self-regulatory attention, participants responded to three items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) that were used by Sitzmann and Ely (2010). The three items were: “During the interview, I found it hard to pay attention” (reverse scored), “During the interview, I had to work hard to keep my mind on the answers” (reverse scored), and “During the interview, I had good concentration.” The measure was scored by finding the average of the three items. This measure had acceptable internal consistency (α = .72) in this study.
**Memory**

Participants responded to a modified 20-item multiple-choice test originally used by Madera and Hebl (2012) to assess their memory of the interview. The test initially had one more question but it was dropped because it was deemed by Madera and Hebl to be too difficult for the participants to remember. Questions were based on the content of the interview. For instance, participants were asked, “What was the name of the applicant?” “What degree is the applicant seeking?” and “What is the applicant’s school?” Participants had seven answer choices to respond to the questions. Some of the options were changed to fit the content of the interview. For example, the interview was changed so that the university the applicant was attending was the one in which the study was taking place. By extension, some of the answer options changed from universities located in the South to universities located in the Midwest. However, the essence of the answers all remained the same. See Appendix K for the complete measure. The memory score was calculated by summing the number of correct items on the test. The measure had poor internal consistency (α = .54) in this study. However, it was found to have acceptable internal consistency (α = .72) in Madera and Hebl (2012).

**Applicant Rating**

Participants rated applicants on nine items originally created by Madera and Hebl (2012). Participants had the option to respond to items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5
= strongly agree). An example of an item that participants responded to is, “This applicant has strong qualifications.” See Appendix L for the complete list of items in the measure. The measure was scored by finding the average of the nine items. This measure had good internal consistency ($\alpha = .85$) in this study.

Prejudice Concerns

Participants responded to the concern about acting prejudiced subscale of Dunton and Fazio’s (1997) Motivation to Control Prejudice Scale. Participants responded to nine items on a 7-point bipolar scale (-3 = strongly disagree, +3 = strongly agree). An example of an item that participants responded to is, “In today’s society it is important that one not be perceived as prejudiced in any manner.” Please see Appendix M for the entire measure. The measure was scored by finding the average of the nine items. This measure had good internal consistency ($\alpha = .83$) in this study.

Previous Experience

To assess previous experience with people with hearing disabilities, participants responded to two items originally used by Kiger (1997). Participants responded to the first item on a 7-point frequency scale (1 = not at all, 7 = quite a lot). The first item was, “Please describe the degree of contact/ interactions you have had with persons who are deaf.” Participants responded to the second item on a 5-point bipolar response scale (-2 = very negative, +2 = very
positive). The second item was, “If you have had any contact with persons who are deaf, on the whole, how would you characterize these experiences?” The scores were multiplied, thus the total score represented both the extent and quality of one’s past experiences with people with hearing disabilities. A large positive product (e.g., 14) indicated that a participant had many interactions with people with hearing disabilities and those interactions were positive. A large negative product (e.g., -14) indicated that a participant had many interactions with people with hearing disabilities and those interactions were negative. A small positive product (e.g., 2) indicated that a participant had a small number of interactions with people with hearing disabilities and those interactions were positive. A small negative product (e.g., -2) indicated a participant had a small number of interactions with people with hearing disabilities and those interactions were negative.

**Attitudes Towards Persons with Disabilities**

Participants responded to the multidimensional Attitudes Toward People with Disabilities measure (MAS), which was originally developed by Findler, Vilchinsky, and Werner (2007). Participants first read a vignette describing a situation in which a person with a hearing disability met the participant at a coffee shop. Participants then responded to three subscales that were all on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = not at all, 5 = very much). The first subscale contains 16 items and asks participants to rate the likelihood that certain affects might arise. Examples of affect items include “pity” (reverse scored), “disgust” (reverse scored), and “nervousness” (reverse scored). The second subscale contains 10 items and asks participants to rate the likelihood that
certain cognitions might arise. Examples of cognition items include, “We may get along really well,” “He will enjoy getting to know me,” and “He seems to be an interesting guy.” The third subscale contains nine items and asks participants to rate the likelihood that certain behaviors might arise. Examples of behavior items include, “Find an excuse to leave” (reverse scored), “Move to another table” (reverse scored), and “Start a conversation.” Please see Appendix O for the entire measure. The subscales were calculated by finding the average of the items. The affect subscale was found to have good internal consistency (α = .85) in this study. The behavior subscale was found to have an acceptable internal consistency (α = .79). The cognitive subscale was found to have good internal consistency (α = .89). The overall attitude measure was calculated by finding the average of all the items. The overall attitude measure was found to have good internal consistency (α = .87) in this study.

**Manipulation Checks**

The manipulation checks consisted of two sets of items that were modified from manipulation checks used in Madera and Hebl (2012). The first set of items asked participants to respond to 11 yes or no questions. One of the questions asked the participants, “Did the applicant have hearing aids?” Participants in the Hearing Aid condition needed to answer “yes” to this question to pass the manipulation check. Another question asked the participants, “Did the applicant have a dot by their ear?” Participants in the Distraction condition needed to answer “yes” to this question to pass the manipulation check. Participants in the Control condition needed to answer “no” to both questions to pass the manipulation check. The rest of the
questions were filler questions and asked questions such as, “Did the applicant wear glasses?” See Appendix P for the complete first manipulation check measure.

The second set of items asked the participants to respond to three items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The three items were: “I tried controlling my gaze during the interview,” “I was distracted by features of the photo,” and “I attempted to not look at certain features of the photo.” The scale score of this measure was calculated by finding the average of all three items. This measure had questionable internal consistency (α = .61).

Analytic Strategy

Hypothesis 1A states that participants would give higher applicant ratings to applicants without a hearing aid than both an applicant with a hearing aid and an applicant with a distractor. Hypothesis 1B states that participants would give lower applicant ratings to applicants with a hearing aid than an applicant without a hearing aid and an applicant with a distractor. An ANOVA was used to test both of these hypotheses. For both hypotheses, applicant condition (Control, Distractor, Hearing Aid) was the independent variable and the participants’ rating of the applicant was the dependent variable. Specifically, the main effect of applicant condition was used to examine both hypotheses.

The second hypothesis states that participants would have lower self-regulatory attention of an interview for an applicant with a hearing aid than an applicant without a hearing aid. The third hypothesis states that participants would have lower memory of the interview for an
applicant with a hearing aid than an applicant without a hearing aid. An ANOVA was conducted to test both hypotheses. The independent variable for both hypotheses was the applicant condition (Control, Distractor, Hearing Aid). For the second hypothesis, the dependent variable was self-regulatory attention. Participants’ memory was the dependent variable for the third hypotheses. The main effect of applicant condition was used to examine both hypotheses.

The fourth hypothesis states that applicant condition would be indirectly related to memory through self-regulatory attention. The fifth hypothesis states that self-regulatory attention would be indirectly related to applicant ratings through memory. Two regressions were used to test the mediation model. Self-regulatory attention was regressed on applicant condition and memory rating was regressed on self-regulatory attention. To do this the test of indirect effects used in Preacher and Hayes (2008) was used. Specifically, the model was tested with bootstrapping. This allowed the fourth hypothesis to be tested and determine whether or not the relationship between applicant condition and memory would be partially mediated by self-regulatory attention. This would also allow the fifth hypothesis to be tested and determine if the relationship between self-regulatory attention and applicant rating would be partially mediated by memory.

The sixth hypothesis states that prejudice concerns would moderate the relationship between applicant condition and self-regulatory attention such that the difference between conditions on self-regulatory attention would be greater for those high on prejudice concerns than those low on prejudice concerns. A regression was conducted to determine if prejudice concerns would moderate the relationship between applicant condition and self-regulatory attention. Applicant condition was dummy coded. The independent variables for the regression
were the dummy-coded applicant condition, prejudice concerns, and the interaction between the dummy-coded applicant condition and prejudice concerns. The interaction was created by mean centering prejudice concerns and then by multiplying it by the dummy-coded applicant condition. The dependent variable was self-regulatory attention.

The seventh hypothesis states that there would be a direct relationship between past experiences and attitudes towards people with a hearing disability such that frequent positive past experiences would lead to positive attitudes and frequent negative past experiences would lead to negative attitudes. This was tested using a regression. Specifically, attitudes was regressed onto previous experience.

The eighth hypothesis states that attitudes towards people with hearing disabilities would moderate the relationship between applicant condition and applicant ratings such that those holding negative attitudes would highly differentiate between conditions based on ratings as compared to those who hold positive attitudes. A regression was conducted to determine if attitudes would moderate the relationship between applicant condition and applicant rating. Applicant condition was dummy coded. The independent variables for the regression were the dummy-coded applicant condition, attitudes, and the interaction between applicant condition and attitudes. The interaction was created by mean centering attitudes and then by multiplying the dummy-coded applicant condition. The dependent variable for the regression was applicant ratings.
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RESULTS

The means, standard deviations, and correlations among the scales used in this study can be seen below in Table 1. The mean of the previous experience measure suggests that participants tended to have some positive interactions with people with hearing disabilities. There were some correlations between variables that were unexpected. For instance, one would expect the correlation between the affective component of attitudes towards people with hearing disabilities and applicant ratings to be positive. However, in this case, and many of the cases, the relationship was not significantly correlated. One surprising non-significant relationship was between the affective and the cognitive component of attitudes towards people with disabilities. This lack of relationship is surprising considering that all the other subcomponents and the overall attitudes towards people with disabilities were significantly correlated with each other. The significant negative correlation between the affective component of attitudes towards people with disabilities and prejudice concerns seems counterintuitive. One would not expect a person with a low positive affect towards people with disabilities to be high in prejudice concerns. This finding becomes more peculiar when one considers that the opposite was found for a person high on positive cognitions towards people with disabilities. However, one only needs to remember the lack of relationship between both attitudinal components to understand how both findings can be possible.
Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of the Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-regulatory Attention</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Memory</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Applicant Ratings</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prejudice Concern</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Previous Experience</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Affective</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Behavioral</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cognitive</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Attitudes Toward Disabilities</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Self-regulatory Demand</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Employment Status</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Hiring Experience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ethnicity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Age</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All of the demographics except for age were dummy coded; affect, behavioral, and cognitive are subscales of attitudes toward disabilities; the memory scale ranges from 0 to 20; the prejudice concern scale ranges from -3 to 3; the previous experiences with disabilities scale ranges from -14 to 14; all other scales range from 0 to 5. * indicates $p < .05$; ** indicates $p < .01$; $M$ and $SD$ represent mean and standard deviation, respectively.
Manipulation Check

There were 381 participants in this study. There was a high rate of participants not passing the initial Distraction condition manipulation check (88.71%). After the stimuli for the Distraction condition was changed, all participants that saw the original Distraction stimulus ($N = 62$) were dropped. This decreased the amount of useable participant data to 319. Participants in the Hearing Aid condition needed to answer “yes” to the manipulation check question, “Did the applicant have hearing aids?,” which decreased the number of participants from 91 to 73 (passed the manipulation check at a rate of 80.22%). Participants in the Distraction condition needed to answer “yes” to the manipulation check question, “Did the applicant have a dot behind their ear?,” which decreased the number of participants from 92 to 73 (rate of 79.35%). Participants in the Control condition needed to answer “no” to the previous two questions to pass the manipulation check. This decreased the number of participants in the Control condition from 136 down to 73 (rate of 53.68%). The final amount of useable participant data was 219.

Missing data was only possible for the demographic items. Participants were prohibited from proceeding in the study if they failed to respond to any other items. Further review of the computer-administered questionnaire revealed the “not applicable” option could have appeared to be missing data because it was not assigned a numeric value. To differentiate between missing data and participants indicating the “not applicable” option, their response to the previous question was observed. Participants who responded that they were not employed would respond that their employment status (e.g., full time) was not applicable. Therefore, the numeric value for
not applicable was entered for blank responses when participants responded they were not employed. All other blank responses were replaced with a value of -99.

Tests of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1A is that participants will give higher applicant ratings to applicants without a hearing aid than an applicant with a hearing aid and an applicant with a distractor. There was a follow-up hypothesis if Hypothesis 1A was found to be supported. Hypothesis 1B is that participants will give lower applicant ratings to applicants with a hearing aid than an applicant without a hearing aid and an applicant with a distractor. Both parts of Hypotheses 1 were tested using an ANOVA with applicant condition (Control, Distractor, Hearing Aid) as the independent variable and the participants’ rating of the applicant as the dependent variable. This analysis revealed a non-significant effect of condition, $F(2, 216) = 0.22, p = .81$. There was no difference between the Control group ($M = 3.81, SD = 0.73$), the Distraction group ($M = 3.88, SD = 0.65$), and the Hearing Aid group ($M = 3.88, SD = 0.68$) on applicant ratings. The means and standard deviations of the conditions by the dependent variables can be seen in Table 2. Hypothesis 1A was not supported. Hypothesis 1B was not examined, as Hypothesis 1A was not supported.

---

1 This hypothesis was not supported when controlling for ethnicity.
2 This hypothesis was also not supported when comparing only the Distraction group to the Control group and only the Hearing Aid group to the Control group.
Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of the Dependent Variables by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Applicant Rating</th>
<th>Self-regulatory Attention</th>
<th>Memory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing aid</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  $N = 73$ for the Control condition; $N = 73$ for the Hearing Aid condition; $N = 73$ for the Distraction condition.

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis is that participants will have lower self-regulatory attention during an interview for an applicant with a hearing aid than an applicant without a hearing aid. This hypothesis was tested with an ANOVA with applicant condition (Control, Distractor, Hearing Aid) as the independent variable and the participants’ self-regulatory attention as the dependent variable. This analysis revealed a non-significant effect of condition, $F(2, 216) = 0.40, p = .67$. There was no difference between the Control group ($M = 3.08, SD = 0.84$), the Distraction group ($M = 2.99, SD = 0.77$), and the Hearing Aid group ($M = 3.10, SD = 0.86$) on self-regulatory attention. Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis is that participants will have lower memory of the interview for an applicant with a hearing aid than an applicant without a hearing aid. This hypothesis was tested
with an ANOVA with applicant condition (Control, Distractor, Hearing Aid) as the independent variable and the participants’ memory as the dependent variable. This analysis revealed a non-significant effect of condition, $F(2, 216) = 0.26, p = .77$. There was no difference between the Control group ($M = 9.63, SD = 3.03$), the Distraction group ($M = 9.97, SD = 2.82$), and the Hearing Aid group ($M = 9.72, SD = 2.98$) on memory. Hypothesis 3 was not supported.³

**Hypothesis 4**

The fourth hypothesis is that applicant condition will be indirectly related to memory through self-regulatory attention. A regression was conducted to predict self-regulatory attention based on applicant condition. A non-significant regression equation was found, $F(2, 216) = 0.40, p = .67$, with an $R^2$ of .00. The results of the regression indicated that compared to the Hearing Aid condition, the Control condition ($b = -.02, p = .89$) and the Distraction condition ($b = -.11, p = .41$) were not significantly different in predicting self-regulatory attention. The indirect effects were tested using the Preacher and Hayes (2008) method. Applicant condition did not predict self-regulatory attention, $F(2, 216) = 0.40, p = .67$, $R^2 = .004$. It was revealed that compared to the Hearing Aid condition, there was no difference between the Control condition ($b = -.02, p = .89$) or the Distraction condition ($b = -.11, p = .41$) in predicting self-regulatory attention. Furthermore, self-regulatory attention was not related to memory when condition was in the model ($b = .41, p = .09$). The indirect effect of condition on memory through self-regulatory attention was not significant when comparing the Hearing Aid condition to the Control condition

³ This hypothesis was not supported when controlling for ethnicity nor when controlling for age.
(ab = -.01, 95% CI = [-0.14, 0.14]) or the Distraction condition (ab = -.05, 95% CI = [-0.21, 0.07]). Finally, the direct effect of condition on memory was not significant when comparing the Hearing Aid condition to the Control condition (b = -.09, 95% CI = [-1.05, 0.87]) or the Distraction condition (b = .29, 95% CI = [-0.67, 1.25]). The fourth hypothesis was not supported.

**Hypothesis 5**

The fifth hypothesis is that self-regulatory attention will be indirectly related to applicant ratings through memory. A regression was conducted to predict memory ratings based on self-regulatory attention. A non-significant regression equation was found, $F(1, 217) = 2.72, p = .10$, with an $R^2$ of .01. The indirect effects were tested using the Preacher and Hayes (2008) method. It was revealed that self-regulatory attention did not have a significant relationship with memory ($b = .40, p = .10$). Memory was related to applicant ratings when self-regulatory attention was in the model ($b = -.03, p < .05$). The indirect effect of self-regulatory attention focus on applicant rating through memory was not significant ($ab = -.01, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.04, 0.00]$). However, the direct effect of self-regulatory attention on applicant rating was significant ($b = .18, 95\% \text{ CI} = [0.08, 0.29]$). Hypothesis 5 was not supported.

**Hypothesis 6**

The sixth hypothesis is that prejudice concerns will moderate the relationship between applicant condition and self-regulatory attention, such that the difference between conditions on
self-regulatory attention will be greater for those high on prejudice concerns than those low on prejudice concerns. A regression analysis was used to test if prejudice concerns moderated the relationship between applicant condition and self-regulatory attention. Using the Hearing Aid condition as the reference group, neither the interaction between the Control condition and prejudice concerns ($b = -.12, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.38, 0.14], t = -0.90, \ p = .37$) nor the interaction between the Distraction condition and prejudice concerns was statistically significant ($b = .07, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.17, 0.31], t = 0.57, \ p = .57$). Prejudice concerns did not moderate the relationship between applicant condition and self-regulatory attention (see Table 3). Hypothesis 6 was not supported.$^4$

Table 3

Regression of Applicant Condition and Prejudice Concerns Predicting Self-Regulatory Attention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$SE (b)$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Condition</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction Condition</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice Concerns</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Condition</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction Condition</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice Concerns</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Condition x Prejudice Concerns</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction Condition x Prejudice Concerns</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^4$This hypothesis was also not supported when controlling for age.
**Hypothesis 7**

The seventh hypothesis is that there will be a direct relationship between past experiences and attitudes towards people with a hearing disability such that frequent positive past experiences will lead to positive attitudes and frequent negative past experiences will lead to negative attitudes. A regression was conducted to predict attitudes toward people with disabilities based on past experiences. A non-significant regression equation was found, $F(1, 217) = 0.99, p = .32$, with an $R^2$ of .01. The results of the regression indicated that previous experience was not significant ($b = .01$). The Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities measure has three subfactors which assessed the three components of an attitude. An exploratory analysis was conducted to determine if one of the components of an attitude could be influenced by one’s past experience. The affective component of attitudes toward disabilities based on past experience was the first component to be examined. The results of the regression indicated that previous experience was not significant ($\beta = .00$). A non-significant regression equation was found, $F(1, 217) = 0.17, p = .678$, with an $R^2$ of .001. The behavioral component of attitudes towards disabilities based on past experience was also examined. The results of the regression indicated that previous experience was not significant ($\beta = .00$). A non-significant regression equation was found, $F(1, 217) = 0.05, p = .83$, with an $R^2$ of .00. Finally, the cognitive component of attitudes toward disabilities based on past experience was examined. The results of the regression indicated that previous experience was not significant ($\beta = .00$). A non-significant regression equation was found, $F(1, 217) = 0.001$.

---

5 No support was found when controlling for either age or ethnicity.
6 No support was found when controlling for either age or ethnicity.
7 No support was found when controlling for age.
indicated that previous experience was significant \( (\beta = .02) \). A significant regression equation was found, \( F(1, 217) = 7.26, p < .01 \), with an \( R^2 \) of .03. These findings suggest that previous experience does not predict one’s overall attitudes towards people with hearing disabilities, but it can predict the cognitive component of their attitude toward people with hearing disabilities. Hypothesis 7 was partially supported.

**Hypothesis 8**

The eighth hypothesis is that attitudes towards people with a hearing disability will moderate the relationship between applicant condition and applicant ratings such that those holding negative attitudes will highly differentiate between conditions based on ratings as compared to those who hold positive attitudes. A regression analysis was used to test if attitudes moderated the relationship between applicant condition and applicant rating. Using the Hearing Aid condition as the reference group, neither the interaction between the Control condition and attitudes towards people with disabilities \( (b = -.05, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-.41, .51], t = 0.22, p = .83) \) nor the interaction between the Distraction condition and attitudes towards people with disabilities \( (b = -.15, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-.63, .33], t = -0.62, p = .54) \) was significant. Attitudes towards people with disabilities did not moderate the relationship between applicant condition and overall applicant rating (see Table 4). Hypothesis 8 was not supported.\(^8\)

\(^8\) No support was found when controlling for either age or ethnicity.
Table 4

Regressions of Applicant Condition and Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities Predicting Applicant Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE (b)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Δ$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Condition</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction Condition</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Condition</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction Condition</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Condition x Attitudes</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction Condition x Attitudes</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on following page)
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Control Condition</th>
<th>Distraction Condition</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Control Condition</th>
<th>Distraction Condition</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table includes the full Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities measure and the affective subscale, the behavioral subscale, and the cognitive subscale. Neither controlling for age nor ethnicity lent support for affect as a moderator. Controlling for age did not lend support for behavior as a moderator.

Exploratory Analysis

Madera and Hebl (2012) conducted additional tests using the manipulation check measure. Considering the manipulation check items also tapped into self-regulation, an exploratory analysis was conducted using this measure. The alternative focus measure will be referred to as self-regulatory demand, as this term is more reflective of the items (e.g., “I attempted to not look at certain features of the photo”). All the hypotheses that involved the self-regulatory attention measure were analyzed using the self-regulatory demand measure.

Hypothesis 2

An exploratory analysis was conducted to determine whether participants had a lower self-regulatory demand for an applicant with a hearing aid than an applicant without a hearing aid.
aid. Specifically, an ANOVA was conducted with applicant condition (Control, Distractor, Hearing Aid) as the independent variable and self-regulatory demand as the dependent variable. The analysis revealed a non-significant effect of condition, $F(2, 216) = 0.92, p = .40$. There was no difference between the Control group ($M = 2.25, SD = 0.96$), the Distraction group ($M = 2.37, SD = 0.91$), and the Hearing Aid group ($M = 2.16, SD = 0.88$) on self-regulatory demand. Hypothesis 2 was not supported using the self-regulatory demand measure.\(^9\)

\[\text{Hypothesis 4}\]

An exploratory analysis was conducted to determine whether applicant condition would be indirectly related to memory through self-regulatory demand. A regression was conducted to predict self-regulatory demand based on applicant condition. A non-significant regression equation was found, $F(2, 216) = 0.92, p = .40$, with an $R^2$ of .01. The results of the regression indicated, when compared to the Hearing Aid condition, neither the Control condition ($b = .09, p = .57$) nor the Distraction condition ($b = .21, p = .18$) was significant in predicting self-regulatory demand. The indirect effects were tested using the Preacher and Hayes (2008) method. Applicant condition did not predict self-regulatory demand, $F(2, 216) = 0.92, p = .40, R^2 = .00$. It was revealed that compared to the Hearing Aid condition, there was no difference between the Control condition ($b = .09, p = .57$) or the Distraction condition ($b = .21, p = .18$) in predicting self-regulatory demand. Furthermore, self-regulatory demand was related to memory when condition was in the model ($b = -.49, p < .05$). The indirect effect of condition on memory

\(^9\) Hypothesis 2 tested with self-regulatory demand was not supported when controlling for age.
through self-regulatory demand was not significant when comparing the Hearing Aid condition to the Control condition ($ab = -.04, 95\% CI = [-0.24, 0.12]$) or the Distraction condition ($ab = -.10, 95\% CI = [-0.30, 0.04]$). Finally, the direct effect of condition on memory was not significant when comparing the Hearing Aid condition to the Control condition ($b = -.05, 95\% CI = [-1.01, 0.90]$) or the Distraction condition ($b = .35, 95\% CI = [-0.61, 1.30]$). The fourth hypothesis was not supported using the self-regulatory demand measure.

**Hypothesis 5**

An exploratory analysis was conducted to determine whether self-regulatory demand would be indirectly related to applicant ratings through memory. A regression was conducted to predict memory based on self-regulatory demand. A significant regression equation was found, $F(1, 217) = 4.92, p < .05$, with an $R^2$ of .02. The indirect effects were tested using the Preacher and Hayes (2008) method. It was revealed that self-regulatory demand did have a significant relationship with memory ($b = -.48, p < .05$). Memory was related to applicant ratings when self-regulatory demand was in the model ($b = -.03, p < .05$). The indirect effect of self-regulatory demand on applicant rating through memory approached significance but was not significant ($ab = .02, 95\% CI = [0.00, 0.04]$). The direct effect of self-regulatory demand on applicant rating also approached significance but was not significant ($b = -.10, 95\% CI = [-0.20, 0.00]$). Hypothesis 5 was partially supported\(^\text{10}\) using the self-regulatory demand measure.\(^\text{11}\)

---

\(^\text{10}\) This result seems to be driven by the first item, which is reflective of effortful behavior.

\(^\text{11}\) No support was found when controlling for age.
Hypothesis 6

An exploratory analysis was conducted to determine whether prejudice concerns would moderate the relationship between applicant condition and self-regulatory demand such that the difference between conditions on self-regulatory demand would be greater for those high on prejudice concerns than those low on prejudice concerns. A regression analysis was used to test if prejudice concerns moderated the relationship between applicant condition and self-regulatory demand. Using the Hearing Aid condition as the reference group, neither the interaction between the Control condition and prejudice concerns \((b = .17, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.10, 0.45], t = 1.24, \ p = .22)\) nor the interaction between the Distraction condition and prejudice concerns was statistically significant \((b = .08, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-0.18, 0.33], t = 0.59, \ p = .56)\). Prejudice concerns did not moderate the relationship between applicant condition and self-regulatory demand. Hypothesis 6 was not supported using the self-regulatory demand measure.

Structural Model

The regression used to re-examine Hypothesis 6 suggested that prejudice concerns predicted self-regulatory demand. Examining this specific relationship in a regression revealed that prejudice concerns predicted self-regulatory demand, \(F(1, 217) = 24.36, \ p < .001\), with an \(R^2\) of .10. An exploratory analysis was conducted to test if prejudice concerns would be indirectly related to memory through self-regulatory demand. The indirect effects were tested using the
Preacher and Hayes (2008) method. It was revealed that prejudice concern had a significant relationship with self-regulatory demand \( (b = .27, p < .001) \). Self-regulatory demand was related to memory when prejudice concern was in the model \( (b = -.50, p < .05) \). The indirect effect of prejudice concerns on memory through self-regulatory demand was significant \( (ab = -.14, 95\% CI = [-0.31, -0.01]) \). These findings, combined with the findings from the exploratory analysis of Hypothesis 5, suggests that a double-mediated model (prejudice concerns \( \rightarrow \) self-regulatory demand \( \rightarrow \) memory \( \rightarrow \) applicant rating) could be possible.

AMOS was used to test this possible model. The adequacy of fit for this model was determined using five indices. The first index was the chi-square \( (\chi^2) \). A non-significant chi-square would suggest that a model was a “good” fit. The second and third indices were the comparative fit index (CFI) and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI). A value of .95 or above would signal a “good” fit for both the CFI and the TLI. Furthermore, values between .90 and .95 would suggest “adequate” fit and any value below .90 would suggest a “poor” fit. The fourth index was the standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR). A SRMR value of less than .08 would signal that the model is a “good” fit. The final index was the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA). A RMSEA value of less than .05 would signal that the model is a “good” fit. The model fit was a good fit according to three out of five indices, \( \chi^2(3, N = 219) = 6.2, p = .10; CFI = .90; TLI = .80; SRMR = .04; RMSEA = .07 \) (see Table 5).
Table 5
Structural Equation Models’ Path Coefficients and Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice concern → Self-regulatory demand</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulatory demand → Memory</td>
<td>-.48*</td>
<td>-.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory → Applicant rating</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulatory demand → Applicant rating</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Df$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 219$; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR = standardized root-mean-square residual; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; * Indicates $p = .05$; * Indicates $p < .05$; ** Indicates $p < .001$.

A second model was tested given the mixed results of the first model. The exploratory analysis of Hypothesis 5 also suggested that a direct relationship between self-regulatory demand and applicant ratings was possible. The second model tested the double mediation with the direct effect of self-regulatory demand on applicant ratings. The model fit was a good fit according to all of the indices, $\chi^2(2, N = 219) = 2.4, p = .30$; CFI = .99; TLI = .96; SRMR = .03; RMSEA = .03. Taken together the results suggest that Model 2 (see Figure 2) is superior to Model 1.

Figure 2. The best fitting model that predicts applicant ratings. Note. * indicates $p = .05$; * indicates $p < .05$; ** indicates $p < .001$; path coefficients are unstandardized.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to expand the field’s understanding of workplace discrimination towards people with hearing disabilities by investigating factors that have not previously been applied to researching this phenomenon. To fulfill this purpose, a model developed in Madera and Hebl (2012) was replicated and extended to people with hearing disabilities. The replication part of this study investigated whether self-regulatory attention and memory played a role in stigmatized applicants receiving lower ratings than non-stigmatized applicants. The extension part of this study added other variables (i.e., previous experience, attitudes, prejudice concerns) that could fit in the model given the stigmatized group of interest. The results revealed that there was no difference between the ratings of applicants with a hearing aid and other applicants. This study was not able to replicate the discriminatory effects that people with hearing disabilities often face in the real world and that have been found in previous research (Bendick, 2018).

There is a methodological reason that could explain the lack of discriminatory effects. The increased popularity of wireless headphones could have normalized objects in and around people’s ears. By extension, this could have rendered any stimuli centered on the ear non-distracting. This possibility is likely given that the results revealed no difference in terms of self-regulatory attention between the Hearing Aid condition, the Control condition, and the Distraction condition. An exploratory analysis also revealed no difference in self-regulatory demand between the three conditions.
None of the hypotheses that tested the model were fully supported. However, collapsed across all experimental conditions, the direct effect of previous experience on attitudes towards people with disabilities was partially supported. This is aligned with previous research from Tajfel (1982) that suggest that attitudes towards out-group members can be influenced by positive contact. Unlike previous research, only the cognitive component of attitudes towards people with disabilities was shown to be predicted by previous experience in this thesis. However, this difference can be due to the attitudes measure that was used. Kiger (1997) used a feelings thermometer to measure attitudes, which captures one’s overall evaluation of a person with a hearing disability, unlike the MAS which measures the three components of an attitude as well.

An exploratory analysis also showed support for a direct relationship between memory and applicant ratings. This finding provides further evidence for the results from Madera and Hebl (2012), who also found that memory predicted applicant ratings. Both findings are rooted in cognitive psychological research on memory. Working memory allows one to sustain behavioral goals and current priorities (Lavie, 2010). However, working memory has a limited capacity, and it can be quickly occupied by simultaneous incoming information (Cowan, 1993). Therefore, working memory was deterred from the priority of evaluating the applicant.

An exploratory analysis which replaced the self-regulatory attention measure with self-regulatory demand provided support for a conceptually related model. Specifically, there is evidence that the relationship between prejudice concerns and applicant ratings is mediated by self-regulatory demand and memory, with self-regulatory demand also having a direct relationship with applicant ratings. As alluded to in the previous paragraph, participants’ working
memory was occupied by not only the priority of collecting information to evaluate the applicant, but also by behavioral goals such as controlling one’s gaze. Controlling one’s gaze (i.e., inhibiting one’s response) is one of the functions of executive control (Miyake et al., 2000). Executive control, according to Schmeichel (2007), is similar to self-regulation. The study required participants to use other executive functions such as shifting between tasks and revising working memory as well. This placed a high self-regulatory demand on participants that predicted their evaluation of applicants.

The model makes conceptual sense when one considers the role of prejudice concerns. In Madera and Hebl (2012), the applicant’s facial stigma acted as a distraction during the interview. Prejudice concerns operated in the same way. Research has shown that people perform worse in administrative attention tasks that assess executive control (i.e., a Stroop task) when they attempt to avoid being perceived as prejudiced (Trawalter & Richeson, 2006). An interview with someone whom they fear could perceive them as prejudiced would require three functions of executive control (Schmeichel, 2007). First, they would have to inhibit their initial prejudiced response. Second, the person would have to shift their focus to paying attention to the contents of the interview. Third, they would have to update their working memory of the interview. These three functions would all be in competition and would deplete executive control.

The difficulty of handling these competing functions during the interview was then captured by self-regulatory demand. The measure of self-regulatory demand replaced the measure of self-regulatory attention in this model. There was basis for using the demand measure in place of the attention measure. Madera and Hebl (2012) conducted an exploratory analysis with the demand measure in place of the attention measure. Additionally, in this study there is a
relationship between self-regulatory demand and self-regulatory attention as indicated by the significant negative correlations between the measures. However, the small correlation would suggest that the measures captured related yet distinct constructs. Caution should be exercised with this measure as the internal consistency would be considered unsatisfactory by most researchers.

Taken together, these results suggest that the original cognitive model of discrimination might not be well suited to examining the underlying mechanism of discrimination towards people with hearing disabilities. However, a model that includes prejudice concerns predicting self-regulatory demand and a direct relationship between the self-regulatory demand and applicant ratings could be useful. However, it cannot be stated with confidence that the original cognitive model is not well suited to examining the underlying mechanism of discrimination, as discriminatory effects were not found. It may be that this should first be re-examined with stronger and clearer manipulations.

Limitations

There were several potential limitations in this study. The original distraction stimulus was selected because it was pretested to be as distracting as the Hearing Aid condition stimulus. However, a high percentage of participants failed the manipulation check by failing to identify the presence of the distractor. This forced a switch to a more noticeable distraction stimulus. The rate at which participants passed the manipulation check improved, but participants were still not passing the manipulation check at a rate comparable to the other conditions. The low rate of
participants passing the manipulation check led to another change. Specifically, the rate at which participants were assigned to conditions was skewed so that participants were randomly assigned to the Distraction condition more often than the other conditions. Comparability between sample sizes was only achieved after all the changes were made.

A second related possibility is the naturalistic fidelity of this study. This study was the closest methodologically to the first study in Madera and Hebl (2012), but with one major difference. That first study had participants look at a static image while listening to the interview audio, as in the present study, but the researchers also utilized an eye tracker which could have made their participants feel the need to observe the stimuli naturally given that they knew their visual attention would be recorded. The researchers’ second study required participants to interview a confederate. Interacting with a confederate is more realistic than viewing a static image on a computer screen and hearing an interview. Relatedly, the research would suggest that participants would inhibit their tendency to stare at a person with a disability in the presence of another individual but not when they are alone.

Future Directions and Implications

This study combined older and newer lines of research on discrimination. As previously mentioned, concerns over appearing prejudiced can be triggered by one’s self-enhancing motive because being perceived as prejudiced could negatively impact one’s self-esteem. Confirming the results of Trawalter and Richeson (2006), prejudice concerns required more self-regulatory resources. Furthermore, similar to Muraven and Baumeister (2000), an activity that required the
use of self-regulation (i.e., dealing with prejudice concerns) predicted poor performance on a subsequent task (i.e., a memory test) that required executive control. These findings imply that addressing one’s self-enhancing motive (i.e., being concerned with appearing prejudiced) can be so demanding that it becomes a distraction and leads to lower applicant ratings. A future study could test this by randomly assigning participants to a confederate with or without a hearing aid. The confederate would task participants to complete a prejudice concerns measure and evaluate an interview.

Several steps can be taken to improve this study in the future and possibly lead to uncovering discriminatory effects. First, more potential candidates with varying qualifications for participants to evaluate should be added to this study. This would provide participants with a standard of comparison on which to base their evaluation of the candidate of interest. Second, the job the candidate is applying to should be changed. It is possible that participants would have rated the candidates differently if participants perceived hearing as crucial to the position. For instance, the discriminatory effects could have emerged if the scenario presented was for a position in a call center. Third, the hearing aid stimuli and the distraction stimuli should be altered. One possibility for the lack of effects was that both the hearing aid stimuli and distraction stimuli could have been only momentarily attention grabbing. Without both stimuli being able to direct attention away from the content of the interview and sustain that attention, the stimuli would have operated similarly to the control stimuli.

Unfortunately, the lack of discriminatory effects found in this study made it impossible to determine the extent to which this model was suited to examine the underlying mechanism of discrimination towards people with hearing disabilities. However, the support for the structure of
the model found in this study still provides some new intriguing possibilities for future research. For instance, the research on prejudice concerns and its impact has mostly been restricted to studying the construct in relation to racial interactions. Researching how prejudice concerns of employees or employers impact their interactions with individuals with disabilities is one possibility. The first step is for future research to test the structure of the model found in this study.

Because discriminatory effects towards an applicant with a hearing disability were not found in this study, there is still much work to be done. Specifically, future research should try methods of detecting discrimination towards people with hearing disabilities with better ecological validity. Researchers can use Hebl, Foster, Mannix, and Dovidio (2002) as an example of how to detect discrimination towards groups in the field. Specifically, a future study could send confederates with hearing aids, ear pods, and without either to apply for jobs in person to detect discrimination. Doing so would help to determine whether the non-discriminatory effects found in this lab-based study were the result of error or the new norm in our society. The results of this study also revealed a relationship between previous experience and cognitions towards people with disabilities. A practical implication is that if employers want to change their employees’ attitudes towards individuals with disabilities, then they will need to hire more employees with disabilities.
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The SONA system will be used to recruit participants. The following script will be used in order to gain interest in participating in the study, “students will get a realistic preview of the hiring process as they listen to a recorded interview and make an evaluation based on the applicant’s performance.” Students will receive two unit of credit in exchange for participating in our 60 minute study.
APPENDIX B
INFORMED CONSENT
I agree to participate in the research project titled “How soon can you start?” being conducted by Jesus Martinez, a graduate student at Northern Illinois University. I have been informed that the purpose of the study is to determine factors that influence hiring decisions.

I understand that if I agree to participate in this study, I will be asked to do the following: listen to a recording of an interview, complete a stoop task and complete questionnaires for roughly 60 minutes. The questionnaire will include: questions regarding memory, a vignette, previous experience, self and other perceptions, the applicant rating, and demographic questions.

I am aware that my participation is voluntary and may be withdrawn at any time without penalty or prejudice, and that if I have any additional questions concerning this study, I may contact Jesus Martinez at jmartinez25@niu.edu and Lisa Finkelstein at lisaf@niu.edu. I understand that if I wish further information regarding my rights as a research subject, I may contact the Office of Research Compliance at Northern Illinois University at (815) 753-8588.

I understand that the intended benefits of this study include understanding the underlying processes that influence hiring decisions.

I have been informed that there are no potential risks and/or discomforts I will experience during this study. I understand that all information gathered during this experiment will not trace back to me. Instead, a unique identifier will be given to the information gathered from me. Additionally, I understand that data will only be shared with relevant parties.

I understand that my consent to participate in this project does not constitute a waiver of any legal rights or redress I might have as a result of my participation, and I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent form.

__________________________________________________________________
Signature of Subject Date

__________________________________________________________________
E-mail Address

Additionally, we ask that you provide your e-mail address below so that you can be contacted to further explain your contribution to this study.
APPENDIX C
VIDEO TRANSCRIPT
DONNA

Hi, my name is Donna, and I am the recruiter that will interview you. I am going to ask you a series of questions about such topics as situations, past behaviors, and your background and knowledge. Please tell me your name.

MICHAEL

My name is Michael Worth. I am an MBA student at the College of Business at Northern Illinois University. I am in my second year; my concentration is in marketing.

DONNA

Now tell me a little bit about yourself. For example, tell me about a challenge you have faced.

MICHAEL

I would say that I went to an okay undergraduate institution and probably as a function the grades I earned in the first year of my program were not the top of the class. In fact I got mostly B but I am working on getting back on track now, during my second year, and that's what matters.

DONNA

Okay, thank you. Now tell me about marketing and why it is important.

MICHAEL

Simply stated, marketing is everything you do to place your product or service in the hands of potential customers. It includes diverse disciplines like sales, public relations, pricing, packaging, and distribution. Marketing is your strategy for allocating resources - that is, time and money - in order to achieve your objectives. Yet the most brilliant strategy will not help you earn a profit or achieve your wildest dreams if it isn't built around your potential customers. Though it may feel counter-intuitive, marketing doesn't begin with a great idea or a unique product but with customers -- those people who want or need your product and will actually buy it.
DONNA

I will now ask you a situational question: Suppose you were giving a sales presentation, and a difficult technical question arose that you could not answer. What would you do?

MICHAEL

If I didn't know the answer, I would remain calm and simply state that I do not have the answer, however that it wouldn't be a problem to try to find out.

DONNA

Okay, great. I will now ask you a past behavioral question: can you provide an example of a specific instance where you developed a sales presentation that was effective?

MICHAEL

I was an intern for Alexandria Consulting - which is a marketing consulting firm based in Virginia. My duty was to present an advertising sales presentation for the director of advertising. This presentation was for a new shopping mall that was out in the suburbs beyond Lafayette. There were three problems that we had to resolve: The marketing budget was low. It was new but had a bad location because it was outside of major residential areas. And the people leasing the spaces at the mall didn't believe that advertising would work. So, to resolve these problems I did two things. First, I was able to get the stores to contribute a low-risk amount of money. Second, I proposed that we put a map in the middle of the advertisement so that potential customers would realize that the shopping mall wasn't as far away as they thought it was. In the end, the advertising campaign was semi-successful and brought in more customers. But not as many as I had hoped.

DONNA

I will now ask you a background question: What work experiences, training, or other qualification do you have for working in a teamwork environment?

MICHAEL

Well, within the MBA program I am in, everyone works within teams. We don't just form a single team - instead, I am part of multiple teams for different projects and classes. So in my formal education, I have been involved with teams. As a current intern for the Chicago Wolves, I
work within teams as well. For example, our duties include organizing autograph sessions. We also organize the pre-game and post-game shows. These duties require the use of team - not individuals. So, for example, the intermission shows usually involve 40 to 50 people, and we have to synchronize the timing so that they can all go out at the same time. That type of duty requires a team, not a single individual.

DONNA

Okay, thank you. Now I am going to ask you about your job knowledge: What factors should you consider when developing a television advertising campaign?

MICHAEL

The most important factor is to communicate the benefits of the product you are trying to sell. You must integrate this with the image of the firm. For example, Volvo is associated with safety, which is their most important benefit. So every time people think of Volvo, they also think of safety. You must take all of this into consideration to create the association. There are three Ps that you must always consider: Product, Price, and People. If the price of the product is too high people will not buy it but if it's too low, people will think it's a poor product; you have to set a price that is a happy medium between the two. It all comes down to integrating the product, price, and people to have a successful campaign.

DONNA

Ok, I have a few more questions. How has this MBA program prepared you for a job in marketing?

MICHAEL

As I mentioned before, we work in teams for class projects. Working in teams has helped me with my interpersonal skills and my communication skills. The MBA program provides a challenging environment with multiple class projects and teams. I have to coordinate my time with my team members' time. On any given day, I have to meet with two teams, prepare a study case, and attend class. After this, I go to work where I meet with more team members, prepare a technical case, and organize an autograph session. So this MBA program keeps me very busy. My current internship with the Bears also keeps me busy. Though I can do better I am learning to balance my school time with the time I spend at work.
DONNA

I see that in your resume you indicate that you are seeking marketing as a career. Why did you choose marketing as a career?

MICHAEL

Since college I have been interested in advertising and how companies try to persuade others to buy their products. I try to look out for new and innovative TV commercials. I also try to figure out their marketing plan by just looking at TV commercials or magazine ads. For example, my favorite commercials are from Coca-Cola - they use a lot of celebrities for their commercials to persuade people to buy their product. They do a great job of using celebrities to target a wide range of customers. They also do ads in Spanish with Latin celebrities from the U.S. like Penelope Cruz and Salma Hayek. They do this because they know they have to compete with Pepsi - who also uses celebrities, like Britney Spears & Missy Elliot. Marketing is also a type of job where you can interact with other people and not just sit behind a desk. Marketing involves a lot of teamwork.

DONNA

Okay, Michael. Thank you for your time. You can expect a decision in the coming days.

MICHAEL

Thank you.
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APPENDIX K
MEMORY MEASURE
**INSTRUCTIONS:** We are interested to see how much you can recall about the interview. Please answer the following questions about the interview.

1. What was the name of the interviewer? (Please circle)
   - (a) Michael
   - (b) Don
   - (c) Michelle
   - (d) Dan
   - (e) Mike
   - (f) Dana
   - (g) Donna

2. What was the last name of the interviewer? (Please circle)
   - (a) Worthom
   - (b) Wilth
   - (c) Worth
   - (d) Walsh
   - (e) Welsh
   - (f) Worley
   - (g) Did not say

3. What was the name of the applicant? (Please circle)
   - (a) Michael
   - (b) Don
   - (c) Michelle
   - (d) Dan
   - (e) Mike
   - (f) Dana
   - (g) Donna

4. What was the last name of the applicant? (Please circle)
   - (a) Worthom
   - (b) Wilth
   - (c) Worth
   - (d) Walsh
   - (e) Welsh
   - (f) Worley
   - (g) Did not say

5. What degree is the applicant seeking? (Please circle)
   - (a) MS
   - (b) MCE
   - (c) MA
   - (d) DMA
   - (e) MBA
   - (f) MCAM
   - (g) MSE
   - (h) Did not say

6. What is the applicant’s school? (Please circle)
   - (a) DePaul University
   - (b) Northern Illinois University
   - (c) Rice University
   - (d) Tulane University
   - (e) University of Illinois at Chicago
   - (f) Purdue University
   - (g) Did not say

7. Where did the applicant go as an undergraduate? (Please circle)
   - (a) DePaul University
   - (b) Northern Illinois University
   - (c) Rice University
   - (d) Tulane University
   - (e) University of Illinois at Chicago
   - (f) Purdue University
   - (g) Did not say

8. All of the following “types” of questions were asked except for one; which type was not asked?
   - (a) Situational question
   - (b) Past Behavioral question
   - (c) Background question
   - (d) Job Knowledge question
   - (e) Future Behavioral question
   - (f) none of the above

9. In what city did the applicant complete an internship that dealt with a shopping mall?
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. In which state is the consulting firm based?</td>
<td>(a) Virginia (b) Texas (c) Louisiana (d) Illinois (e) Vermont (f) Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What was the name of the consulting company that the applicant worked for as intern?</td>
<td>(a) Avery (b) Arlington (c) Alexandria (d) Argyle (e) Afton (f) Alton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. When giving an answer to a question, the applicant mentioned that as part of an internship the applicant gave a presentation about a shopping mall - who did the applicant present to? (Please circle)</td>
<td>(a) Director of Marketing (b) Director of Sales (c) Director of Finance (d) Director of Business (e) Director of Community Sales (f) Director of Advertising (g) Director of Regional Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. When giving a presentation about a shopping mall – the applicant said there was what problem with the shopping mall?</td>
<td>(a) Old mall and bad promotion (b) Old mall but good location (c) New mall but bad financing (d) Old mall but good promotion (e) New mall but bad location (f) Old mall and bad location (g) New mall but bad promotion (h) Old mall and bad financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. When asked why marketing is important, the applicant responded that marketing begins with what?</td>
<td>(a) “customers” (b) “a unique product” (c) “a great idea” (d) “a plan” (e) “a budget” (f) “a simple product” (g) “money”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When asked what is marketing, the applicant responded that marketing includes all of the following business disciplines except for</td>
<td>(a) sales (b) public relations (c) pricing (d) packaging (e) distribution (f) communication (g) none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. When asked about developing a television advertisement, the applicant gave an example of what product? (Please circle)</td>
<td>(a) Pepsi (b) Coca Cola (c) Sprite (d) Volvo (e) Ford (f) Honda (g) All of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. According to the applicant, what are the “three Ps”?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Product, Price, and People</td>
<td>(b) Product, Price, and Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Product, Place, and People</td>
<td>(d) Price, Promotion, and People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Product, Promotion, and Place</td>
<td>(f) Product, Price, and Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) People, Product, and Promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. According to the applicant, working in teams has helped refine the applicant’s:
   (a) interpersonal and leadership skills   (b) interpersonal and communication skills
   (c) interpersonal and team skills       (d) social and interpersonal skills
   (e) leadership and communication skills (f) team and communication skills
   (g) social and team skills             |

19. The applicant is a current intern for what professional sports team?
   (a) Chicago White Soxs  (b) Chicago Bulls  (c) Chicago Bears
   (d) Chicago Blackhawks (e) Chicago Cubs   (f) none of the above

20. When describing TV commercials, which two celebrities did the applicant mention?
    (a) Jessica Simpson & Penelope Cruz   (b) Mandy Moore & Missy Eliot
    (c) Britney Spears & Jessica Simpson (d) Jessica Simpson & Missy Eliot
    (e) Mandy Moore & Penelope Cruz       (f) Britney Spears & Missy Eliot
APPENDIX L
APPLICANT RATING MEASURE
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about the candidate (the interviewee) based on what you recall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The applicant has strong qualifications.</th>
<th>Not at all Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M
PREJUDICE CONCERNS MEASURE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-3 (strongly disagree) to +3 (strongly agree) 9 items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>In today’s society it is important that one not be perceived as prejudice in any manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I get angry with myself when I have a thought or feeling that might be considered prejudiced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>It’s important to me that other people not think I’m prejudiced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>It’s never acceptable to express one’s prejudices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I feel guilty when I have a negative thought or feeling about other groups of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>When speaking to members of other groups, it’s important to me that he/she not think I’m prejudiced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>It bothers me a great deal when I think I’ve offended someone, so I’m always careful to consider others people’s feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If I have a prejudiced thought or feeling, I keep it to myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I would never tell jokes that might offend others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE MEASURE
1. Please describe the degree of contact/interactions you have had with persons who are deaf.

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

2. If you have had any contact with persons who are deaf, on the whole, how would you characterize these experiences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Very Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O
ATTITUDES TOWARD PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES MEASURE
Vignette

Imagine the following situation. Joseph went out for lunch with some friends to a coffee shop. A man with a hearing aid, with whom Joseph is not acquainted, enters the coffee shop and joins the group. Joseph is introduced to this person, and shortly thereafter, everyone else leaves, with Joseph and the man with the hearing aid remaining alone together at the table. Joseph has 15 minutes to wait for his ride. Try to imagine the situation.”

People experience a variety of emotions when they are involved in such a situation. In the next column is a list of possible emotions, which may arise before, during, and/or after such a situation. Please rate on each line the likelihood that this emotion might arise in Joseph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helplessness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervousness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serenity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alertness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People experience a variety of *cognitions* when they are involved in such a situation. Following is a list of possible thoughts that may arise before, during, and/or after such a situation. Please rate on each line the likelihood that this *cognition* might arise in Joseph/Michelle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.  He/she seems to be an interesting guy/girl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.  He/she looks an OK person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.  We may get along really well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.  He/she looks friendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.  I enjoy meeting new people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.  He/she will enjoy getting to know me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.  I can always talk with him/her about things that interest both of us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.  I can make him/her feel more comfortable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.  Why not get to know him/her better?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. He/she will appreciate it if I start a conversation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People experience a variety of behaviors when they are involved in such a situation. Following is a list of possible behaviors that may arise before, during and/or such a situation. Please rate on each line the likelihood that Joseph/Michelle would behave in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Move away</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Get up and leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Read the newspaper or talk on a call phone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Continue what he/she was doing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Find an excuse to leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Move to another table</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Initiate a conversation if he/she doesn’t make the first move</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Start a conversation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX P
MANIPULATION CHECK #1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the applicant wear glasses?</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the applicant wear a blue shirt?</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the applicant have hearing aids?</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the applicant have piercings?</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the applicant have tattoos?</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the applicant have a scar on their face?</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the applicant acknowledge their age?</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the applicant have a dot by their ear?</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the applicant acknowledge their gender?</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the applicant acknowledge their religion?</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the applicant acknowledge their ethnicity?</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Q
MANIPULATION CHECK #2
Please indicate the extent which you agree with the following statements about the candidate (the interviewee) based on what you recall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I tried controlling my gaze during the interview.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I was distracted by features of the photo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I attempted to not look at certain features of the photo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX R

DEMOGRAPHICS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you currently employed? (Please circle)</th>
<th>(1)Yes</th>
<th>(2) No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If so, what is your employment status? (Please circle)</td>
<td>(1)Full time</td>
<td>(2)Part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any experience making hiring recommendations? (Please circle)</td>
<td>(1)Yes</td>
<td>(2) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender? (Please circle)</td>
<td>(1) Male</td>
<td>(2) Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your ethnicity? (Please circle)</td>
<td>(1) White</td>
<td>(2) Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your age? __________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX S
PARTIAL DEBRIEF
The purpose of the study was to examine the effects applicant differences. Participants viewed one of the various applicant images. Your response will go on to inform the understanding of human behavior and thus advance the field of psychology. If you would like more information about the purpose of the study please contact the researchers once the data collection has concluded. Thank you again for participating in this study.
APPENDIX T
FULL DEBRIEF
The purpose of the study was to determine whether the discrimination that people with hearing disabilities face during interviews can be attributed to the attention placed on their device(s) rather than the perceptions of their qualifications as an applicant. Participants viewed one of the varied applicant images. The images either include an “applicant” either wearing no device, an in-the-ear device, or an applicant with a distraction by their ear. In the past, researchers have used explanations such as occupational stereotypes to account for differences in applicant ratings in studies in which applicant demographics was manipulated (King, Mendoza, Madera, Hebl, & Knight, 2006). In 2012, Madera and Hebl found support for a model proposing that discrimination against facially stigmatized (e.g. scar or port wine stain) applicants can be attributed to visual attention, self-regulatory focus, and memory. They examined whether increased visual attention on a stigmatized area leads to a decrease in memory that would then negatively impact an applicant’s rating (Madera & Hebl, 2012). They found that indeed lower applicant ratings resulted from a lower memory of the applicant’s job-related information, which itself stemmed from high visual attention on the stigmatized area. This study was a methodological replication and a conceptual extension of Madera and Hebl (2012) as the group of interest shifts from facially stigmatized people to those with a hearing disability. This study also looked at the impact prejudice concerns and attitudes towards people with disabilities had on the model. Thank you again for participating in this study.