In-group and out-group member reactions to discrimination: Effects of group membership, group identity, and control appraisals on behavioural and physiological responses

A Thesis submitted to the Department of Psychology and the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research of Carleton University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science
Psychology
Specialization in Neuroscience

Katherine Raspopow
Department of Psychology
Carleton University

© Copyright 2006

Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-18373-1

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-18373-1

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

Discrimination may be perceived as a stressor to devalued group members, and might thus influence both individuals' mental and physical well-being. There is reason to believe that witnessing discrimination toward in-group members may also be interpreted as a stressor, thereby influencing well-being, as well as behaviours displayed, among witnesses. The present investigation examined control appraisals, willingness to offer support and advise action, and cortisol levels among witnesses of a conflict, as a function of group membership (male vs. female), group identity, the nature of the conflict (social conflict vs. discrimination), and the victim's emotions (anger vs. shame vs. neutral). It was observed that females displayed comparable appraisals of the victim's control over both conflict conditions irrespective of the victim's emotional responses. In contrast, victim emotionality influenced males' appraisals following a social conflict. Specifically, a shameful victim was appraised as having less control than an angry or neutral victim. Appraisals of decreased control were associated with participants' greater tendencies to provide support and recommend action. Also, greater support and advice responses were elicited by discrimination, compared to a social conflict. The different associations of these variables with perceived discrimination among males and females suggest that their comparable responses were likely stemming from different motivations. Finally, as males displayed comparable cortisol reactivity in all conditions, whereas females displayed increased reactivity in response to discrimination, support was provided for the view that witnessing a transgression against an in-group member can elicit reactions in an observer similar to those that would be expected if one had personally experienced the transgression. The interpretation and implications of these findings are discussed.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Hymie Anisman. This thesis would not have been possible without the guidance, knowledge, and encouragement he has given me over the past two years. I would also like to thank Dr. Kimberly Matheson for the expertise and support she has shown me, for which I am grateful. Thanks to Kelly Carroll for all the time and effort spent in preparation and running of this study. Also much appreciated is the support and advice from members of the lab. Finally, thank you to my family and friends, for supporting me along the way, and whose tremendous encouragement got me here in the first place. This research was supported by grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and the Canadian Institutes for Health Research.

Table of Contents

Title.....	i
Acceptance Sheet	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents	v
Figure Captions.....	vi
List of Tables	vii
List of Appendixes.....	viii
Introduction.....	1
Method	17
Results.....	23
Discussion.....	52
Conclusion and Limitations	64
References.....	68
Appendixes	87

List of Figures

Figure 1. Gender Identification Differences in Perceptions of Discrimination.

Figure 2. Gender Differences in Perceptions of the Victim's Displayed Emotions.

Figure 3. Gender and Conflict Condition Differences in Perceived Victim Control.

Figure 4. Gender and Conflict Condition Differences in Cortisol Levels.

Figure 5. Gender Identification and Victim Emotionality Differences in Cortisol Levels.

Figure 6. Males' Gender Identification and Conflict Condition Differences in Cortisol Reactivity (5 mins post audio / baseline).

Figure 7. Females' Gender Identification and Conflict Condition Differences in Cortisol Reactivity (5 mins post audio / baseline).

Figure 8. Gender Differences in Cortisol Reactivity (20 mins post audio / baseline).

Figure 9. Males' Gender Identification and Conflict Condition Differences in Cortisol Reactivity (20 mins post audio / baseline).

Figure 10. Females' Gender Identification and Conflict Condition Differences in Cortisol Reactivity (20 mins post audio / baseline).

List of Tables

Table 1. Pearson Correlations (Bivariate) Assessing the Associations between Male Participants' Perceptions of Discrimination, Perceived Victim Control, Action Recommendations and Social Support Offered to the Victim, and Cortisol Reactivity.

Table 2. Pearson Correlations (Bivariate) Assessing the Associations between Female Participants' Perceptions of Discrimination, Perceived Victim Control, Action Recommendations, Advice and Social Support Offered to the Victim, and Cortisol Reactivity.

List of Appendixes

Appendix A. Informed Consent

Appendix B. Background Information

Appendix C. Identity Scale

Appendix D. Audio Clip Stressor Transcripts

Appendix E. Ratings of Situation (Perception of Discrimination, Appraisals of Control, Perceived Victim Emotion)

Appendix F. Response Scale (Social Support)

Appendix G. Advice Scale (Action Recommendations)

Appendix H. Debriefing

Introduction

Considerable research has focused on the effects of stressors on psychological and physical disturbances, and the mechanisms through which these effects are produced and mitigated. Identifying these relationships may aid in the development of more effective treatment programs for stress-related disorders, as well as preventative strategies to preclude their appearance. One of the complexities inherent in such an endeavor comes from the appreciable inter- and intra-individual variability that exists in response to stressors. Other things being equal, individuals may differ in subjective appraisals of situations, and the appraisals of resources available to deal with the situation (King, 2005; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Martin & Westerhof, 2003). Moreover, these responses vary over time and across situations. (Lee-Baggley, Preece & DeLongis, 2005).

Although stressful events have often been broadly defined, including psychological, physical and systemic insults, limited attention has been devoted to discriminatory experiences as stressors that instigate or exacerbate pathological states. In this regard, however, members of devalued social groups may face appreciable distress given their discriminatory experiences (Clark, Anderson, Clark, & Williams, 1999; Dion, 2002; Herek, Gillis & Cogan, 1999; Mays & Cochran, 2001). These discriminatory occurrences may be overt or subtle, as well as acute or chronic, and over time they may instigate significant psychological and physiological consequences (Checkley, 1996; Dion, 2002; Pianta & Egeland, 1994; Troxel, Matthews, Bromberger & Sutton-Tyrrell, 2003). Indeed, there are considerable data suggesting that discriminatory experiences may contribute to the occurrence of heart disease among Black Americans (Peters, 2004; Thompson, Kamarck, & Manuck, 2002).

Whether or not stressors influence pathological outcomes is thought to be dependent, in part, on the availability and accessibility of effective coping mechanisms. In this regard, social support is a fundamental coping resource that acts to buffer against the adverse psychological and physiological effects of stressors (Heinrichs, Baumgartner, Kirschbaum & Ehlert, 2003; Lee, Koeske & Sales, 2004; Lepore, 1992). This type of support can take on multiple forms, ranging from emotional or financial support, through to a source of information and problem solving. Likewise, it is probable that among those who provide support, there may be different motivations or self-perceived functions that operate to instigate this role. Thus, it may be of considerable value to identify the factors and circumstances that elicit different types of social support from the social network, and why these factors operate as they do.

Just as there are marked differences in individual appraisals of discriminatory events, there may be multiple factors that determine whether support will be forthcoming from observers. For instance, social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) would predict that individual group membership (i.e., in-group vs. out-group) would determine the type of support and action endorsements provided to victims. Indeed, this has been the case, and in-group members often endorse greater collective action in response to perceived discrimination (Foster, 2001; Foster, & Matheson, 1998; Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990). In addition, individual characteristics, such as strength of identification with the group (or the gender identification of the individual witnessing sex discrimination) may play a pivotal role in determining whether support will be forthcoming.

Among the various stressors that have been documented, witnessing an adverse event happening to others has been reported to be relatively poignant (Hansen, Hogh, Persson, Karlson, Garde & Ørbæk, 2006; Mackie & Smith, 2003). Likewise, hearing a victim recount a stressful experience may influence biological and behavioural stress responses, depending on the nature of the event as well as the emotional state of a witness or victim while recounting the event (Kaufmann, Drevland, Wessel, Overskied & Magnussen, 2003). Interestingly, in rodents, witnessing a conspecific experiencing an adverse event elicits emotional distress, and may promote activation of physiological stress processes, such as increased release of brain norepinephrine (Sutoo & Akiyama, 2002; Yoshida, Umekawa, Sakane, Yoshimoto, & Kondo, 1995).

Similar analyses of stress responses among witnesses are rare in human studies. Nevertheless, the animal research, together with the few studies of human observers (e.g., studies of bullying, empathy; see Dovidio & Penner, 2001; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1990; Hansen et al., 2006; Stephan & Finlay, 1999), raise the possibility that the emotions a victim displays while recounting an act perpetrated against them may have wide ranging emotional and physiological effects on the observer, and may influence the helping behaviours (social support) offered to the victim. As alluded to earlier, the coping strategies individuals employ to deal with stressors are thought to be dependent on appraisal processes, and the support and advice individuals offer may vary with the appraisal of the discriminatory situation, and particularly appraisals concerning control over the situation by the victims. In this regard, it could be argued that appraisals mediate between the victim's emotional responses and the support offered by the observer.

In light of the potential interplay between group membership (i.e., gender), group identification, victim emotionality, and appraisals of control, it was the purpose of the present investigation to examine (a) the effect of the social situation presented, and victim emotions while relaying a description of the events on the appraisals of control made, and the type of recommended actions and social support offered, and (b) the moderating effects of group membership and gender identity of the witness in governing helping behaviors and advice offered. In addition, as emotional responses of victims and observers may not be readily discerned, and oral reports of distress may be inaccurate, in the present investigation an objective index of distress was included, namely that of salivary cortisol levels. In this instance, the observer's response to an audio clip (depicting discriminatory or non discriminatory conflict) was obtained, and it was predicted that (c) group membership, group identification, and victim display of emotions would affect the observer's physiological reaction to the stressor (e.g. cortisol elevations).

Discrimination

Discrimination as a stressor. People belonging to socially devalued groups (e.g., women, African Americans) may experience relatively severe and traumatic (e.g., assault) or more mundane (e.g., racist jokes) acts of discrimination. The latter are more likely to occur on an ongoing basis, and may be ambiguous in their intent; hallmark traits of stressors with significant psychological and health implications (Anisman & Merali, 2000). Of the many stressors that have been investigated, one of the least studied has concerned the influence of discrimination. Yet, few would question that members of devalued social groups may face considerable distress given their discriminatory experiences (Clark et al., 1999; Herek et al., 1999; Liebkind & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2000),

and that these experiences can engender significant psychological and physiological disturbances (Checkley, 1996; Pianta & Egeland, 1994; Troxel et al., 2003). Indeed, increased perception of discriminatory events against the self or group has been associated with increased psychological distress and anxiety (Cassidy, O'Connor, Howe, & Warden, 2005; Liebkind et al., 2000; Sellers & Shelton, 2003), as well as physiological disturbances, such as cardiovascular disease (Peters, 2004; Thompson, Kamarck, & Manuck, 2002; Troxel et al., 2003).

Appraisals of discrimination. Although devalued group members may frequently be confronted with instances of discrimination, these events may be ambiguous in their nature, and not always perceived as such (Clark et al., 1999; Dion, 2002). Individual factors, such as group identity, have been shown to influence the perception of discrimination in such instances. In this regard, group identification has been demonstrated to moderate the perception of ambiguous acts of discrimination, such that higher in-group identifiers are more likely to attribute the event to discrimination relative to low identifiers (Major, Quinton, & Schmader, 2003; Sellers & Shelton, 2003). Furthermore, avoiding an attribution of discrimination can serve in a protective capacity for the individual, such as protecting positive self-esteem (Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002). Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey (1999) proposed, and found support for, the rejection-identification model whereby attributing an ambiguous event to discrimination, given that it is part of pervasive discrimination against one's group, results in feelings of rejection from the power group, and thus impairs well-being. Therefore, members of devalued groups may not always be motivated to claim discrimination.

Emotional responses to discrimination. When faced with unavoidable instances of discrimination, members of the in-group and out-group tend to display different patterns of emotional reactivity. In this regard, in-group members tend to experience feelings of anger due to a sense of injustice about the situation (Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000; Yzerbyt, Dumont, Gordijn, & Wigboldus, 2002; Yzerbyt, Dumont, Wigboldus, & Gordijn, 2003), whereas out-group members often experience feelings of guilt (Branscombe, Doosje, & McGarty, 2003). The feelings of guilt among out-group members are posited to motivate them to make reparation to the victim (Augoustinos & LeCouteur, 2004; Branscombe & Miron, 2004; Iyer, Leach, & Pederson, 2004). Much research has been conducted examining the effect of empathy on helping behaviours towards others (see Dovidio et al., 2000; Eisenberg et al., 1990; Stephan et al., 1999). However, examining the responses of individuals specifically observing discriminatory situations occurring to others is scant. Still, several studies have revealed that witnessing discrimination may result in emotional responses akin to those experienced by the victims (Mackie & Smith, 2003; Yzerbyt et al., 2002, 2003).

Action endorsements against perceived discrimination. In addition to responding with consistent emotional patterns, when an attribution to discrimination is unavoidable, members of the devalued group often respond with predictable patterns of action endorsement. Wright, et al. (1990) have suggested that reactions to such events can be summarized into five categories: acceptance of position, attempt to increase individual status within societal norms, attempt to increase individual status outside of societal norms, collective action within societal norms, and collective action outside of societal norms. In line with these classifications, Foster and Matheson (1998) found recognition

of personal discrimination to be associated with collective action to elevate the in-group. Foster (2000) also found that the means of coping used had greater predictive abilities of the action taken. In fact, using social support to cope was associated with greater collective action and decreased levels of helplessness. Most research has focused on reactions of devalued group members to discriminatory events that they themselves have experienced (Foster, 2001; Wright, et al., 1990), but little attention has been devoted to the impact of discrimination on those who witness such events. Yet, these witnesses may provide an essential function to victims' ability to contend with such insults.

Stress and Coping

Coping with discrimination. In general, the coping strategies individuals use in response to stressors can be predictive of psychological and physiological consequences. Emotion-focused coping is associated with greater anxiety and personal distress (Bolger, 1990; Burker, Evon, Marroquin Losielle, Finke, & Mill, 2005; Stanton & Snider, 1993), whereas problem-focused coping tends to result in decreased personal distress, and enhanced well-being (Carver et al, 1993). In examining discrimination as a stressor, it was observed that social support was associated with greater collective action and diminished helpless behaviour. In contrast, the more avoidance was used as a coping resource, the greater the helpless behaviour reported (Foster, 2000). Thus, the type of social support provided (problem- vs. emotion-focused strategies) to a victim of discrimination may influence their psychological well-being.

Stress and well-being. Psychological (psychogenic) stressors have repeatedly been shown to have marked effects on well being, profoundly affecting anxiety and depression as well as exacerbating a range of physical illness (e.g., diabetes, cardiovascular disease,

autoimmune disorders; Anisman & Matheson, 2004). Not surprisingly, sources of distress vary appreciably across individuals, as do subjective appraisals of potentially adverse situations, and the appraisals of resources available to deal with the situation (King, 2005; Lazarus et al., 1984; Martin et al., 2003; Krause, Liang, & Keith, 1990). Ultimately, individual perceptions of the coping resources available, and then acting on the stressor in an appropriate fashion, may have fundamental effects on well-being.

Problem- and emotion-focused coping strategies may have different functions and repercussions in their effectiveness in alleviating distress. Problem-focused coping strategies concentrate on taking action in order to alleviate the source of the stress, whereas emotion-focused coping strategies focus on alleviating the emotional distress created by the threat or entail the use of emotion to minimize distress. Although both strategies may be used in conjunction with one another to temper the impact of a perceived threat, it has been shown that they differ in their effectiveness in alleviating personal distress. Problem focused coping strategies (e.g. problem solving, social support seeking) have been associated with markedly diminished negative affect, whereas emotion focused strategies (e.g., wishful thinking, avoidance, and denial) have been associated with high levels of anxiety and personal distress (Bolger, 1990; Stanton & Snider, 1993; Carver et al., 1993).

Although the relative effectiveness of coping strategies differs, when faced with stressors, individuals tend to display dispositional coping styles. These are a set of coping strategies, high in the individual's repertoire, that are most commonly adopted in response to threats, although the combination of particular strategies chosen may vary

across situations and over time (Carver & Scheier, 1994; Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub, 1989; Lazarus, 1999).

Appraisals of control. A well-accepted model of stress, appraisals, and coping is Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) transactional model of coping. According to this perspective, when faced with a stressor one first makes a primary appraisal of the potential threat of the challenge. Secondary appraisals are then made as to whether the necessary resources are available to contend with the threat. If resources are available, then problem-focused coping responses will predominate, whereas emotion-focused responses are thought to emerge when the stressor is perceived to be uncontrollable (i.e., when resources are deemed not to be available to contend with the insult).

Social Support

Social support as a buffer. Of the various coping methods available, seeking social support is among the most potent in buffering against the adverse psychological and physiological effects of stressors (Caldwell, Pearson, & Chin, 1987; Heinrichs et al., 2003; Lee et al., 2004; Lepore, 1992). Low ratings of social support when faced with a stressor have been associated with increased symptoms among rheumatoid arthritis patients (Evers, Kraaimaat, Geenen, Jacobs, & Bijlsma, 2003), psychological distress (Lepore, 1992; Major, Richards, Cooper, Cozzarelli, & Zubek, 1998), symptoms of depression (Anisman & Matheson, 2004), and decreased well-being (Martinez Barcia, Barcia Ramirez, & Maya Jariago, 2002). In fact, it has been shown that increased ratings of anticipated support in dealing with future stressors are associated with lower ratings of personal distress (Krause et al., 1990).

There is evidence the buffering effects of social support may vary as a function of gender and context. For example, when manipulating the social support received in the time leading up to a stress reactivity task (i.e. from either a stranger or partner), males and females differed in their cortisol responses to the task. Men showed increased cortisol reactions when strangers were providing the support, whereas women showed decreased cortisol reactions. Conversely, when the partner provided support, men displayed decreased cortisol reactions to the task, whereas women's cortisol reactions were shown to increase (Kirschbaum, Klauer, Filipp, & Hellhammer, 1995).

Factors that elicit social support. Although data are available concerning observer action endorsements in response to discrimination, limited research is available regarding social support elicited from observers to a victim (research regarding empathy to non-group specific others is available; Eisenberg et al., 1990; Stephan et al., 1999), as well as the factors that moderate such outcomes. Yet, this line of research may be particularly cogent as social support is fundamental in mitigating the adverse effects of stressors. Thus, it is of interest to identify the factors and circumstances that elicit different types of social support from the social network, and how these factors operate in determining various aspects of well-being among both the donor and recipient of support.

Group membership, as defined in Tajfel and Turner's (1979) Social Identity Theory, may influence individuals' behaviours toward a situation when their group identity is involved. Social Identity Theory proposes that individuals have several different social identities contributing to their self-concept, based on the social groups they belong to. These identities may differ in strength as a function of context or perceived group membership. In addition, an in-group and out-group division is created

based on group membership, wherein individuals favour the in-group. It follows from this perspective that gender may play a moderating role between the perception of discrimination and type of social support offered to a member of the in- or out-group under conditions of sexual discrimination.

Gender differences in social support patterns. Just as individual differences in coping styles exist, so do differences in social support styles. Gender can often be a predictor of the type of social support offered, or how received social support is perceived. For example, females report receiving more social support than males (Matud, 2004), as well as exchange higher amounts of emotion focused coping (Matud, 2004; Liebler, 2002). However, several investigators concluded that there were no significant gender differences in perceptions of social support received (Day & Livingstone, 2003; Hamilton & Fagot, 1988). In effect, males and females may perceive receiving comparable support, even though support is less forthcoming from males toward other males. Further, it seems that the genders may view social support as structurally different, wherein females define social support as a general phenomenon, while males divide social support into emotion focused and problem focused categories (Matud, Ibanez, Bethencourt, Marrero & Carballeira, 2003). As males and females may perceive the reception and underlying structural components of social support differently, it is plausible that they may also differ in the type of social support they provide.

Vicarious Stressors

The role of emotions. Among the various stressors documented, witnessing an adverse event happening to others has been reported to be relatively poignant (Mackie & Smith, 2003; Nejtek, 2002). Also, when a situation entails discrimination, witnessing

such an act against a member of one's group can provoke feelings of anger similar to those elicited if the transgression had been against the self (Mackie & Smith 2003; Yzerbyt et al, 2002, 2003). Likewise, hearing the recount of an adverse event may influence stress responses, and may influence attributions of events and appraisals of the victim and transgressors (Hartnett, Robinson, & Singh, 1989). Such responses may vary depending on the nature of the event as well as the emotional state of a witness or victim while they recount their experience (Kaufmann et al., 2003; Vrij & Fisher, 1997). For instance, Hartnett, et al. (1989) found that participants rated a perpetrator's sexually harassing behaviour more favourably on ratings of attractiveness, manipulativeness and sexual inadequacy than they did victim, if the victim accepted the sexual harassment. Building on this research, Smirles (2004) found that more responsibility for the event was assigned to the victim when she accepted the harassing behaviour, as opposed to fighting back, and that this effect was greater in females than in males. When considering simulated rape victim testimony, Kaufmann et al. (2003) demonstrated that victim emotion, but not the story content (varying severity of events), predicted victim reliability ratings with neutral and incongruent emotions being related to lower victim reliability ratings. When examining specific emotions, Vrij and Fisher (1997) found gender differences in the reactions of participants to a simulated interview with a rape victim. Male participants rated angry victims as being less distressed and reliable than victims displaying sad emotions, whereas female participant ratings remained constant over conditions. When experiences of discrimination are involved, out-group member reactions to the victim may also depend on victim emotionality. Victims displaying feelings of anger are suspected to elicit defensive reactions from out-group members,

whereas feelings of distress are posited to elicit feelings of guilt and sympathy, thereby eliciting a need to be forgiven, and wanting to help the victim change the situation in attempts to make reparation (Branscombe & Miron, 2004). In view of these considerations, it is possible that the emotions a victim displays, while recounting an act perpetrated against them, may influence the helping behaviours (social support) offered to the victim (Branscombe, et al., 2003; Branscombe et al., 2004; Yee & Greenberg, 1998).

Just as witnessing an event can cause emotional stress reactions in the observer, such an experience may promote activation of physiological stress processes, such as hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal activity reflected by cortisol release. Thus, the induced affective state causes a physiological stress response (Nejtek, 2002). It is uncertain, however, what effect witnessing an act of discrimination has on either an in-group or out-group observer. In instances of discrimination, group membership may influence the emotional reactivity of the observer, thus in- and out-group members may experience different physiological reactions.

Physiological effects of stressors

Stressors exert their effects through various physiological mechanisms, one of which is the HPA axis, a negative feedback system involved in the stress response (Kirschbaum et al., 1995; Shulkin, 2004). The final product of the HPA cascade is cortisol, a hormone produced by the adrenal glands, which may have adaptive effects for the organism (see Erickson, Drevets, & Schulkin, 2003; Shulkin, 2004). Cortisol levels have been shown to increase both in anticipation of a stressor, and during a stressor event (Alpers, Abelson, Wilhelm, & Roth, 2003; Kudielka, Schommer, Hellhammer, &

Kirschbaum, 2004; Sgoifo et al., 2003; Smyth, Ockenfels, Porter, Kirschbaum, Hellhammer, & Stone, 1997). Some of the beneficial effects of cortisol include the mobilization energy sources through effects on glucose metabolism, increased arousal, and memory consolidation (see Erikson et al., 2003). However, when released chronically, or at high levels, its effects can be harmful and include decreased cellular immune functioning (Cacioppo et al., 1998; Kiecolt-Glaser, Glaser, Shuttlesworth, Dyer, Ogrocki, & Speicher, 1987), increased risk of myocardial infarction (Yusuf et al., 2004), and hippocampal cell loss (McEwen, 2002). Psychologically, some of the consequences of chronic or severe stress include depression and anxiety (see Tafet and Bernardini, 2003), post traumatic stress disorder (Anisman, Griffiths, Matheson, Ravindran, Merali, 2001), lower levels of self-esteem (Schmitt, Branscombe, & Postmes, 2003), and decreased well-being (Branscombe et al., 1999). Thus, although adaptive in response to typical acute stressors, when chronically activated, the stress response may have significant adverse physiological and psychological effects.

Affect and physiological stress responses. In general, negative affect has been related to greater cortisol responses (Buchanan, al'Absi, & Lovallo, 1999; Polk, Cohen, Doyle, Skoner, & Kirschbaum, 2005), whereas positive affect may be related to decreased cortisol responses (Hartridge et al., 1998). The evidence for the latter remains inconclusive, however, pending further research. In challenging this perspective, Lerner, Gonzalez, Dahl, Hariri and Taylor, (2005) argued that because different negative emotions elicit different cognitive appraisals (Lerner, Gonzalez, Small, & Fishhoff, 2003; Lerner & Keltner, 2001, Lerner, Tiedens, Gonzales, 2006; Smith & Ellsworth, 1987), an emotion-specific stress response may instigated (i.e., different emotions are associated

with a diverse set of neuroendocrine changes). In support of their proposal, upon having participants take part in a stress-challenge task, positive correlations emerged between feelings of fear (as measured by coded facial expressions) and the cortisol response, while negative correlations between both anger and disgust and cortisol reactions were observed (no significant results were found using self-report measure as the determinant of emotion). More evidence in support of this proposal was found with children who displayed increased cortisol responses to feelings of evaluative embarrassment and shame as a result of failure, but decreased responses to feelings of embarrassment as a result of success (Lewis, & Ramsay, 2002). However, the results remain uncertain, as conflicting results have been reported.

The Present Study

Considerable research has focused on the perceived social support, and coping resources used in response to discriminatory events. As well, efforts have been made to determine whether social support and coping strategies mediate between discriminatory events and psychological and physical well-being in devalued group members. Although much research has been conducted with empathically motivated helping behaviours to victims of adverse events (see Dovidio et al., 2001; Eisenberg et al., 1990; Stephan et al., 1999), more research is required specifically examining reactions to devalued group members. The purpose of the present investigation was to examine factors influencing the provision of social support and action endorsements, as well as the physiological response to discrimination. It will be recalled that several factors have been identified that could potentially moderate the amount and nature of the support engendered by victims of discrimination (e.g., the mood responses of the victim). Further, the support provided

might be expected to vary with the gender (or gender identification) of the observer, and might also be influenced by the observer's appraisal of control over the situation.

In the present investigation, which comprised a laboratory analysis of the responses to discrimination it was hypothesized that:

1. social support and action endorsements offered to the victim would be greater in a discrimination condition relative to a social conflict condition.
2. gender would moderate the impact of the social situation on the support offered, and will also influence action endorsements. Specifically, females would offer greater problem focused support and collective action endorsements in response to the discrimination condition relative to the conflict condition. Males were expected to offer greater emotion focused support and individual action endorsements in response to the discrimination condition relative to the social conflict. These effects may be further moderated by gender identity.
3. greater social support and action endorsements will be offered in response to a mood condition (i.e. anger, shame) relative to a neutral affect condition.
4. control appraisals will vary as a function of mood condition, whereby the shame condition will be associated with a lower perception of control than the angry and neutral mood conditions.
5. greater appraisals of control will be associated with increased problem focused support and collective action endorsements, whereas decreased appraisals of control will be associated with increased emotion focused support and avoidance endorsements.

6. greater cortisol reactions will occur in the discrimination condition than the social conflict, with group membership (male vs. female) and group identity (low vs. high) serving as a possible moderators.
7. greater cortisol reactions may be elicited from victims displaying feelings of anger or shame than one displaying neutral affect.

Methods

Participants

Undergraduate students, aged 18-43 years (males $n=99$, M age=19.93 years $SD=2.27$; females $n=99$, M age=19.53 $SD=2.81$) served as participants for a study on student reactions on-campus experiences. Participants were told they would be asked to listen to an audio clip of a student describing an on-campus experience, and would then be asked to provide their reactions to the experience, in questionnaire format. They were also told that they would be asked for some personal information such as coping styles, and personal experiences. Of those who reported ethnic status, the majority self-reported as being Caucasian ($n = 117$, 61.9%), with remainder of participants reporting East Asian ($n = 19$, 10.1%), Middle Eastern ($n=13$, 6.9%), Canadian ($n=12$, 6.3%), Asian ($n=8$, 4.2%), Black ($n=7$, 3.7%), Hispanic ($n=5$, 2.6%), or mixed ethnic status ($n=7$, 3.7%). As incentives, participants received course credit (if in Introductory Psychology), monetary compensation, or a combination of the two.

Procedure

Subjects were tested during the fall and winter semesters of the 2004-2005 academic school year (December – April) in groups of 1 to 5. Groups were comprised of

either all male or all female participants. Groups were randomly assigned to one of two conflict conditions (social conflict, discrimination), and one of three portrayed victim emotion conditions (angry, ashamed, neutral). At the outset of the experiment participants received a full description of the study and an informed consent form was read and signed before beginning the session. Participants were then asked to fill out a battery of questionnaires divided into three sections. The first section included personal and background information, as well as information relevant to the interpretation of cortisol results. After the first set of questionnaires was completed, participants provided the first saliva sample, which served as a baseline measure of cortisol levels. Participants then listened to the audio clip specific to their conditions that lasted approximately 15 mins, after which they completed the second section of the questionnaire, which assessed participants' appraisals of the conflict and mood of victim in the audio clip, and their perceptions of the victim's control over the events. A second saliva sample was taken 20 minutes after the beginning of the audio clip (approximately 5 mins after the end of the audio clip), after which participants completed questionnaires assessing the support and advice they were willing to provide to the victim. The third saliva sample was then taken, 20 mins following the end of the audio clip. At the end of each session, participants were debriefed and provided with contact information if they wished to obtain more information about the study, had any ethical concerns, or if they wished to seek help related to personal well-being or student skills. Participants were then awarded academic credit or monetary compensation as desired.

Audio Clip Stressor

Audio clips served as stressors and provided the conflict and victim emotion manipulations. The audio scenarios were simulated situations, and consisted of a conversation between a female student and her academic counselor. The scripts for the scenarios were written by a researcher in the laboratory, and were revised following pilot data to ensure that they were depicting the desired conflicts and emotions correctly. In each scenario the female student expressed concerns about meeting course expectations, a developing conflict with the study group that she had formed with class members, the hassling she underwent in and out of the class by her group members (all male when events were discriminatory or not specified during a social conflict scenario), discouraging comments from her brother and male professor when going to them for advice and help, and the end result comprising the course being dropped.

The scenario was intended to be depictive of a situation that undergraduate students might potentially experience, therefore allowing both males and females to identify with the events presented. The core events in the scenario remained the same for all conditions, but differed with respect to the basis of the conflict in which the female student found herself (i.e., non-discriminatory social conflict vs. sexual discrimination), and the emotions she expressed while recounting the events (anger vs. shame vs. neutral). Conflict conditions differed only in the form of the comments made by the transgressors toward the female student. For example, “They mimicked me, saying that I thought I was a genius, and that I just used people. They said that I should wear a sign on my back listing the price tag for my brilliant help.” appeared in the social conflict condition, and equivalent comments appeared in the sexual discrimination condition, namely “They

said, that I was boring and ‘I was like all the other girls...just a tease who enjoys leading men on.’ They said that I should wear a sign on my back that read ‘not interested in guys’.” To achieve the different emotion conditions, the female student portrayed the intended emotion in her voice while telling the story, and emotional cue words were also present. For example, “I felt so angry. I could hardly bring myself to stand up to walk out of there, I was so mad.” is present in the anger condition, while “I felt like crying. I could hardly bring myself to stand up and walk out of there, I felt so ashamed.” is in the shame condition. No mood cues were present in the neutral condition.

Measures

Gender identification. Gender Identification was assessed using a 12-item scale (Cameron, 2004). Students responded on a 7- point rating scale ranging from 0 “Strongly Disagree” to 7 “Strongly Agree”. Mean responses across the items provided an index of total gender identity (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .73$). For the purposes of subsequent analyses, a median split was conducted ($Mdn = 3.33$) with participants scoring below the median classified as low gender identifiers (males: $n = 54$; females: $n = 41$), and those scoring above the median were deemed high gender identifiers (males: $n = 45$; females: $n = 58$)¹.

Perception of victim emotion. To assess whether the manipulation of the emotions conveyed by the victim in the scenario was effective, following the audio clip participants rated 15 mood adjectives on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 “Not at all” to 6 “Extremely”. A principal components analysis with a varimax rotation was performed. Based on a scree plot, four factors were revealed, explaining 63.37% of the total variance.

¹ A dichotomous measure of gender identity was used to simplify the interpretation of the results. However, preliminary regression analyses revealed similar findings.

Items were included on a factor when loadings were greater than .40. Items that loaded on more than one factor were included on the one to which they were most theoretically relevant. Of particular interest in this investigation were the dimensions of anger (angry, annoyed, infuriated), and shame (ashamed, embarrassed, humiliated) that emerged. Both factors of interest demonstrated high internal reliabilities (anger: Cronbach's $\alpha = .86$; shame: Cronbach's $\alpha = .88$).

Perception of discrimination. To assess whether the manipulation of the nature of the conflict was effective, participants responded to a single item "Was the cause of the event was due to sexism or sex discrimination" using an 11-point rating scale ranging from -5 "Not at all" to 5 "Definitely due to sex discrimination". A higher rating reflected greater perceived discrimination against the victim in the audio clip.

Control Appraisals. Participants were asked about the extent to which they perceived the victim as having over the events in the scenario on a 3-item measure of control. On an 11-point scale ranging from -5 "Not at all (in her control)" to 5 "Definitely (due to something about her, or, could have been avoided, or, under her control)", participants gave their opinions regarding the degree to which the cause of the experience was due to something about the woman herself, the experience could have avoided if the victim had taken more control or whether it was out of her hands entirely, and if the final outcome was something that was under her control so that an acceptable resolution could have been achieved. Responses were reverse recoded if necessary and the mean of the items was taken, with increased values indicating greater perceived control (Cronbach's $\alpha = .76$).

Social support. Participants were asked about the nature of social support they would be willing to provide participants using a modified version of Bertera's (1997) 12-item measure of consumption and generation of social support. This scale measures the extent to which individuals had offered guidance, emotional support, and tangible support to others in the past. To measure how likely participants would be to provide each form of support to a victim, they responded to a 4-point rating scale ranging from 0 "Not At All" to 3 "Absolutely". Consistent with Bertera, a two-factor structure was found. These factors were representative of emotion- and problem focused support, and accounted for 50.51 % of the variance. Items were included on a factor when loadings were greater than .40. Items that loaded on more than one factor were included on the one to which they were most theoretically relevant. The mean of all the relevant items was used to reflect the emotion- and problem-focused support participants were willing to provide. Both factors demonstrated adequate internal reliabilities (emotion-focused support: Cronbach's $\alpha=.73$; problem-focused support: Cronbach's $\alpha=.72$).

Advised action. Participants indicated the actions that they would advise the victim to take. This scale was developed for the purposes of the present study, and designed to reflect a range of actions, from acceptance to highly visible confrontation of the perpetrator. Participants rated each action using an 8-point scale ranging from 0 (Not At All) to 7 (Extremely Appropriate). Necessary items were reverse coded before analyses were performed. A principal components analysis of the scale was performed using a varimax rotation. Based on a scree plot, three factors accounting for 61.92% of the variance emerged. Items were included on a factor when loadings were greater than .40. Items that loaded on more than one factor were included on the one to which they were

most theoretically relevant. The three factors represented dimensions of collective action, individual action, and avoidance. The mean of the values for items in each dimension was taken to obtain the overall scores. Internal reliability for collective action (Cronbach's $\alpha = .80$) was high, while reliabilities for individual action (Cronbach's $\alpha = .41$) and avoidance ($r = .28$) were found to be low.

Cortisol Response. Three salivary cortisol samples were taken from each subject during the study [baseline sample taken before commencement of audio clip, 20 min after commencement of audio clip (5 mins post audio clip), 20 min after the end of the audio clip]. All samples were stored at -30°C immediately after the session, and moved to -80°C . Samples were subsequently analyzed, in duplicate, using assay kits obtained from ICN Biochemicals using I^{125} as the radioisotope marker. Two ratio scores of the samples taken both 5 or 20 mins following the end of the audio clip : baseline sample was used to determine the degree of the stress response in reaction to the audio clip, where a higher value reflected a greater stress response. A ratio score was used to control for individual differences naturally present in the diurnal cortisol levels (Smyth et al., 1997). As cortisol takes approximately 20 mins to be evident in saliva (Schmidt-Reinwald, et al., 1999), the sample taken 20 mins following the end of the clip was used to represent the full physiological stress reaction to the audio clip stressor.

Analyses were performed on the female data to determine whether taking oral contraceptives affected cortisol reactivity. No main effects of oral contraception were present, nor did (not) taking oral contraception moderate the effect of gender identification, conflict condition, or victim emotion on cortisol reactivity.

Results

Of interest in this study was how control appraisals, social support and action endorsements on behalf of a victim of discrimination, as well as cortisol reactivity in response to events recounted by the victim, varied as a function of group membership (participant gender), gender identification (high, low), conflict condition (social conflict, sex discrimination), and the emotions conveyed by a victim (anger, shame, neutral). Outcome variables were analyzed by way of 2 (participant gender: male vs. female) x 2 (gender identification: high vs. low) x 2 (conflict condition: social conflict vs. sex discrimination) x 3 (victim emotion: anger vs. shame vs. neutral) (multivariate) analyses of variance (ANOVAS). Preliminary analyses were also conducted to identify outliers, and assess assumptions for univariate or multivariate parametric analyses. When examining the significance of the multivariate analyses, Pillai's Trace was used. Significant multivariate effects were followed-up with univariate analyses, and simple effects analyses were pursued where interactions were significant. Bonferroni's correction for family-wise error was applied to pairwise comparisons conducted to pursue any significant effects of the victim emotion condition. Both cortisol reactivity 20 mins after the start of the audio clip (5 mins post-audio) and 20 mins post-audio were analyzed due to the patterns revealed during the cortisol reactivity check.

Correlation analyses were performed between all outcome variables, as well as participants' perception of discrimination, to determine existing associations. These correlations were also used to test the hypotheses that control appraisals would be associated with the degree of support and action recommendations participants would be willing to offer to a victim.

Manipulation Checks

Discrimination manipulation. An ANOVA of the participants' ratings of discrimination was conducted to verify that participants correctly perceived the conflict condition manipulations. As expected, participants exposed to the sex discrimination scenarios reported discrimination to be present ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 2.65$), whereas those who were exposed to the social conflict scenarios reported an absence of discrimination ($M = 2.40$, $SD = 2.72$), $F(1, 174) = 166.02$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .488$. The effect of conflict condition was qualified by the level of the participants' gender identification, $F(1, 174) = 4.07$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .023$. Specifically, as seen in Figure 1, high gender identifiers were more likely than low identifiers to perceive sex discrimination in the social conflict scenarios, $F(1, 174) = 4.67$, $p < .05$, although both groups were nevertheless unlikely to report that this situation constituted discrimination. High and low identifiers were equally likely to perceive discrimination in the sex discrimination scenarios, $F < 1$. There were no further effects on perceptions of discrimination. In effect, it appears that on the whole the manipulation was effective.

Figure 1. Mean ($\pm$ SEM) perceived discrimination for high and low gender identifiers as a function of conflict condition

Manipulation of the victim's emotion. In order to determine if the intended emotions conveyed by the victim were correctly perceived by participants, a MANOVA was conducted on ratings of the victim's feelings of anger and shame. In this regard, participant's ratings differed as a function of the victim emotion manipulation to which they were exposed, Pillai's = .41, $F(4, 346) = 22.07, p < .001$. Univariate analyses revealed that both anger, $F(2, 173) = 14.22, p < .001, \eta^2 = .141$, and shame perceptions, $F(2, 173) = 26.57, p < .001, \eta^2 = .235$, were influenced by this manipulation. Pairwise comparisons indicated that ratings of the victim's anger were greatest following the anger manipulation ($M = 5.36, SD = 0.83$) relative to the shame ($M = 4.19, SD = 1.35$) and neutral manipulations ($M = 4.62, SD = 1.24$), $ps < .05$. Also, ratings of the victim's shame were greatest following the shame manipulation ($M = 5.20, SD = 0.92$), in comparison to the anger ($M = 3.45, SD = 1.52$) and neutral ($M = 3.74, SD = 1.55$) manipulations, $ps < .05$.

Unexpectedly, ratings of the victim's emotions also differed as a function of the conflict condition to which participants were exposed, Pillai's = .05, $F(2, 172) = 4.90, p < .01$. Participant gender moderated the effect of the conflict condition on ratings of the victim's emotions, Pillai's = .04, $F(2, 172) = 3.39, p < .05$. Both males', $F(2, 86) = 4.05, p < .05, \eta^2 = .086$, and females', $F(2, 85) = 3.97, p < .05, \eta^2 = .085$, ratings of the victim emotions differed as a function of the nature of the events portrayed. Follow-up univariate analyses indicated that among males, as seen in Figure 2, victim anger was perceived as being greater when sex discrimination was experienced, $p < .05$; men's perceptions of the extent of shame the victim experienced did not vary as a function of the conflict. Conversely, among females, perceptions of anger did not vary, but ratings of victim shame were greater when she conveyed sexually discriminatory events, $p < .05$. In

effect, the manipulation of the emotion the victim conveyed appeared to be effective in that when an emotion predominated, it was the appropriate one. However, the context in which the emotion conveyed seems to have altered the extent to which participants were sensitive to it.

Figure 2. Mean ($\pm$ SEM) perceived victim anger and shame for males and females as a function of conflict condition [Social Conflict (SC) and Discrimination (D)].

Appraisals of control.

An ANOVA of participant appraisals of victim control indicated a main effect of the nature of the conflict she reported, $F(1, 174) = 6.34, p < .05, \eta^2 = .035$, but this effect was qualified by the emotion the victim conveyed, $F(2, 174) = 3.45, p < .05, \eta^2 = .038$. This relation was further qualified in that the three-way interaction between participant gender, conflict condition, and victim emotion was also significant, $F(2, 174) = 3.74, p < .05, \eta^2 = .041$. The simple interactions between conflict condition and victim emotion were assessed for males and females. As Figure 3 indicates, among males, the nature of the conflict condition moderated the effect of victim emotions on control appraisals, $F(2, 174) = 5.43, p < .01, \eta^2 = .134$. Specifically, victim emotion affected appraisals of control when she encountered a social conflict, $F(2, 174) = 7.10, p < .01, \eta^2 = .284$, in that, as seen in Figure 3, when the victim displayed feelings of shame, she was perceived as having significantly less control over the situation than when she conveyed feelings of anger or neutral affect, $ps < .05$. The latter did not differ significantly from each other. The emotion displayed by the victim was not found to influence appraisals of control among males exposed to the discrimination, $F < 1$; under these conditions, they perceived the victim to have little control, irrespective of her emotional reactions. The nature of the conflict condition was not found to interact with the victim's emotions to influence control appraisals among females, $F(2, 174) = 1.43, ns$, nor did the nature of the conflict, $F < 1$, or mood of the victim directly influence their appraisals of control, $F(2, 174) = 1.17, ns$. Females consistently appraised the victim as having little control regardless of the nature of the conflict, or emotions displayed by the victim.

Therefore, the nature of the conflict and the emotions displayed by the victim do little to influence in-group members' appraisals of control. In contrast, it seems that when faced with a social conflict, males are influenced by the emotions displayed by the victim, with an ashamed victim eliciting appraisals of little control. However, when the conflict is discriminatory, the victim's emotions no longer affect out-group members' control appraisals.

Figure 3. Mean ($\pm$ SEM) perceived victim control for males and females participants. Data are presented for social conflict (SC) and discrimination (D) scenarios, and as a function of the portrayed victim emotions.

Social Support

A MANOVA conducted of the extent to which participants were willing to provide support (problem-focused, emotional) to the victim indicated a significant main effect of participant gender, Pillais = .04, $F(2, 170) = 3.52$, $p < .05$. Follow-up univariate analyses revealed that females ($M = 2.13$, $SD = 0.42$) indicated a greater willingness to offer emotion-focused support to the victim than did males ($M = 1.98$, $SD = 0.51$), $F(1, 171) = 3.35$, $p = .069$, $\eta^2 = .019$. There was no difference in their willingness to provide problem-focused support, $F < 1$ (females: $M = 1.94$, $SD = 0.48$; males: $M = 1.94$, $SD = 0.59$).

Support offered differed as a function of the conflict condition to which participants were exposed, Pillais = .06, $F(2, 170) = 5.54$, $p < .01$. Follow-up univariate analyses indicated that for both emotion-, $F(1, 171) = 6.64$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .037$, and problem-focused support, $F(1, 171) = 10.77$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .059$, participants were more willing to offer support to the victim who encountered sex discrimination (emotion-focused: $M = 2.14$, $SD = 0.49$; problem-focused: $M = 2.08$, $SD = 0.53$), than a social conflict (emotion-focused: $M = 1.97$, $SD = 0.44$; problem-focused: $M = 1.81$, $SD = 0.47$).

There were no further significant main effects or interactions. In summary, when a conflict is discriminatory in nature, observers are more willing to lend all types of support to the victim, irrespective of their group membership. However, in-group members (i.e., females) displayed an overall greater tendency to offer emotion-focused support.

Actions Recommended

A MANOVA conducted of the actions participants would advise the victim to take (collective, individualistic, avoidant) revealed a significant main effect of condition, Pillai's = .25, $F(3, 172) = 18.66$, $p < .001$. Follow-up univariate analyses indicated that participants exposed to the sex discrimination condition ($M = 4.29$, $SD = 1.44$) were more likely to advise collective action than were those exposed to the social conflict condition ($M = 2.72$, $SD = 1.31$), $F(1, 174) = 55.55$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .242$. This same pattern was evident when examining individual action endorsements, $F(1, 174) = 6.77$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .037$, with the discrimination scenario ($M = 4.87$, $SD = 1.30$) evoking greater degrees of endorsement than the social conflict condition ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 1.19$). There was no difference in the extent to which they advised her to use avoidant strategies, $F < 1$.

In contrast to the hypothesis, the emotions conveyed by the victim did not influence the action endorsements made by the participants, Pillai's = .06, $F(6, 346) = 1.73$, *ns*. There were no further significant main effects or interactions.

Therefore, when advising the victim, the nature of the conflict affected the degree to which collective and individual actions were advised. Group membership did not seem to influence the degree to which action was advised, as both groups were more likely to advise the victim to take both individual and collective action when faced with discrimination.

Cortisol Patterns

In order to determine whether cortisol levels declined over the course of an experimental session, a common outcome in the absence of protracted habituation to the test environment, a mixed measures ANOVA was performed on cortisol levels, with measurement times (baseline, 5 mins-post audio, 20 mins post-audio) as a within subjects factor. The Greenhouse-Geiser correction was used due to violations of the assumption of sphericity. As indicated in Figure 4, this analysis revealed a 3-way interaction between measurement time, gender and conflict condition, $F(2, 302) = 3.72, p < .05, \eta^2 = .024$. As indicated among females, conflict condition did not moderate the effect of time on cortisol levels, $F(2, 302) = 2.22, ns$, nor was there a main effect of time present, $F < 1$. Among males, conflict condition was a moderator of time on cortisol levels, $F(2, 302) = 3.85, p < .05, \eta^2 = .039$. Males exposed to a social conflict displayed decreased cortisol levels between measurement times 5 and 20 mins following the end of the audio clip, $F(2, 302) = 4.55, p < .05, \eta^2 = .067$. When the victim conveyed discrimination, cortisol levels decreased between the first measurement time immediately preceding the commencement of the audio clip and the measurement 20 mins following the end of the clip, $F(2, 302) = 3.03, p < .05, \eta^2 = .097$.

Also, as figure 5 indicates, gender identification moderated the effect of victim emotion on cortisol levels over time, $F(4, 302) = 2.84, p < .05, \eta^2 = .036$. Among low identifiers, the emotions displayed by the victim moderated cortisol levels over time, $F(4, 302) = 2.77, p < .05, \eta^2 = .069$, but when the victim displayed neutral affect, low identifiers revealed an effect of time on cortisol levels, $F(2, 302) = 3.28, p < .05, \eta^2 = .103$, wherein cortisol levels increased over time. However, pairwise comparisons reveal

no significant differences between measurement times. When victims displayed feelings of anger or shame, cortisol levels among low identifiers did not vary over time, $F(2, 302) = 1.88, ns$, and $F(2, 302) = 1.76, ns$. Likewise, the victim's emotions did not affect cortisol levels over time among high identifiers, and time by itself had no effect, $F < 1$, $F(2, 302) = 1.97, ns$.

In effect, cortisol patterns followed the expected pattern, declining somewhat over the course of the experimental session. This decline, however, was moderately abrogated among females that had been exposed to discriminatory events.

Figure 4. Mean ($\pm$ SEM) cortisol levels ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) at baseline over time following exposure to a stressful audio clip. Data are presented for males (left) and females (right) as a function of the conflict condition presented.

Figure 5. Mean ($\pm$ SEM) cortisol levels ($\mu\text{g/dl}$) at baseline over time following exposure to a stressful audio clip. Data are presented for low (left) and high (right) gender identifiers as a function of the emotion portrayed by the victim.

Cortisol Stress-Reactivity

The mixed measures analysis of cortisol levels across measurement times revealed effects of time as well as two interactions of measurement time with the independent variables. Accordingly, separate analyses were performed to determine whether the pattern of cortisol reactivity following exposure to the audio clip differed at the two post-audio measurements of cortisol (5 and 20 min following the audio clip).

Cortisol reactivity approximately 5 mins following the audio presentation (which corresponded to 20 mins after the commencement of the audio clip) varied as a function of gender identity, $F(1, 155) = 7.20, p < .01, \eta^2 = .044$, but this effect was qualified by the nature of the conflict the victim reported and the emotion she portrayed, $F(2, 155) = 3.16, p < .05, \eta^2 = .039$. To simplify reporting of these effects, and because, intuitively, gender identification ought to have a different meaning to males and females when they exposed to a situation of discrimination against women, the follow-up simple effect break-downs for this interaction were conducted separately for males and females. Among males, the three-way interaction between gender identification, the nature of the conflict, and the emotions displayed by the victim was not significant, $F(2, 81) = 1.63, ns$. As indicated in Figure 6, a simple main effect of conflict condition was evident, in that males displayed greater cortisol reactivity when presented with a social conflict ($M = 1.45, SD = 1.00$) in comparison to discrimination ($M = 1.14, SD = 0.67$), $F(1, 81) = 4.32, p < .05, \eta^2 = .051$. Similarly to males, the three-way interaction between gender identification, the nature of the conflict, and the emotions displayed by the victim among females was not significant, $F(2, 74) = 1.64, ns$. As seen in Figure 7, females did display a simple main effect of gender identification, in that low identifying females ($M = 1.55,$

$SD = 0.91$) displayed greater cortisol reactivity than did high identifying females ($M = 1.22$, $SD = 0.70$), $F(1, 74) = 4.11$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .053$.

Figure 6. Mean ($\pm$ SEM) proportionate change of cortisol reactivity (5 mins post audio / baseline) for males who were high or low gender identifiers and as a function of conflict condition [Social Conflict (SC) and Discrimination (D)].

Figure 7. Mean ($\pm$ SEM) proportionate change of cortisol reactivity (5 mins post audio / baseline) for females who were high or low gender identifiers and as a function of conflict condition [Social Conflict (SC) and Discrimination (D)].

An ANOVA of the ratio scores reflecting cortisol reactivity 20 mins following exposure to the audio clip indicated a significant interaction between gender and conflict condition, $F(1, 155) = 5.18, p < .05, \eta^2 = .032$. As seen in Figure 8, among males, conflict condition had no effect on cortisol reactivity, $F < 1$, whereas among females, when the victim reported events of a discriminatory nature, cortisol reactivity was greater than when she reported a social conflict, $F(1, 155) = 4.80, p < .05, \eta^2 = .054$. Thus it appears that simply witnessing discriminatory events may be distressing to in-group members.

A main effect of gender identification, $F(1, 155) = 8.09, p < .01, \eta^2 = .050$, was qualified by conflict condition, $F(1, 155) = 4.32, p < .05, \eta^2 = .027$, which was further qualified by a marginal 3-way interaction between gender identification, conflict condition, and victim emotion, $F(2, 155) = 2.93, p = .056, \eta^2 = .036$. As with the earlier cortisol reactivity measure where there was an effect of gender identification irrespective of gender, to simplify reporting of these effects, the follow-up simple effect breakdowns for this interaction were conducted separately for males and females. Among males, as Figure 9 illustrates, the 3-way interaction between gender identification, conflict condition, and the emotion displayed by the victim was not significant, $F(2, 81) = 2.47, ns$, nor were there any simple main effects or interactions. Similarly, among females, the 3-way interaction between gender identification, conflict condition, and the emotion displayed by the victim failed to reach significance, $F(2, 74) = 1.28, ns$. As depicted in Figure 10, level of gender identification moderated the effect of the conflict condition on cortisol reactivity among females, $F(1, 74) = 4.61, p < .05, \eta^2 = .059$. When the victim conveyed discrimination, low identifying females displayed greater cortisol reactivity

than when a social conflict was conveyed, $F(1, 74) = 7.23, p < .01, \eta^2 = .163$. The nature of the conflict conveyed did not influence cortisol reactivity among high female identifiers, $F < 1$. Also among females, gender identification moderated the effect of the victim's emotion on cortisol reactivity, $F(2, 74) = 3.41, p < .05, \eta^2 = .084$. Among low identifying females, the emotion conveyed by the victim influenced cortisol reactivity, $F(2, 74) = 5.86, p < .01, \eta^2 = .239$. Specifically, a victim conveying neutral affect elicited greater cortisol reactivity than did a victim conveying feelings of anger, $p < .05$. The victim's emotion had no effect on cortisol reactivity among high identifying females, $F < 1$.

It seems that out-group members (i.e., males) displayed similar stress reactions irrespective of the nature of the conflict or the emotions displayed by the victim. In contrast, in-group members (i.e., females), when weakly identified with the group, found a discriminatory conflict, and a victim conveying neutral affect more stressful.

Figure 8. Mean ($\pm$ SEM) proportionate change of cortisol reactivity (20 mins post audio / baseline) for males and females as a function of conflict condition [Social Conflict (SC) and Discrimination (D)].

Figure 9. Mean ($\pm$ SEM) proportionate change of cortisol reactivity (20 mins post-audio / baseline) for males who were high or low gender identifiers and as a function of conflict condition [Social Conflict (SC) and Discrimination (D)].

Figure 10. Mean ($\pm$ SEM) proportionate change of cortisol reactivity (20 mins post-audio / baseline) for females who were high or low gender identifiers and as a function of conflict condition [Social Conflict (SC) and Discrimination (D)].

Correlation Analyses

In order to determine the associations between outcome variables (collective, individual and avoidance action endorsements, problem- and emotion-focused support, control appraisals, perception of discrimination, and cortisol reactivity), correlation analyses were examined for each of the male and female participants. As is shown in Table 1, among males, the more discrimination was perceived against the victim, the more emotion-focused support was more forthcoming. Also, the more control they appraised the victim as having over the events, the less collective and individual action they tended to advise. As their perception of discrimination against the victim increased, so did their recommendations of collective and individual action, and they indicated that they would be willing to provide problem-focused support for the latter. Not surprisingly, the more males perceived discrimination against the victim, the less they perceived her as having control.

When examining the associations between outcome variables among females, increased appraisals of control and lower perceived discrimination were associated with a lower likelihood of recommending collective actions, but unlike males, these appraisals were not significantly related to recommendations of taking individualistic actions (although the difference between correlations for males and females was not significant). Women's appraisals of control and discrimination were associated with the extent they were willing to provide problem-focused and emotion-focused support, and such willingness to provide support was especially likely to be associated with recommendations that the victim adopt individualistic actions. Although cortisol reactivity, on the whole, appeared to be unrelated to perceptions of discrimination,

appraisals of control and action endorsements of both male and female participants, among females increased cortisol reactivity at 20 mins following the audio clip was associated with decreased likelihood to endorse avoidance actions.

Table 1

Pearson Correlations (Bivariate) Assessing the Associations Between Male Participants' Perceptions of Discrimination, Perceived Victim Control, Action Recommendations and Social Support Offered to the Victim, and Cortisol Reactivity.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Perception of Discrimination									
2. Appraisals of Control	-.27**								
Advice Recommended									
3. Collective Action	.66***	-.36***							
4. Individual Action	.29**	-.24*	.49***						
5. Avoidance	.11	-.10	.01	-.05					
Social Support Offered									
6. Emotion-focused	.20*	.00	.14	.14	-.09				
7. Problem-focused	.15	.06	.16	.21*	-.16	.71***			
Cortisol-Stress Reactivity									
8. 5mins post-clip	-.19 ⁺	.12	-.10	-.20 ⁺	-.20 ⁺	.06	-.09		
9. 20mins post-clip	-.07	.00	-.04	-.14	-.03	-.03	.01	.84***	

⁺p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 2

Pearson Correlations (Bivariate) Assessing the Associations Between Female Participants' Perceptions of Discrimination, Perceived Victim Control, Action Recommendations and Social Support Offered to the Victim, and Cortisol Reactivity.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Perception of Discrimination									
2. Control Appraisals	-.15								
Advice Recommended									
3. Collective Action	.31**	-.21*							
4. Individual Action	.14	-.17	.46***						
5. Avoidance	.12	-.06	-.04	.01					
Social Support Offered									
6. Emotion-focused	.24*	-.27**	.11	.26*	.16				
7. Problem-focused	.34***	-.21*	.06	.24*	.16	.56***			
Cortisol Stress Reactivity									
8. 5 mins post-audio	-.11	.07	-.14	-.11	-.20 ⁺	.02	-.12		
9. 20 mins post-audio	.05	.06	-.08	-.09	-.26*	.03	.00	.85***	

⁺ p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Discussion

Stressors can be broadly considered to include psychological or physical challenges, and experiences of discrimination fall within such a definition. The case can also be made that witnessing discrimination represents a stressful challenge. In general, stressful events are thought to influence well being, and such an outcome may depend on individual appraisal of events, coupled with the coping strategies endorsed to deal with situations that are appraised as being stressful (Lazarus et al., 1984). Furthermore, appraisals of victim control over events, the willingness to provide social support, recommendations of what actions ought to be taken by the victim and cortisol reactivity may all be influenced by witness group membership, group identification, the nature of the conflict witnessed and the emotions conveyed by the victim (King, 2005; Lazarus et al., 1984; Major et al., 2003; Martin et al., 2003; Sellers et al., 2003).

Appraisal of victim control over events.

In the present investigation we assessed whether individual responses to a victim were influenced by the emotions displayed by that victim. As any such effect could be situation-specific, we included both a clear discrimination situation as well as one that involved a social conflict. Consistent with expectations, group membership (i.e., male vs. female), the nature of the events victims experienced, as well as victim emotions all contributed to participant appraisals of the victim's control over events. This said, when discriminatory events were being portrayed, neither appraisals by males nor females appraisals were affected by the emotions displayed by the victim, in that both genders appraised the victim as having little control over events. Evidently, group membership did not affect the ability to recognize discrimination as something that was beyond the

victim's control. In contrast, group membership was influential in affecting appraisals made when a social conflict was presented. Consistent with the findings of Vrij et al. (1997) assessing perceptions of rape victim distress and reliability, female appraisals of control in response to a female victim conveying a social conflict were unaffected by the emotions displayed by the victim. In contrast, when a social conflict was conveyed, males seemed to rely on the emotional expression of the victim to make their appraisals. As expected, victims displaying feelings of shame were deemed by males as having less control over events than were victims who displayed either anger or neutral affect.

It is possible that the situation-specific influence of the victim emotions among males lies in the nature of shame and anger. It has been proposed that when listening to someone speak, the person's thoughts and interpretation of events are inferred from the emotions expressed (Vanman, & Miller, 1993; Vrij et al., 1997). In this regard, shame is a self-focused emotion that is thought to reflect an individual's reaction to a negative evaluation against a standard, negative and unchangeable aspects of the self, or a lack of control (Gilbert, 2004; Lickel, Schmader, & Barquissau, 2004; Tangney, Wagner, Hill-Barlow, Marschall & Gramzow, 1996; Tracy & Robins, 2004). Thus, when witnessing a victim expressing feelings of shame, males may have interpreted these emotions to indicate the victim believed herself to be unable to change aspects of the self that would allow her to affect the outcome of the events, thus resulting in low appraisals of the victim's control. In contrast, anger is an emotion associated with strength, perhaps allowing males to infer a sense of control within the victim (Mackie et al., 2000).

It is uncertain why males, not females, were influenced by the emotions displayed by the victim of a social conflict. As both males and females correctly perceived the

intended emotions portrayed by the victim, it is unlikely that males possessed a greater ability to recognize the victim's emotions, resulting in a greater influence on their appraisals. Instead, it is possible that victim emotions had different effects on males and females due to the use of different perspective-taking styles. Specifically, cognitive perspective-taking refers to the recognition and comprehension of another's thoughts (Enright, & Lapsley, 1980; Oswald, 1996; Underwood, & Moore, 1982), whereas affective perspective-taking entails recognizing and comprehending another's emotions (Burlison, 1994; Enright et al, 1980; Oswald, 1996; Underwood et al., 1982). When considering empathy and helping intentions, the perspective-taking style engaged has been reported to affect the degree of empathy experienced by an observer, as well as the helping intentions displayed. Specifically, affective perspective-taking was reported to elicit the greatest degree of empathy and helping intentions from observers (Oswald, 1996, 2000, 2002). Furthermore, follow-up studies revealed that the gender of the observer, as well as the emotions and cognitive styles displayed by a target, to moderate such effects. In particular, when affective perspective-taking was adopted, a victim displaying positive emotions elicited greater helping intentions than did a victim displaying negative emotions. The emotions displayed by the target had no significant effect on the helping intentions when cognitive perspective-taking was adopted (Oswald, 2002). In a separate investigation, when engaging affective perspective-taking, males were more empathic and helpful in response to an unfocused, confused and illogical target, whereas this same effect was elicited from females in response to a focused, clear, and logical target (Oswald, 2000). Taken together, these results would suggest that the use of cognitive versus affective perspective-taking styles might result in different

behavioural responses among observers. Moreover, males and females may respond differently when engaging similar perspective-taking styles.

It is possible that appraisal processes may also be affected by the type of perspective-taking engaged. Although speculative, if females in the present investigation were more likely to engage a cognitive perspective-taking style, then as observed with respect to helping intentions (Oswald, 2002), the emotional cues displayed may not have influenced the appraisals made. In contrast, if men were more likely to engage in affective perspective-taking, it is possible that the emotions displayed by the victim would have had a greater influence on their appraisal processes, allowing the emotions displayed by the victim to dictate their ratings of control. To be sure, perspective taking was not measured in the present investigation, and hence conclusions pertaining to this dimension are highly provisional. Nevertheless, this factor may provide an interesting and testable approach to assess the processes by which victim emotions and situational factors influence appraisal processes among observers.

Taken together, these findings suggest that the nature of the event (i.e., social conflict vs. discrimination) supercedes the effect of victim emotions on appraisals of their control. In a situation involving a social conflict, the individuals' appraisal processes may be affected by the observers' different perspective-taking styles, as well as the inferences they make based on the nature of specific emotions. In contrast, in a patently unjust and uncontrollable situation, as in the case of discrimination, factors that might otherwise influence perceptions and appraisals were diminished.

Willingness to offer social support.

When witnessing discrimination, relative to a social conflict, both males and females responded similarly in their greater willingness to offer emotion- and problem-focused support to the victim. Moreover, among females, a willingness to provide both emotion- and problem-focused support was related to the extent they regarded the conflict as constituting discrimination, whereas among males, perceptions of discrimination were only associated with emotion-focused support. In addition, as previously reported (Matud, 2004; Liebler, 2002; see Taylor et al, 2000), females rated themselves as more willing to offer emotion-focused support to the victim than did males, whereas no difference was observed between males and females in their willingness to offer problem-focused support.

This pattern of findings suggests the possibility that the support males and females were willing to provide to a victim of discrimination may stem from different motivations. Social Identity Theory (Tajfel et al., 1979) posits that individual actions are biased in favour of the in-group. Thus, it is possible that the support females were willing to offer reflected their perceptions that their group was being threatened, and hence support was necessary to protect the well-being of the group as a whole. The association between the amount of discrimination perceived (where discrimination may be acting as a stressor) and the amount of support females were willing to offer is also consistent with the tend-and-befriend perspective (Taylor, et al., 2000). According to this view, when confronted by a stressor, males and females display different behavioural and physiological reactions, stemming from differing evolutionary origins. Whereas males exhibit typical “fight-flight” behaviours, females are thought to act in order to protect

their offspring and to form or strengthen social bonds with others, particularly with other women. These social bonds serve the purpose of providing a greater number of protectors when faced with future assaults, or creating a supportive social network from which they can draw instrumental or emotional support for themselves and their offspring.

Although Taylor et al. (2000) viewed the tend-and-befriend response to be particularly evident under stressor (or threatening) conditions, they did not specify whether certain types of stressors would be most effective in this respect. It is likely that the in-group threat may have been salient when discrimination was present, thus females would have appraised these events as stressful, and hence befriending the victim. In contrast, a social conflict may not have been viewed as threatening to the in-group as a whole, and thus these events were not appraised as stressful (to the self), resulting in decreased attempts to befriend the victim (i.e., females were less willing to offer social support), instead responding in a manner similar to that of men.

The social support females were willing to offer to the victim was also associated with their perceptions of the victim's control, whereas men's support was independent of these appraisals. Specifically, the less control females perceived the victim to have over a situation, the more emotion-focused and problem-focused support they were willing to offer. These results suggest that the willingness of women to offer support might be related to the ability to take the perspective of the victim. Perhaps, being more likely than males to have had similar experiences, females were better able to relate to the victim, thus increasing their feelings of empathy and desire to help (Levy, Freitas & Salovey, 2002; Oswald, 1996, 2000). Women's recognition that situations of

discrimination afford the victim little control over a situation might have further increased their tendency to offer both types of social support.

Although men's support propensities were not linked to their appraisals of control, their support was more forthcoming when the situation constituted discrimination rather than a social conflict. It is possible that when observing group members acting unjustly to a victim, males were willing to offer more support in an effort to alleviate feelings of guilt that may have been evoked. In this regard, guilt experienced in response to group actions has been associated with greater prosocial behaviour (Augoustinos & LeCouteur, 2004; Branscombe et al., 2004; Iyer, Leach & Pederson, 2004). These intentions may involve actions comparable to emotion-focused support (i.e., apologizing, compensation), and not those that characterize problem-focused support (i.e., supporting social equality, elevating the devalued group's status; Iyer, et al., 2003). Likewise, in the present investigation, males' perceptions of discrimination were associated with the emotion-focused, but not problem-focused support they were willing to offer.

Action Recommendations

Recognition of personal discrimination has consistently been linked to increased collective action endorsements (Foster, 2001; Foster et al., 1998; Gill & Matheson, 2006; Wright, et al., 1990). In the present investigation, participants were more likely to advise a victim to take both collective and individual actions when events were perceived as being discriminatory, relative to those involving a social conflict. Thus it seems that witnessing discriminatory events can elicit behavioural responses similar to those often associated with having personally experienced the transgression.

Although women's action endorsements are not surprising, in that an active response to discrimination is likely to benefit the group as a whole, it is less clear why men also advised the victim of discrimination to respond actively to her treatment. However, there exist several possibilities for such advice among males. First, a higher level of education has been associated with more egalitarian views concerning gender roles among men (Lottes & Kuriloff, 1994), and among college men, support for equity in the workplace has increased in recent years (Astin, 1998; Oppenheim Mason & Lu, 1988). Thus, within a university student sample, the promotion of active responses to discrimination is, perhaps, predictable.

From a different perspective, support has been provided for the role of collective guilt in affecting action tendencies among members of privileged social groups. When the group's privileged status is viewed as unmerited (i.e., gender), and the group's actions are viewed as unjust, feelings of guilt are often evoked. These feelings of guilt are associated with greater likelihood of apology, compensatory actions, and attempts to make restitution in power group members (Branscombe et al., 2004, Iyer et al., 2003). Thus, it is possible that feelings of guilt evoked from witnessing discrimination influenced male willingness to recommend greater action to the female victim (it is uncertain whether the guilt would actually have caused males to take greater action on behalf of women).

Another possibility for male recommended actions lies in relative deprivation theory (Kawakami & Dion, 1992; Walker & Pettigrew, 1984), and in particular, feelings of relative deprivation on behalf of others. According to this perspective, when individual or the group identity is made salient, one's unmerited disadvantaged status

may also become apparent, evoking varying emotions that result in action tendencies (see Smith & Kessler, 2004; Kawakami & Dion, 1995; Walker et al., 1984). When group relative deprivation is experienced, action tendencies may constitute collective action, likely stemming from feelings of anger (see Smith et al., 2004). Similarly, an observer's recognition of out-group member deprivation has also been associated with support for compensatory actions (Tiraboschi, Maass, 1998). As relative deprivation theory also assumes the involvement of evoked emotions in the actions advised (see Smith & Kessler, 2004; Kawakami & Dion, 1995; Walker et al., 1984), it is possible that when examining the behaviour of privileged group members, males may experience feeling of empathy toward the devalued group, resulting in a greater desire to advise action. Thus, in the present investigation, it is possible that witnessing discrimination made group membership salient, causing males to recognize the undeserved devalued status of females. This, in turn, may have evoked feelings of guilt or empathy for the female victim, resulting in a greater likelihood to recommend action.

In an attempt to distinguish between action tendencies associated with collective guilt versus empathy, Iyer et al. (2003) reported that feelings of collective guilt were related to support for limited types of actions. In contrast, they found that when feelings of empathy among out-group members were present, this was associated with support of actions to promote or endorse social equality and increased opportunities for the devalued group. Thus, the association of both collective and individual action with perceptions of discrimination among males may provide support for the role of empathy in the advice males were willing to offer to the victim.

In addition to evoked emotions influencing the actions recommended to a victim, it seemed that an observer's appraisal of a victim's control might also affect the actions they were willing to recommend. When the victim was perceived as having little control over events, males and females unexpectedly advised greater individual and collective action. It is possible that the recommendations to take action reflected the observer's desire for the victim to take control of the situation. Indeed, greater participation in activities aimed at community, social, and political change has been related to increased perceptions of control and empowerment among African American women, university students, and community members (Becker, Israel, Schulz, Parker & Klem, 2002; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). Although these investigations were performed using only in-group members, the increased egalitarian views of university males leave the possibility that comparable motivations may have been possible among both males and females.

Cortisol Stress-Reactivity to Discrimination

It has repeatedly been demonstrated that salivary cortisol levels increase when individuals are confronted with a stressor, both in a laboratory context (Heinrichs, et al., 2003; Kirschbaum et al., 1995; Matheson & Cole, 2004; Roy, 2004) as well as stressors encountered in situ (Hartridge, et al., 1998; Kivlighan, Granger, & Booth, 2005; Lewis, & Ramsay, 2002). Likewise, simply witnessing emotionally laden material can evoke increased cortisol responses (Nejtek, 2002), particularly when these events are perceived as being stressful (Biondi & Picardi, 1999; Gaab, Rohleder, Nater, & Ehlert, 2005; Olf, Langeland, & Gersons, 2004). The present investigation addressed the question of whether witnessing discrimination against a member of the in-group would be appraised

as stressful to observers, and would activate the hormone cascade that characterizes the stress response.

It has been maintained that discrimination acts a stressor for devalued group members (Dion, 2002; Herek, Gillis & Cogan, 1999; Matheson & Cole, 2004; Mays & Cochran, 2001), and the psychological stress of discrimination has indeed been shown to be associated with stress-relevant pathology, such as increased risk of cardiovascular disease, and anxiety (Clark, Anderson, Clark, & Williams, 1999; Peters, 2004; Thompson, Kamarck, & Manuck, 2002; Troxel et al., 2003). Moreover, it has been suggested that witnessing discrimination against a member of the in-group can evoke emotional and behavioural reactions similar to those experienced if one was personally the target of discrimination (Mackie et al., 2000; Mackie & Smith, 2003; Yzerbyt et al., 2003).

The present investigation, indeed, provides support for the view that discrimination is a stressor to devalued group members, and that witnessing a stressor against an in-group member can elicit responses similar to having personally experienced the stressor. Specifically, females witnessing discrimination against a female victim displayed an elevation of salivary cortisol levels, an effect that was neither evident among women witnessing a social conflict, nor among men in response to either social conflict or discrimination against women. Although the differential responses of males and females might reflect differences of in- vs. out-group members, it has been reported that males and females may display different cortisol patterns when confronted with a stressor (see Taylor, et al., 2000; Ennis, Kelly, & Lambert, 2001; Kivlighan et al., 2005).

However, as males typically display a greater cortisol response to a stressor, the present findings could not simply be attributed to sex differences in stress reactivity.

The data of the current investigation are consistent with the view that witnessing a relevant stressor being experienced by an in-group member may be responsible for the elicitation of neuroendocrine stress responses, much like those that would be expected if they themselves encountered the adverse event. Yet, the cortisol responses were most apparent among those women who weakly identified with the group, provided that the victim neither exhibited shame nor anger, but instead displayed a neutral mood. This outcome was not hypothesized, as one might have expected that women who exhibited shame or anger would be most likely to elicit an emotional response in those witnessing the event. In this regard, personally experiencing feelings of shame due to failure or lack of control has indeed been associated with increased cortisol levels (Dickerson & Gable, 2004; Lewis & Ramsay, 2002; Matheson & Anisman, 2006). At this point a reasonable accounting for these counterintuitive findings is not available. This is especially the case as women who did not strongly identify with their gender displayed the greatest increase in stress reactivity. One could speculate that a mood reaction would be expected of the victim of discrimination or a social conflict, and when none was forthcoming, this proved to be distressing. However, this does not account for the cortisol response occurring in low identifying women. At this time, it is probably best to replicate these findings to confirm their reliability, before speculating further on possible sources for these effects.

Beyond the cortisol levels associated with identification, low cortisol levels among females appeared to be associated with an increased likelihood of advising the victim to adopt avoidant action strategies, including accepting the outcome of the events,

moving on with their life, and avoiding the perpetrators so they would not have to deal with them again. This association implies that viewing the conflict as less distressing may result in a greater likelihood of advising a victim to avoid further confrontational action or contact with the transgressors. Conversely, it is possible that females viewed avoidant action as a form of acceptance of the victim's treatment. Thus, when the conflict was interpreted as being aversive, particularly when the situation involved a blatant transgression, such as gender discrimination, avoiding and accepting such treatment was deemed unacceptable.

Conclusions and Limitations

Although the present investigation may have helped elucidate differences between in- and out-group members' reactions to witnessing discrimination, there are some limitations that ought to be underscored. First, the present investigation was conducted in a laboratory setting, and thus it cannot be assumed that the behaviours observed would translate into real world situations. Similarly, as participants were informed that the scenarios were simulated, the severity or impact of the events may have been minimized, and responses may have been diminished or altered. In this regard, it is possible that responses may have been more profound if the audio clip would have portrayed an actual female victim conveying her experiences.

Participants in the present investigation were restricted to university students, thus limiting the population to which the results might be applicable. Further to this issue, the young age of the students may have limited the number of experiences they might have had with such issues (i.e., conflicts with friends, discrimination, advising victims, etc.).

This may influence their belief of the events presented as well as their ability to relate to the victim or transgressors, thus influencing their responses.

Yet another limitation of the present investigation was that only sexual discrimination was examined. It cannot be assumed that individuals experiencing different forms of discrimination (e.g., racial, religious) would respond to transgressions against their group members in similar fashions. Also, the emotions displayed by the victim were limited to feelings of anger, shame, and neutrality. It is possible that, in reality, victims display a wider range of emotions when sharing their experiences, which may be more or less relevant to the responses of in- and out-group members. In addition, although many of the findings are consistent with various theories involving inter-group emotions, the emotions of the participants were not directly measured in this investigation, and thus some of the conclusions are highly speculative.

Finally, the responses obtained from participants may have been limited due to the close-ended style of the questionnaires. It is possible that other actions or forms of support that participants might have been willing to offer were not captured by the questionnaires provided. The quality of information obtained may have been greater through the use of open-ended questionnaires where participants could respond based on their individual perspectives. Importantly, as well, the responses obtained from the questionnaire data represent only intended actions, and are not necessarily reflective of how participants would actually respond if they were in the situation.

It might be noted that although the laboratory setting of the present investigation may affect the application of the results to a real world venue, there are benefits to using such methods. Most important was the ability to control for confounding factors. More

specifically, the audio clip manipulation allowed factors such as race of the victim and self-presentation to be precluded as factors that could potentially influence outcomes, thus allowing interpretation of the results to be based on gender, not ethnic or religious group membership, or based on other factors such as self-presentation.

These caveats notwithstanding, the present investigation raises a few potential points of interest. It seems, not surprisingly, that witnessing discrimination against an in-group member can evoke increased support and advice recommendations that may serve to benefit the group as a whole. Moreover, these responses are similar to those that have been observed when one is personally the target of discrimination (Foster et al., 1998; Foster, 2000; Gill et al., 2006). Such responses among witnesses of discrimination may be particularly important during times of social protest (e.g., women's and civil rights movements). In this regard, feelings of anger evoked in response to discrimination against the self or a member of one's in-group, have been related to greater endorsements of collective action tendencies (Gill et al., 2006; Mackie et al., 2000). Furthermore, it is possible that repeatedly experiencing, witnessing, or listening to accounts of discriminatory events elicits greater anger among the in-group, potentially resulting in increased endorsement of, or participation in, social protest. The shared sense of anger and desire for action between the victim and their in-group members may help foster a sense of unity and support within the group. Indeed, such factors have been related to actions for social change, wherein greater unity and group support were associated with increased action (Drury, Cocking, Beale, Hanson & Rapley, 2005).

In addition to comparable behavioural reactions among in-group witnesses of discrimination, physical reactions comparable to those that would result after personally

experiencing such a transgression may be experienced. In this regard, the activation of the physical stress response among group members witnessing discrimination against an in-group member raises the possibility that such experiences may influence personal well-being. The present investigation examined the effects of a single instance of discrimination against an in-group member; however, repetitive exposure to such events may compound biological and emotional stress responses. Although speculative, it is conceivable that second order events may account for the trans- or cross-generational traumatization among children of war veterans, and Holocaust survivors who display increased incidences of anxiety disorders, and increased sensitivity to future traumatic events (Baider, Peretz, Ever Hadani, Perry, Avramov & Kaplan De-Nour, 2000; Yehuda, Halligan & Bierer, 2001; Yehuda, Schmeidler, Giller, Siever, & Binder-Brynes, 1998).

References

- Alpers, G.W., Abelson, J.L., Wilhem, F.H., & Roth, W.T. (2003). Salivary cortisol response during exposure treatment in driving phobics. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 65, 679-687.
- Anisman H, Griffiths J, Matheson K, Ravindran AV, & Merali Z. (2001). Posttraumatic stress symptoms and salivary cortisol levels. *Am J Psychiatry*, 158, 1511-1513
- Anisman, H., & Matheson, K. (2004). Stress, depression, and anhedonia: Caveats concerning animal models. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 29, 525-546.
- Anisman, H., & Merali, Z. (2000). Understanding stress: Characteristics and caveats [Special Issue]. *Alcohol Research and Health*, 23, 241-249.
- Astin, A.W. (1998). The changing American college student: Thirty-year trends, 1966-1996. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21.2, 115-135.
- Augoustinos, M., & LeCouteur, A. (2004). On whether to apologize to indigenous Australians: The denial of white guilt. In NR Branscombe and B Doosje (Eds), *Collective guilt: International Perspectives*. (236-261). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Baider, L., Peretz, T., Ever Hadani, P., Perry, S., Avramov, R., & Kaplan De-Nour, A. (2000). Transmission of response to trauma? Second-generation holocaust survivors' reaction to cancer. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 157, 904-910.
- Bertera, E.M. (1997). Consumption and generation of social support scale: Its psychometric properties in low socioeconomic status elderly. *Journal of Clinical Geropsychology*, 3, 139-148.

- Biondi, A., & Picardi, A. (1999). Psychological stress and neuroendocrine function in humans: The last two decades of research. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 68, 114-150.
- Bolger, N. (1990). Coping as a personality process: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 525-537.
- Branscombe, N.R., Doosje, B., & Mackie, D.M. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of collective guilt. In DM Mackie and ER Smith (Eds), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: differentiated reactions to social groups*. (49-66).
- Branscombe, N.R., & Miron, A.M. (2004). Interpreting the ingroup's negative actions toward another group: Emotional reactions to appraised harm. In L.Z. Tiedens & C.W. Leach (Eds.), *The social life of emotions* (pp. 314-335). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Branscombe, N.R., Schmitt, M.T., & Harvey, R.D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 135-149.
- Buchanan, T.W., al'Absi, M., & Lovallo, W.R. (1999). Cortisol fluctuates with increases and decreases in negative affect. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 24, 227-241.
- Burker, E.J., Evon, D.M., Marroquin Loiselle, M., Finkel, J.B., & Mill, M.R. (2005). Coping predicts depression and disability in heart transplant candidates. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 59, 215-222.
- Burleson, B.R. (1994). Friendship and similarities in social-cognitive and communication abilities: Social skill bases of interpersonal attraction in childhood. *Personal Relationships*, 1, 371-389.

- Cacioppo, J.T., Berntson, G.G., Malarkey, W.B., Kiecolt-Glaser, J.K., Sheridan, J.F., Poehlmann, K.M., et al. (1998). Autonomic, neuroendocrine and immune responses to psychological stress: The reactivity hypothesis. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 840, 664-673.
- Cameron, J.E. (2004). A three-factor model of social identity. *Self and Identity*, 3, 239-262.
- Caldwell, R.A., Pearson, J.L., & Chin, R.J. (1987). Stress-moderating effects: Social support in the context of gender and locus of control. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 13, 5-17.
- Carver, C.S., Pozo, C., Harris, S.D., Noriega, V., Scheier, M.F., Robinson, D.S., et al. (1993). How coping mediates the effects of optimism on distress: A study of women with early stage breast cancer. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 375-391.
- Carver, C.D., & Scheier, M.F. (1994). Situational coping and coping dispositions in a stressful transaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 184-195.
- Carver, C.D., Scheier, M.F., & Weintraub, J.K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 267-283.
- Cassidy, C., O'Connor, R.C., Howe, C., & Warden, D. (2005). Perceived discrimination among ethnic minority young people: The role of psychological variables. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35, 1246-1265.
- Checkley, S. (1996) The neuroendocrinology of depression and chronic stress. *British Medical Bulletin*, 52, 597-617.

- Christensen, D., & Rosenthal, R. (1982). Gender and nonverbal coding skill as determinants of interpersonal expectancy effects. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 75-87.
- Clark, R., Anderson, N.B., Clark, V.R., & Williams, D.R. (1999). Racism as a stressor for African Americans: A biopsychosocial model. *American Psychologist*, 54, 805-816.
- Day, A.L., & Livingstone, H.A. (2003) Gender differences in perceptions of stressors and utilization of social support among university students. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 35, 73-83.
- Dion, K.L. (2002). The social psychology of perceived prejudice and discrimination. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, 43, 1-10.
- Dovidio, J.F., & Penner, L.A. (2001). Helping and Altruism. In G.J.O. Fletcher, & M.S. Clark (Eds.) *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Interpersonal Processes* (pp. 162-195). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Drury, J., Cocking, C., Beale, J., Hanson, C., & Rapley, F. (2005). The phenomenology of empowerment in collective action. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 309-328.
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R.A. (1990). Empathy: Conceptualization, measurement, and relation to prosocial behaviour. *Motivation and Emotion*, 14, 131-149.
- Ennis, M., Kelly, K.S., & Lambert, P.L. (2001). Sex differences in cortisol excretion during anticipation of a psychological stressor: Possible support for the tend-and-befriend hypothesis. *Stress and Health*, 17, 253-261.

- Enright, R.D., & Lapsley, D.K. (1980). Social role-taking: A review of the constructs, measures, and measurement properties. *Review of Educational Research*, 50, 647-674.
- Evers, A.W.M., Kraaimaat, F.W., Geenen, R., Jacobs, J.W.G., & Bijlsma, J.W.J. (2003). Stress-vulnerability factors as long-term predictors of disease activity in early rheumatoid arthritis. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 55, 293-302.
- Foster, M.D. (2000). Positive and negative responses to personal discrimination: Does coping make a difference? *Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 93-106.
- Foster, M.D., & Matheson, K. (1998). Perceiving and feeling personal discrimination: Motivation or inhibition for collective action? *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 1, 165-174.
- Gaab, J., Rohleder, N., Nater, U.M., & Ehlert, U. (2005). Psychological determinants of the cortisol stress response: the role of anticipatory cognitive appraisal. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 30, 599-610.
- Gilbert, P. (2004). Evolution, attractiveness, and the emergence of shame and guilt in a self-aware mind: A reflection on Tracy and Robins. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 132-135.
- Gill, R., & Matheson, K. (2006). Responses to discrimination: The role of emotion and expectations for emotional regulation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 149-161.
- Hamilton, S., & Fagot, B.I. (1988) Chronic Stress and Coping Styles: A Comparison of Male and Female Undergraduates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 819-823.

- Hansen, ? .M., Hogh, A., Persson, R., Karlson, B., Garde, A.H., & Ørbæk, P. (2006). Bullying at work, health outcomes, and physiological stress response. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 60, 63-72.
- Hartnett, J.J, Robinson, D., & Singh, B. (1989). Perceptions of males and females toward sexual harassment and acquiescence. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 4, 291-298.
- Hartridge, A., Bhattacharya, A.K., Majumdar, C.K., Das, D., Chintalapudi, S.N., Smyth, J., et al. (1998). Stressors and mood measured on a momentary basis are associated with salivary cortisol secretion. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 23, 353-370.
- Heinrichs, M., Baumgartner, T., Kirschbaum, C., and Ehlert, U. (2003) Social support and oxytocin interact to suppress cortisol and subjective responses to psychosocial stress. *Biological Psychiatry*, 54, 1389-1398.
- Herek, G.M., Gillis, J.R., & Cogan, J.C. (1999) Psychological Sequelae of Hate-Crime Victimization Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Adults. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 945-951.
- Hill, C., & Dagnan, D. (2002). Helping, attributions, emotions and coping style in response to people with learning disabilities and challenging behaviour. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 6, 363-372.
- Hubert, W., & de Jong-Meyer, R. (1990). Psychophysiological response patterns to positive and negative film stimuli. *Biological Psychology*, 31, 73-93.
- Insch, G.S., Moore, J.E., & Murphy, L.D. (1997). Content analysis in leadership research: Examples, procedures, and suggestions for future use. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 1-25.

- Iyer, A., Leach, C.W., & Crosby, F.J. (2003). White guilt and racial compensation: The benefits and limits of self-focus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 117-129.
- Iyer, A. Leach, C.W., & Pederson, A. (2004). Racial wrongs and restitutions: The role of guilt and other group-based emotions. In NR Branscombe and B Doosje (Eds), *Collective guilt: International Perspectives*. (262-283). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaufmann, G., Drevland, B.C.B., Wessel, E., Overskied, G., & Magnussen, S. (2003). The importance of being earnest: Displayed emotions and witness credibility. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 17, 21-34.
- Kawakami, K., & Dion, K. (1992). The impact of salient self-identities on relative deprivation and action intentions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 525-540.
- Kawakami, K., & Dion, K. (1995). Social identity and affect as determinants of collective action: Toward an integration of relative deprivation and social identity theories. *Theory & Psychology*, 5, 551-577.
- Kiecolt-Glaser, J.K., Glaser, R., Shuttleworth, E.C., Dyer, C.S., Ogrocki, P., & Speicher, C.E. (1987). Chronic stress and immunity in family caregivers of Alzheimer's disease victims. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 49, 523-535.
- King, K. (2005) Why is Discrimination Stressful? The Mediating Role of Cognitive Appraisal. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*., 11, 202-212.

- Kirschbaum, C., Klauer, T., Filipp, S.H., & Hellhammer, D.H. (1995). Sex-specific effects of social support on cortisol and subjective responses to acute psychological stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 57, 23-31.
- Kivlighan, K.T., Granger, D.A., & Booth, A. (2005). *Gender differences in testosterone and cortisol response to competition*. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 30, 58-71.
- Krause, N., Liang, J., & Keith, V. (1990). Personality, social support, and psychological distress in later life. *Psychology and Aging*, 5, 315-326.
- Kudielka, B.M., Schommer, N.C., Hellhammer, D.H., & Kirschbaum, C. (2004). Acute HPA axis responses, heart rate and mood changes to psychosocial stress (TSST) in humans at different times of day. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 29, 983-992.
- Lazarus, R.S. (1999). *Stress and emotion: A new synthesis*. New York: Springer Pub. Co.
- Lazarus, R.S., & Folkman, S. (1984) *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.
- Lee, J.S., Koeske, G.F., & Sales, E. (2004). Social support buffering of acculturative stress: a study of mental health symptoms among Korean international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28, 399-414.
- Lee-Baggley, D., Preece, M., & DeLongis, A. (2005). Coping with interpersonal stress: role of big five traits. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 1141-80.
- Leibler, C.A., & Sandefur, G.D. (2002) Gender differences in the exchange of social support with friends, neighbors, and co-workers at midlife. *Social Science Research*, 31, 364-391.

- Lewis, M., & Ramsay, D. (2002). Cortisol response to embarrassment and shame. *Child Development*, 73, 1034-1045.
- Liebkind, K., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2000). The influence of experiences of Discrimination on psychological Stress: A comparison of Seven Immigrant Groups. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 10, 1-16.
- Lepore, S.J. (1992) Social Conflict, Social Support, and Psychological Distress: Evidence of Cross-Domain Buffering Effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 857-867.
- Lerner, J.S., Gonzalez, R.M., Dahl, R.E., Hariri, A.R., & Taylor, S.E. (2005). Facial expressions of emotion reveal neuroendocrine and cardiovascular stress responses. *Biological Psychiatry*, 58, 743-750.
- Lerner, J.S., Gonzalez, R.M., Small, D.A., & Fischhoff, B. (2003). Effects of fear and anger on perceived risks of terrorism: A national field experiment. *Psychological Science*, 14, 144-150.
- Lerner, J.S., & Keltner, D. (2001). Fear, anger, and risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 146-159.
- Lerner, J.S., Tiedens, L.Z., & Gonzalez, R.M. (2006). Portrait of the angry decision maker: How appraisal tendencies shape anger's influence on cognition. *Journal of Behavioural Decision Making*, 19, 115-137.
- Levine, S. (2000). Influence of psychological variables on the activity of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis. *European Journal of Pharmacology*, 405, 149-160.

- Levy, S.R., Freitas, A.L., & Salovey, P. (2002). Construing action abstractly and blurring social distinctions: Implications for perceiving homogeneity among, but also empathizing with and helping, Others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1224-1238.
- Lewis, M., & Ramsay, D. (2002). Cortisol response to embarrassment and shame. *Child Development*, 73, 1034-1045.
- Lickel, B., Schmader, T., & Barquissau, M. (2004). The evocation of moral emotions in intergroup contexts: The distinction between collective guilt and collective shame. In NR Branscombe and B Doosje (Eds), *Collective guilt: International Perspectives*. (35-55). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lottes, I.L. & Kuriloff, P.J. (1994). The impact of college experience on political and social attitudes. *Sex Roles*, 31, 31-54.
- Mackie, D.M., Devos, T., & Smith, E.R. (2000). Intergroup Emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 602-616.
- Mackie, D.M., & Smith, E.R. (2003). Intergroup emotions and the social self: prejudice reconceptualized as differentiated reactions to out-groups. In J.P. Forgas & K.D. Williams (Eds.) *The social self: Cognitive, interpersonal, and intergroup perspectives* (pp. 309-326 Philadelphia, PA.: Psychology Press.
- Major, B., Quinton, W.J., & Schmader, T. (2003). Attributions to discrimination and self-esteem: Impact of group identification and situational ambiguity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 220-231.

- Major, B., Richards, C., Cooper, M.L., Cozzarelli, C., & Zubek, J. (1998). Personal resilience, cognitive appraisals, and coping: an integrative model of adjustment to abortion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 735-52.
- Martin, M., & Westerhof, G.J. (2003) Do you need to have them or should you believe you have them? Resources, their appraisal, and well-being in adulthood. *Journal of Adult Development*, 10, 99-112.
- Martinez Garcia, M.F., Garcia Ramirez, M., & Maya Jariego, I. (2002). Social support and locus of control as predictors of psychological well-being in Moroccan and Peruvian immigrant women in Spain. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26, 287-310.
- Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2006). *Anger on the Flip-side: Shame Elicited by Discrimination in Relation to Coping and Neuroendocrine Responses*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Matheson, K., & Cole, B.M., (2004). Coping with a threatened group identity: Psychosocial and neuroendocrine responses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 777-786.
- Matud, M.P. (2004) Gender differences in stress and coping styles. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 1401-1415.
- Matud, M.P., Ibanez, I., Bethencourt, J.M., Marrero, R., & Carballeira, M. (2003) Structural gender differences in perceived social support. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 1919-1929.

- Mays, V.M., & Cochran, S.D. (2001). Mental Health Correlates of Perceived Discrimination among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health*, 91, 1869-1876.
- McEwen, B.S. (2002). Sex, stress and the hippocampus: Allostasis, allostatic load and the aging process. *Neurobiology of Aging*, 23, 921-939.
- Nejtek, V.A. (2002). High and low emotion events influence emotional stress perceptions and are associated with salivary cortisol response changes in a consecutive stress paradigm. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 27, 337-352.
- Neuendorf, K.A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Olf, M., Langeland, W., & Gersons, B.P.R. (2005). Effects of appraisal and coping on the neuroendocrine response to extreme stress. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 29, 457-467.
- Oppenheim Mason, K. & Lu, Y-H., (1988). Attitudes toward Women's Familial Roles: Changes in the United States, 1977-1985. *Gender and Society*, 2, 39-57.
- Oswald, P.A. (1996). The effects of cognitive and affective perspective taking on empathic concern and altruistic helping. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 136, 613-623.
- Oswald, P.A. (2000). Subtle sex biases in empathy and helping behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 87, 545-551.
- Oswald, P.A. (2002). The interactive effects of affective demeanor, cognitive processes, and perspective-taking focus on helping behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142, 120-132.

- Peacock, E.J., & Wong, P.T.P. (1996). Anticipatory Stress: The relation of locus of control, optimism, and control appraisals to coping. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 30, 204-222.
- Peters, R.M. (2004). Racism and Hypertension among African Americans. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 26, 612-631.
- Pianta, R.C. and Egeland, B. (1994) Relation Between Depressive Symptoms and Stressful Life Events in a Sample of Disadvantaged Mothers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 62, 1229-1234.
- Polk, D.E., Cohen, S., Doyle, W.J., Skoner, D.P., & Kirschbaum, C. (2005). State and trait affect as predictors of salivary cortisol in healthy adults. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 30, 261-272.
- Roy, M.P. (2004). Patterns of cortisol reactivity to laboratory stress. *Hormones and Behavior*, 46, 618 – 627.
- Schmidt-Reinwald, A., Pruessner, J.C., Hellhammer, D.H., Federenki, I., Rohleder, N., Schurmerer, T.H., et al. (1999). The cortisol response to awakening in relation to different challenge tests and a 12-hour cortisol rhythm. *Life Sciences*, 64, 1653-1660.
- Schmitt, M.T., & Branscombe, N.R. (2002). The causal loci of attributions to prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 620-628.
- Schmitt, M.T., Branscombe, N.R., & Postmes, T. (2003). *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 297-312.
- Sellers, R.M. & Shelton, J.N. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 1079-1092.

- Sgoifo, A., Braglia, F., Costoli, T., Musso, E., Meerlo, P., Ceresini, G., & Troisi, A. (2003). Cardiac autonomic reactivity and salivary cortisol in men and women exposed to social stressors: Relationship with individual ethological profile. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 27, 179-188.
- Shulkin, J. (Ed.). (2004). *Allostasis, Homeostasis, and the costs of physiological adaptation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smirles, K.E. (2004). Attributions of responsibility in cases of sexual harassment: The person and the situation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 342-365.
- Smith, C.A. & Ellsworth, P.C. (1987). Patterns of appraisal and emotion related to taking an exam. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 475-488.
- Smith, H.J., & Kessler, T. (2004). Group-based emotions and intergroup behavior: The case of relative deprivation. In L.Z. Tiedens & C.W. Leach (Eds.), *The social life of emotions* (pp. 314-335). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smyth, J.M., Ockenfels, M.C., Gorin, A.A., Catley, D., Porter, L.S., Kirschbaum, C., Hellhammer, D.H., & Stone, A.A. (1997). Individual Differences in the Diurnal Cycle of Cortisol. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 22, 89-105.
- Smyth, J.M., Ockenfels, M.C., Porter, L., Kirschbaum, C., Hellhammer, D.H., & Stone, A.A. (1998). Stressors and mood measured on a momentary basis are associated with salivary cortisol. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 23, 353-373.
- Stanton, A.L., & Snider, P.R. (1993). Coping with a breast cancer diagnosis: A prospective study. *Health Psychology*, 12, 16-23.
- Stephan, W.G., & Finlay, K. (1999). The role of empathy in improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 729-743.

- Strunin, L. (2001). Assessing alcohol consumption: developments from qualitative research methods. *Social Science and Medicine*, 53, 215-226.
- Sutoo, D., & Akiyama, K. (2002). Neurochemical changes in mice following physical or psychological stress exposures. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 134, 347-354.
- Tafet, G.E., & Bernardini, R. (2003). Psychoneuroendocrinological links between chronic stress and depression. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology & Biological Psychiatry*, 27, 893-903.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp.33-48). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tangney, J.P., Wagner, P.E., Hill-Barlow, D., Marschall, D.E., & Gramzow, R. Relation of shame and guilt to constructive versus destructive responses to anger across the lifespan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 797-809.
- Taylor, S., Cousino Klein, L., Lewis, B.P., Bruenewals, T.L., Gurung, R.A.R., & Updegraff, J.A., (2000). Biobehavioral Responses to Stress in Females: Tend-and-Befriend, Not Fight-or-Flight. *Psychological Review*, 107, 411-429.
- Thompson, H.S., Kamarck, T.W., & Manuck, S.B. (2002). The association between racial identity and hypertension in African-American adults: Elevated resting and ambulatory blood pressure as outcomes. *Ethnicity and Disease*, 12, 20-28.
- Tiraboschi, M., & Maass, A. (1998). Reactions to perceived deprivation in ingroup and outgroup: A cross-cultural comparison. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 403-421.

- Tomaka, J. & Blascovich, J. (1994). Effects of Justice Beliefs on Cognitive Appraisal of and Subjective, Physiological, and Behavioral Responses to Potential Stress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 732-740.
- Tracy, J.L., & Robins, R.W. (2004). Putting the self into self-conscious emotions: A theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 103-125.
- Troxel, W.M., Matthews, K.A., Bromberger, J.T., & Sutton-Tyrrell, K. (2003) Chronic Stress Burden, Discrimination, and Subclinical Carotid Artery Disease in African American and Caucasian Women. *Health Psychology*, 22, 300-309.
- Underwood, B., & Moore, B. (1982). Perspective-taking and altruism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, 143-173.
- Vanman, E.J., & Miller, N. (1993). Applications of emotion theory and research to stereotyping and intergroup relations. In DM Mackie & DL Hamilton (Eds.) *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 213-238). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.
- Vrij, A. & Fisher, A. (1997). The role of displays of emotions and ethnicity in judgements of rape victims. *International Review of Victimology*, 4, 255-265.
- Walker, I., & Pettigrew, T.F. (1984). Relative deprivation theory: An overview and conceptual critique. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 301-310.
- Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Tellegan, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.

- Wright, S.C., Taylor, D.M., & Moghaddam, F.M. (1990). Responding to membership in a disadvantaged group: From acceptance to collective protest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 994-1003.
- Yee, J.L., & Greenberg, M.S. (1998). Reactions to crime victims: Effects of victims' emotional state and type of relationship. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 17, 209-226.
- Yehuda, R., Halligan, S.L., & Bierer, L.M. (2001). Relationship of parental trauma exposure and PTSD to PTSD, depressive and anxiety disorders in offspring. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 35, 261-270.
- Yehuda, R., Schmeidler, J., Giller, E.L., Siever, L.J., & Binder-Byrnes, K. (1998). Relationship between posttraumatic stress disorder characteristics of holocaust survivors and their adult offspring. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 155, 841-843.
- Yoshida, T., Umekawa, T., Sakane, N., Yoshimoto, K., & Kondo, M. (1995). Effects of nicotine on norepinephrine turnover of mice subjected to emotional stress. *Pathophysiology*, 2, 205-210.
- Yzerbyt, V., Dumont, M., Wigboldus, D., & Gordijn, E. (2003). I feel for us: the impact of categorization and identification on emotions and action tendencies. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 533-549.
- Yzerbyt, V., Dumont, M., Gordijn, E., & Wigboldus, D. (2002). Intergroup emotions and self-categorization: The impact of perspective-taking on reactions to victims of harmful behavior. In DM Mackie, & ER Smith (Eds.) *From prejudice to intergroup emotions*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Zimmerman, M.A., & Rappaport, J. (1988). Citizen participation, perceived control, and psychological empowerment. *American Journal of community Psychology*, 16, 725-750.

Reactions to Student Scenarios

A study sponsored by

The Centre for Research
On Stress, Coping and Well Being

Ottawa, Ontario

©2005

APPENDIX A

Informed Consent

The purpose of an informed consent is to ensure that you understand the purpose of the study and the nature of your involvement. The informed consent has to provide sufficient information such that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study.

Study Title: Reactions to student scenarios.

Research Personnel: The following people are involved in this research and may be contacted at any time if you have any questions about the project, what it means, or concerns about how it was conducted:

Kelly Carroll, Researcher, Department of Psychology, (613) 520-2600 ext. 2683

Kate Raspopow, Researcher, Department of Psychology, (613) 520-2600 ext. 2683

Dr. Kim Matheson, Faculty Member, Department of Psychology, (613) 520-2684

If you have any ethical concerns about how this study was conducted, please contact either of the following

Dr. C. Davis, Chair of the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee for Psychological Research, (613) 520-2600, ext. 2251

Dr. M. Gick, Acting Chair, Dept. of Psychology, Carleton University, (613) 520-2648

Purpose and Task Requirements: Students find themselves in a variety of social situations, some of which are more stressful than others. We are interested in your reactions to some of these situations. You'll be asked to listen to an audiotape of a conversation in which a student describes his or her experience, and to provide your reaction to it. We will also be asking you some personal questions about yourself. One of our measures involves a brief group-based interview with the experimenter, and we will be asking for your permission to audiotape this part of the experimental session. Finally, as one's own stress can affect reactions to the experiences of others, we will also be asking you to provide 5 saliva samples from which we can extract stress hormones. This study will take about 2 hours, and you will receive 2 course credits, OR 1 course credit and \$10 OR \$20 for your participation.

Potential Risk and Discomfort: There are no physical risks in this study. Some individuals may experience discomfort when asked to respond to personal, sensitive questions, or listening to a stressful experience.

Anonymity/Confidentiality: The data collected in this study will be kept anonymous and confidential. Your informed consent form will be separated from your questionnaire and kept in a separate and secured file by one of the research investigators. A code placed

on your written measures will be used to match your responses with the physiological measures and the taped interview.

Right to Withdraw: Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. At any point during the study you have the right to choose to not answer any questions, or to withdraw entirely without penalty.

I have read the above description of the study concerning students' experiences. The data collected will be used in research publications and/or for teaching purposes. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the study, and this in no way constitutes a waiver of my rights.

Full Name (please print): _____

Signatures:

Participant: _____ Researcher: _____

Date: _____ Date: _____

Please check here whether or not you consent to audiotaping about 10 min of the experimental session, during which you will be briefly interviewed about your response to the student in the situation you listen to:

I agree to be audiotaped _____ ; I do NOT agree to be audiotaped _____

APPENDIX B

Background information

Please take a few moments to complete some background information about yourself.

Sex: _____

Age: _____

Academic Major (i.e. Psychology, Sociology, Biology, etc.): _____

What is your first language? _____

What is your religion, if any? _____

What is your ethnic/racial background? _____

What is your relationship status? (please check the one that applies best to you)

_____ Single, and not seeing anyone

_____ Am going out with someone

_____ Am living with or married to an intimate other

_____ Have recently broken up

Is your current (or most recent) partner: Male _____ OR Female _____?

Please indicate how many siblings you have: Brothers _____ ; Sisters

The following questions are important for our analysis of stress hormones:

What time did you wake up this morning? _____

Are you currently being treated for any physical condition?

No _____ Yes _____ If yes, please specify _____

Are you on any of the following medications (please check all that apply)

_____ Birth control pill
_____ Anti-inflammatories (please specify) _____
_____ Anti-depressants (please specify) _____
_____ Anti-anxieties (please specify) _____
_____ Other prescription drugs (please specify) _____

APPENDIX C

Identity

Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements below on a scale of 0 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) in terms of how you feel in relation to others who are the same sex as you (i.e., males complete this in relation to how they feel about being men, and females complete it in relation to how they feel about being women).

1) I have a lot in common with other [women OR men].

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

2) I often think about the fact that I am a [woman OR man].

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

3) In general, I'm glad to be a [woman OR man].

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

4) The fact that I am a [woman OR man] rarely enters my mind.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

5) Generally, I feel good when I think about myself as being a [woman OR man].

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

6) I feel strong ties to other [women OR men].

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

7) I often regret that I am a [woman OR man].

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

8) Overall, being a [woman OR man] has very little to do with how I feel about myself.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

9) I don't feel good about being a [woman OR man].

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

10) I find it difficult to form a bond with other [women OR men].

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

11) In general, being a [woman OR man] is an important part of my self-image.

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

12) I don't feel a sense of being "connected" with other [women OR men].

Strongly Disagree 0 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

APPENDIX D

Sexual Discrimination Scenario Neutral

C = Academic counsellor J = Student (Julie)

C: Hi Julie, come on in.

J: Hi, how are you?

C: Fine, thanks, and you?

J: Oh...alright I guess.

C: So...what can I do for you today?

J: Well... last term, I decided to drop out of my psychology class and now I am short a credit for this year. I just wanted to get some advice about what I should do.

C: Ok. Maybe we should first discuss why you chose to drop the class and we can go from there.

J: Sure. But it's somewhat hard to talk about. The whole thing was just so embarrassing. Lets just say that it wasn't because I didn't enjoy the course material, and the professor was ok. He was pretty new, but he was a greater lecturer. I actually thought that I would do quite well in the class.

C: Oh...so what happened? Would you like to talk about it?

J: Well...I was having problems with some of the guys in the class.

C: What kind of problems?

J: It's a long story...I don't even know where to start. I can't believe I even let it happen to me.

C: Ok. How about you start from the beginning?

J: Alright. There were these three guys in my Psych. class who sat next to me. One of the guys seemed quite nice and we used to chat at the beginning of every class. There didn't seem to be anything weird about him. We'd just talk about things happening on campus, places to go in Ottawa. We both like biking, so we'd talk about new paths. That sort of stuff. Anyway, a couple of weeks into the course, he asked to borrow my notes because he missed the last 2 classes because he was sick. I didn't mind. Our class wasn't the ITV section, and the professor already told us that he wanted us to get our notes from each other if we missed anything because he didn't have them on the web yet, and couldn't give them to some students without giving them to everyone. So I agreed, but I told him that I would like to get them back at the next class, because we had our midterm coming up and I would need them. That's when things started to get really weird.

C: How so?

J: Well...when I saw him in class, he claimed that he had forgotten my notes. He was all-apologetic and suggested that we get together for lunch and he would buy to make up for it. He said he'd return my notes then. His buddies were listening and they started snickering and hooting. I don't particularly like his friends. Even though I didn't mind him, they seemed pretty crude to me. They used to talk about their Saturday night 'lay', and how the girl never knew what happened, but if she did how great a time she'd have. They'd say these things loud enough that I knew they were trying to impress me. It was kind of humiliating that they would think that I'd be interested. I actually found them a

bit scary. So when they started up about this guy asking me to lunch, I felt pretty uncomfortable, so I said no. But, I did suggest that we grab a coffee at the library and I'd get them then.

C: What happened next?

J: Well...the next day we met at the library as planned, and guess what? He forgot the notes again! I was a little confused ...I mean that was the only reason we were supposed to meet. Anyway...he said he didn't live far, so we should just go back to his place and pick them up. A red flag went up and I started to question his motives. I wasn't that naive. Who hasn't heard this line before. So, I said no...that I would wait till next class.

C: How did he respond to that?

J: At first, he didn't seem too bothered. He insisted on buying me a coffee. I think he thought that he would actually convince me to go back home with him. But, when I made it clear that I wasn't comfortable with the idea and that he wasn't going to change my mind, he became really frustrated with me.

C: How so?

J: He just wouldn't let it go...asking why...what else did I have to do...did I not trust him. His behaviour was really starting to creep me out...so I just told him that I would wait till next class.

C: What did he say?

J: He just said something really crude, I can hardly say it. He got up and said loud enough that everyone around could hear, "fine...you're such a cock-tease" and then walked away. Everyone around was looking at me. I should have known better than to stay for coffee with him.

C: So...did things end there?

J: No, not at all. He started emailing me a couple of times and day...saying that he was sorry about the way he acted, but he still wanted to meet with me. He said that he really liked me and wanted to get to know me better. He even got his friends to send me emails telling me that I wasn't giving the guy a chance, that I was too uptight. They'd say stupid things like 'Chicks like you cheap, and you should get it while you can'. It all started to really freak me out! At first, ignored them...in hopes that they would stop bugging me. But, I soon realized that was wishful thinking, so I finally responded back and told him that I wasn't interested. I told him to forget about the notes...that I would just borrow someone else's.

C: Did he continue to email you?

J: Yeah. In one email he sent me, he wrote, "I really thought that you liked me...at least that's how you acted in class. If you weren't interested, you shouldn't have kept coming on to me." He even made comments about the way I dressed – he said my skirts were so short that how could I not expect a guy to think I was wanting it! I couldn't believe the things that I was reading...I never gave him any reason to think that I wanted to go out with him. Before class started, we would just talk about normal, everyday things...I was just being friendly...not any different from the way I normally act. As soon as I started to suspect that he wanted more from me I made it clear that I wasn't interested in him that way.

C: How did he react towards you in class?

K: Well...I found another place to sit.... far away from him and his buddies! But...after class, he caught up with me and demanded to know what was wrong with me and why I was ignoring him. I told him to leave me alone...that he was crossing the line. His friends were with him and they started making rude comments. They said, "We don't like girls like you...girls who lead guys on." They kept asking what was wrong with me...why I didn't like him. They even asked me if I was a lesbian! Thankfully, my bus came and I was able to get away from them. On the way home, I felt pretty stressed. That night...I couldn't sleep...I decided to skip the next class.

C: Did you tell anyone else about this?

J: I told my brother about it. But he wasn't any help. He figured it was just guys acting like guys, and that I was just being paranoid. He told me that I was acting like a victim, and that if I really wanted them to stop giving me a hard time, I should get a sense of humour and joke back at them. He just didn't see what I was so uptight about.

C: What about the professor? Did you say anything to him?

J: I sent him an email. But I was really disappointed in his response - he wasn't at all helpful. I didn't tell him all of the details. I just said that these guys were making me uncomfortable, and that I had lent one of them my notes and he wouldn't return them. I asked if it would be possible to get a copy of his lecture notes and gave him the dates.

C: Did he respond?

J: Yeah. He said that if he gave his notes out to every girl who couldn't stand up for herself, he might as well post them in the university newspaper. His 'bit of advice' was pretty much like my brother's. If I can't handle guys in the classroom, then I should consider doing something else, maybe becoming a kindergarten teacher. I couldn't believe he said this. He seemed to be such an ok professor in class!

C: So, was that when you decided to drop the class?

J: No...I convinced myself to go to the next one.... to see how things went. I really enjoyed the lectures and I didn't want to let these guys control my life. I thought that maybe things would cool down and that they would leave me alone.

C: How did it turn out?

J: Terrible. Again, I sat at the opposite side of the room. But, this time they had the nerve to sit behind me and whisper comments about me. You know, part of what upset me is that other people could hear these things, but they all just looked at me like if I didn't fight back it must be true. But how can you fight these kinds of stupid comments.

C: What did they say?

J: Well...pretty much everything they said before and more. They said, that I was boring and "I was like all the other girls...just a tease who enjoys leading men on." They said that I should wear a sign on my back that read "not interested in guys". I couldn't concentrate, so at the break I decided to drop the class...there was no point to going back in there.

C: I see. So now we have to figure out where you can go from here.

Sexual Discrimination Scenario Shame

C = Academic counsellor J = Student (Julie)

C: Hi Julie, come on in.

J: Hi, how are you?

C: Fine, thanks, and you?

J: Oh...alright I guess.

C: So...what can I do for you today?

J: Well... last term, I decided to drop out of my psychology class and now I am short a credit for this year. I just wanted to get some advice about what I should do.

C: Ok. Maybe we should first discuss why you chose to drop the class and we can go from there.

J: Sure. But it's somewhat hard to talk about. The whole thing was just so embarrassing. Lets just say that it wasn't because I didn't enjoy the course material, and the professor was ok. He was pretty new, but he was a greater lecturer. I actually thought that I would do quite well in the class.

C: Oh...so what happened? Would you like to talk about it?

J: Well...I was having problems with some of the guys in the class.

C: What kind of problems?

J: It's a long story...I don't even know where to start. I can't believe I even let it happen to me.

C: Ok. How about you start from the beginning?

J: Alright. There were these three guys in my Psych. class who sat next to me. One of the guys seemed quite nice and we used to chat at the beginning of every class. There didn't seem to be anything weird about him. We'd just talk about things happening on campus, places to go in Ottawa. We both like biking, so we'd talk about new paths. That sort of stuff. Anyway, a couple of weeks into the course, he asked to borrow my notes because he missed the last 2 classes because he was sick. I didn't mind. Our class wasn't the ITV section, and the professor already told us that he wanted us to get our notes from each other if we missed anything because he didn't have them on the web yet, and couldn't give them to some students without giving them to everyone. So I agreed, but I told him that I would like to get them back at the next class, because we had our midterm coming up and I would need them. That's when things started to get really weird.

C: How so?

J: Well...when I saw him in class, he claimed that he had forgotten my notes. He was all-apologetic and suggested that we get together for lunch and he would buy to make up for it. He said he'd return my notes then. His buddies were listening and they started snickering and hooting. I don't particularly like his friends. Even though I didn't mind him, they seemed pretty crude to me. They used to talk about their Saturday night 'lay', and how the girl never knew what happened, but if she did how great a time she'd have. They'd say these things loud enough that I knew they were trying to impress me. It was kind of humiliating that they would think that I'd be interested. I actually found them a bit scary. So when they started up about this guy asking me to lunch, I felt pretty

uncomfortable, so I said no. But, I did suggest that we grab a coffee at the library and I'd get them then.

C: What happened next?

J: Well...the next day we met at the library as planned, and guess what? He forgot the notes again! I was a little confused, **and kind of upset**...I mean that was the only reason we were supposed to meet. Anyway...he said he didn't live far, so we should just go back to his place and pick them up. A red flag went up and I started to question his motives. **I was starting to be a bit frightened of him.** So, I said no...that I would wait till next class.

C: How did he respond to that?

J: At first, he didn't seem too bothered. He insisted on buying me a coffee. I think he thought that he would actually convince me to go back home with him. But, when I made it clear that I wasn't comfortable with the idea and that he wasn't going to change my mind, he became really frustrated with me.

C: How so?

J: He just wouldn't let it go...asking why...what else did I have to do...did I not trust him. His behaviour was really starting to creep me out...so I just told him that I would wait till next class.

C: What did he say?

J: He just said something really crude, I can hardly say it. He got up and said loud enough that everyone around could hear, "fine...you're such a cock-tease" and then walked away. Everyone around was looking at me, **it was just sooo embarrassing.** I should have known better than to stay for coffee with him. **I felt like crying. I could hardly bring myself to stand up to walk out of there, I felt so ashamed.**

C: So...did things end there?

J: No, not at all. He started emailing me a couple of times and day...saying that he was sorry about the way he acted, but he still wanted to meet with me. He said that he really liked me and wanted to get to know me better. He even got his friends to send me emails telling me that I wasn't giving the guy a chance, that I was too uptight. They'd say stupid things like 'Chicks like you are cheap, and you should get it while you can'. It all started to really freak me out! At first, **I really tried to just ignore them**...in hopes that they would stop bugging me. **I just wanted them to go away and leave me alone.** But, I soon realized that was wishful thinking, so I finally responded back and told him that I wasn't interested. I told him to forget about the notes...that I would just borrow someone else's.

C: Did he continue to email you?

J: Yeah. In one email he sent me, he wrote, "I really thought that you liked me...at least that's how you acted in class. If you weren't interested, you shouldn't have kept coming on to me." He even made comments about the way I dressed – he said my skirts were so short that how could I not expect a guy to think I was wanting it! I couldn't believe the things that I was reading...I never gave him any reason to think that I wanted to go out with him. **I was really upset, and kept trying to think of what I should have done differently, and what I might have done to give him the wrong impression.** Before class started, we would just talk about normal, everyday things...I was just being

friendly...not any different from the way I normally act. As soon as I started to suspect that he wanted more from me I made it clear that I wasn't interested in him that way.

C: How did he react towards you in class?

K: Well...I found another place to sit.... far away from him and his buddies! **I just couldn't face them.** But...after class, he caught up with me and demanded to know what was wrong with me and why I was ignoring him. I told him to leave me alone...that he was crossing the line...you know...he was really beginning to scare me. His friends were with him and they started making rude comments. They said, "We don't like girls like you...girls who lead guys on." They kept asking what was wrong with me...why I didn't like him. They even asked me if I was a lesbian! Thankfully, my bus came and I was able to get away from them. On the way home, **I felt sick. That night...I couldn't sleep...I was so upset and worried,** I decided to skip the next class.

C: Did you tell anyone else about this?

J: I told my brother about it. But he wasn't any help. He figured it was just guys acting like guys, and that I was just being paranoid. He told me that I was acting like a victim, and that if I really wanted them to stop giving me a hard time, I should get a sense of humour and joke back at them. He just didn't see what I was so uptight about. **After talking to him, I felt even more humiliated that I wasn't able to stand up for myself.**

C: What about the professor? Did you say anything to him?

J: I sent him an email. But I was really disappointed in his response - he wasn't at all helpful. I didn't tell him all of the details. I just said that these guys were making me uncomfortable, and that I had lent one of them my notes and he wouldn't return them. I asked if it would be possible to get a copy of his lecture notes and gave him the dates.

C: Did he respond?

J: Yeah. He said that if he gave his notes out to every girl who couldn't stand up for herself, he might as well post them in the university newspaper. His 'bit of advice' was pretty much like my brother's. If I can't handle guys in the classroom, then I should consider doing something else, maybe becoming a kindergarten teacher. I couldn't believe he said this. **It was like a slap in the face.** He seemed to be such an ok professor in class!

C: So, was that when you decided to drop the class?

J: No...I convinced myself to go to the next one.... to see how things went. I really enjoyed the lectures and I didn't want to let these guys control my life. I thought that maybe things would cool down and that they would leave me alone. **It wasn't easy though – I couldn't even eat that day because my stomach was in knots. I just dreaded it.**

C: How did it turn out?

J: Terrible. Again, I sat at the opposite side of the room. But, this time they had the nerve to sit behind me and whisper comments about me. You know, part of what upset me is that other people could hear these things, but they all just looked at me like if I didn't fight back it must be true. But how can you fight these kinds of stupid comments. **What can you say that isn't going to make them come back at you twice as much?**

C: What did they say?

J: Well...pretty much everything they said before and more. They said, that I was boring and “I was like all the other girls...just a tease who enjoys leading men on.” They said that I should wear a sign on my back that read “not interested in guys”. **I felt totally humiliated and couldn’t concentrate. I felt as though I was going to start crying in the middle of class! I didn’t know what to do**, so at the break I decided to drop the class...I couldn’t bring myself to go back in there.

C: I see. So now we have to figure out where you can go from here.

Sexual Discrimination Scenario

Anger

C = Academic counsellor J = Student (Julie)

C: Hi Julie, come on in.

J: Hi, how are you?

C: Fine, thanks, and you?

J: Oh...alright I guess.

C: So...what can I do for you today?

J: Well... last term, I decided to drop out of my psychology class and now I am short a credit for this year. I just wanted to get some advice about what I should do.

C: Ok. Maybe we should first discuss why you chose to drop the class and we can go from there.

J: Sure. But it's somewhat hard to talk about. The whole thing was just so embarrassing. Lets just say that it wasn't because I didn't enjoy the course material, and the professor was ok. He was pretty new, but he was a greater lecturer. I actually thought that I would do quite well in the class.

C: Oh...so what happened? Would you like to talk about it?

J: Well...I was having problems with some of the guys in the class.

C: What kind of problems?

J: It's a long story...I don't even know where to start. I can't believe I even let it happen to me.

C: Ok. How about you start from the beginning?

J: Alright. There were these three guys in my Psych. class who sat next to me. One of the guys seemed quite nice and we used to chat at the beginning of every class. There didn't seem to be anything weird about him. We'd just talk about things happening on campus, places to go in Ottawa. We both like biking, so we'd talk about new paths. That sort of stuff. Anyway, a couple of weeks into the course, he asked to borrow my notes because he missed the last 2 classes because he was sick. I didn't mind. Our class wasn't the ITV section, and the professor already told us that he wanted us to get our notes from each other if we missed anything because he didn't have them on the web yet, and couldn't give them to some students without giving them to everyone. So I agreed, but I told him that I would like to get them back at the next class, because we had our midterm coming up and I would need them. That's when things started to get really weird.

C: How so?

J: Well...when I saw him in class, he claimed that he had forgotten my notes. He was all-apologetic and suggested that we get together for lunch and he would buy to make up for it. He said he'd return my notes then. His buddies were listening and they started snickering and hooting. I don't particularly like his friends. Even though I didn't mind him, they seemed pretty crude to me. They used to talk about their Saturday night 'lay', and how the girl never knew what happened, but if she did how great a time she'd have. They'd say these things loud enough that I knew they were trying to impress me. It was kind of humiliating that they would think that I'd be interested. I actually found them a bit scary. So when they started up about this guy asking me to lunch, I felt pretty

uncomfortable, so I said no. But, I did suggest that we grab a coffee at the library and I'd get them then.

C: What happened next?

J: Well...the next day we met at the library as planned, and guess what? He forgot the notes again! I was a little confused, **and kind of ticked**...I mean that was the only reason we were supposed to meet. Anyway...he said he didn't live far, so we should just go back to his place and pick them up. A red flag went up and I started to question his motives. **I was starting to get pretty irritated with him.** So, I said no...that I would wait till next class.

C: How did he respond to that?

J: At first, he didn't seem too bothered. He insisted on buying me a coffee. I think he thought that he would actually convince me to go back home with him. But, when I made it clear that I wasn't comfortable with the idea and that he wasn't going to change my mind, he became really frustrated with me.

C: How so?

J: He just wouldn't let it go...asking why...what else did I have to do...did I not trust him. His behaviour was really starting to creep me out...so I just told him that I would wait till next class.

C: What did he say?

J: He just said something really crude, I can hardly say it. He got up and said loud enough that everyone around could hear, "fine...you're such a cock-tease" and then walked away. Everyone around was looking at me, **I was enraged.** I should have known better than to stay for coffee with him. **I felt so angry. I could hardly bring myself to stand up to walk out of there, I was so mad.**

C: So...did things end there?

J: No, not at all. He started emailing me a couple of times and day...saying that he was sorry about the way he acted, but he still wanted to meet with me. He said that he really liked me and wanted to get to know me better. He even got his friends to send me emails telling me that I wasn't giving the guy a chance, that I was too uptight. They'd say stupid things like 'Chicks like you cheap, and you should get it while you can'. It all started to really freak me out! At first, **I really tried to just ignore them**...in hopes that they would stop bugging me. **If they kept it up, I was going to lose my cool, and who needs it.** But, I soon realized that was wishful thinking, so I finally responded back and told him that I wasn't interested. I told him to forget about the notes...that I would just borrow someone else's.

C: Did he continue to email you?

J: Yeah. In one email he sent me, he wrote, "I really thought that you liked me...at least that's how you acted in class. If you weren't interested, you shouldn't have kept coming on to me." He even made comments about the way I dressed – he said my skirts were so short that how could I not expect a guy to think I was wanting it! I couldn't believe the things that I was reading...I never gave him any reason to think that I wanted to go out with him. **I was fit to be tied I was so mad. I started trying to think of ways to give this guy some of his own – who did he think he was that he could pull this number.** Before class started, we would just talk about normal, everyday things...I was just being

friendly...not any different from the way I normally act. As soon as I started to suspect that he wanted more from me I made it clear that I wasn't interested in him that way.

C: How did he react towards you in class?

K: Well...I found another place to sit.... far away from him and his buddies! **I just couldn't stomach them, and didn't want to blow in class.** But...after class, he caught up with me and demanded to know what was wrong with me and why I was ignoring him. I told him to leave me alone...that he was crossing the line...you know...he was really beginning to scare me. His friends were with him and they started making rude comments. They said, "We don't like girls like you...girls who lead guys on." They kept asking what was wrong with me...why I didn't like him. They even asked me if I was a lesbian! Thankfully, my bus came and I was able to get away from them. **I thought I was going to lose it. That night...I couldn't sleep...I was so angry I couldn't stop thinking about what jerks they were and how I could get them back.** So, I decided to skip the next class.

C: Did you tell anyone else about this?

J: I told my brother about it. But he wasn't any help. He figured it was just guys acting like guys, and that I was just being paranoid. He told me that I was acting like a victim, and that if I really wanted them to stop giving me a hard time, I should get a sense of humour and joke back at them. He just didn't see what I was so uptight about. **After talking to him, I was even more disgusted. Guys really stick together.**

C: What about the professor? Did you say anything to him?

J: I sent him an email. But I was really disappointed in his response - he wasn't at all helpful. I didn't tell him all of the details. I just said that these guys were making me uncomfortable, and that I had lent one of them my notes and he wouldn't return them. I asked if it would be possible to get a copy of his lecture notes and gave him the dates.

C: Did he respond?

J: Yeah. He said that if he gave his notes out to every girl who couldn't stand up for herself, he might as well post them in the university newspaper. His 'bit of advice' was pretty much like my brother's. If I can't handle guys in the classroom, then I should consider doing something else, maybe becoming a kindergarten teacher. I couldn't believe he said this. **He was no better than the rest.** He seemed to be such an ok professor in class!

C: So, was that when you decided to drop the class?

J: No...I convinced myself to go to the next one.... to see how things went. I really enjoyed the lectures and I didn't want to let these guys control my life. I thought that maybe things would cool down and that they would leave me alone. **It wasn't easy though - I was pretty ticked, but trying to keep from lashing out. I would have loved to confront them, but they weren't worth the ongoing battle that would come of it.**

C: How did it turn out?

J: Terrible. Again, I sat at the opposite side of the room. But, this time they had the nerve to sit behind me and whisper comments about me. You know, part of what upset me is that other people could hear these things, but they all just looked at me like if I didn't fight back it must be true. But how can you fight these kinds of stupid comments.

What can you say that isn't going to make you look like the bitch? I wasn't going to give them that satisfaction.

C: What did they say?

J: Well...pretty much everything they said before and more. They said, that I was boring and "I was like all the other girls...just a tease who enjoys leading men on." They said that I should wear a sign on my back that read "not interested in guys". **I was shaking with anger and couldn't concentrate. I was on the verge of turning and yelling at the guy in the middle of class!** So at the break I decided to drop the class...I just knew that I couldn't go back in there. **If I wanted to deal with him, it would have to be somewhere other than the classroom.**

C: I see. So now we have to figure out where you can go from here.

Sexual Conflict Scenario
Neutral

C = Academic counsellor J = Student (Julie)

C: Hi Julie, come on in.

J: Hi, how are you?

C: Fine, thanks, and you?

J: Oh...alright I guess.

C: So...what can I do for you today?

J: Well... last term, I decided to drop out of my psychology class and now I am short a credit for this year. I just wanted to get some advice about what I should do.

C: Ok. Maybe we should first discuss why you chose to drop the class and we can go from there.

J: Sure. But it's somewhat hard to talk about. The whole thing was just so embarrassing. Lets just say that it wasn't because I didn't enjoy the course material, and the professor was ok. He was pretty new, but he was a greater lecturer. I actually thought that I would do quite well in the class.

C: Oh...so what happened? Would you like to talk about it?

J: Well...I was having problems with some of the other students in the class.

C: What kind of problems?

J: It's a long story...I don't even know where to start. I can't believe it got so out of hand.

C: Ok. How about you start from the beginning?

J: Alright. The Psychology class is a really big one – it wasn't the ITV section or anything, but it was still a huge class. So the professor suggested that students learn to help each other out by setting up study groups. He also already told us that he wanted us to get our notes from each other if we missed anything because he didn't have them on the web yet, and couldn't give them to some students without giving them to everyone. So it all seemed like a pretty good idea. I also really wanted to do this because a lot of the course is about biological stuff and I hadn't taken Biology in high school after grade 10 – so I was just dreading that part. Well this is all easy enough if you know people, but a lot of us don't know other students in the class in our first year. So I asked some other students who usually sat near me if I could join them to set up our own group. There were 5 of us, and at first it seemed like a pretty good group. We all got along. We'd meet once a week at the Starbucks in the library, so it was pretty cool. Sometimes when we were done going over stuff, we'd just hang for a bit and talk about things happening on campus, places to go in Ottawa. Some of us like biking, so we'd talk about new paths. That sort of stuff. Anyway, a couple of weeks into the course, the biology stuff started, and it was actually not so bad. At least not for me – I was actually getting it. But that's when the problems started.

C: How so?

J: Well...I got it, but one of the other guys in my group really didn't. We all tried to explain it to him, but you know, some people just don't understand that stuff. He asked if he could pay me to tutor him through the stuff. I didn't really have time for this, and so instead I volunteered to lend him my notes, because I knew they were pretty clear - I was

the best note-taker of our group, and between them and the text, he should have got it. Even though I didn't mind helping him during our study groups, I was just too busy outside of that. I should have known better than to let him take my notes away though, because then he had something of mine that I needed. At the next class, he didn't bring them. He suggested that we get together for coffee the next day, and he'd return my notes then.

C: What happened next?

J: Well...the next day we met at the library as planned, and guess what? He forgot the notes again! I was a little confused ...I mean that was the only reason we were supposed to meet. Anyway...he said as long as we were there, would I be willing to help him with some questions he had about the stuff. Amazing – he had his list of questions, but just happened to forget my notes. He said he was sure it would only take him about 30 min, if that would be ok. But, I said no...I didn't have time for this, and could he please just bring my notes to the next class.

C: How did he respond to that?

J: At first he seemed ok. I think he was really trying to get me to like him, so that I'd help him out. But, when I made it clear that I didn't have time for his games, that I had other commitments and things to do, he got really rude.

C: How so?

J: Well, he started to get really loud – right there in the library. He just wouldn't let it go...asking why...what kind of person was I. He new I was dreading the biological stuff at first, and now that I got it, and he didn't, I couldn't be bothered helping out. His reaction was really starting to freak me out...so I just told him that I would see him next class.

C: What did he say?

J: He almost yelled, "fine...you obviously think you're too good for the rest of us" and then walked away. Everyone around was looking at me. I should have known better than to meet him.

C: So...did things end there?

J: No, not at all. He started emailing me a couple of times and day...saying that he was sorry about the way he acted, but he still hoped that I'd help out at the study group sessions. He realized that I was busy and that people have other things to do, and if he needed extra help, it was up to him to go see the prof. But maybe if we talked about this stuff more at the study group, he'd get it. He was so persistent; it was like he was obsessed. He even got the other members of our group to send me emails telling me that I wasn't being very helpful, and that my attitude really sucked. At first, I ignored these emails...in hopes that they would stop bugging me. But, I soon realized that was wishful thinking, so I finally responded back and told him thanks, but I wasn't going to be able to go to the next group, and I'd just get the notes I lent him from someone else.

C: Did he continue to email you?

J: Yeah. In one email he sent me, he wrote, "I really thought that you were smart, and that you like working with us and teaching people. I wish you would just give me a chance." He said I was obviously just acting that I liked helping people, when all I seemed to want to do was figure out what I could get from them. But I do like helping

people. I want to be a teacher someday, and that was one of the reasons I'd actually been enjoying the study group. But this guy was just over the top. Helping people is one thing, but he was really being manipulative.

C: How did he react towards you in class?

J: Well...I found another place to sit.... far away from him and from the rest of my study group too! But...after class, he caught up with me and demanded to know what was wrong with me and why I was ignoring him. I told him to leave me alone...that he was crossing the line. The rest of my study group was there, and they were actually pretty rude. They said, "We don't like people like you – take what you can, but don't give anything in return." They made remarks like "it was no wonder teachers got such a bad rap, with people like you thinking that you're good at teaching." Thankfully, my bus came and I was able to get away from them. On the way home, **I was pretty stressed. That night, I couldn't sleep...** I decided to skip the next class.

C: Did you tell anyone else about this?

J: I told my brother about it. But he wasn't any help. He figured that this was the kind of thing that always happened in study groups ... one person finds things easy and another doesn't and gets frustrated. I was just being too sensitive. He told me that if I really wanted them to stop giving me a hard time, I should get a sense of humour and lighten up. He just didn't see what I was so uptight about.

C: What about the professor? Did you say anything to him?

J: I sent him an email. But I was really disappointed in his response - he wasn't at all helpful. I didn't tell him all of the details. I just said that my study group took a turn for the worse, and that I had lent one of them my notes and he wouldn't return them. I asked if it would be possible to get a copy of his lecture notes and gave him the dates.

C: Did he respond?

J: Yeah. He said that if he gave his notes out to every one whose study group turned sour, he might as well post them in the university newspaper. His 'bit of advice' was pretty much like my brother's. If I can't handle this kind of conflict, then I would have to learn to do things by myself. I couldn't believe he said this. He seemed to be such an ok professor in class!

C: So, was that when you decided to drop the class?

J: No...I convinced myself to go to the next one.... to see how things went. I really enjoyed the lectures and I didn't want to let this kind of experience affect my life. I thought that maybe things would cool down and that they would realize that this wasn't my fault.

C: How did it turn out?

J: Terrible. Again, I sat at the opposite side of the room. But, this time they had the nerve to sit behind me and whisper comments about me. You know, part of what upset me is that other people could hear these things, and they all just looked at me like if I didn't fight back it must be true. But how can you fight these kinds of stupid comments.

C: What did they say?

J: Well...pretty much everything they said before and more. They mimicked me, saying that I thought I was a genius, and that I just used people. They said that I should wear a

sign on my back listing the price tag for my brilliant help. I couldn't concentrate, so at the break I decided to drop the class...there was no point to going back in there.

C: I see. So now we have to figure out where you can go from here.

Social Conflict Scenario Shame

C = Academic counsellor J = Student (Julie)

C: Hi Julie, come on in.

J: Hi, how are you?

C: Fine, thanks, and you?

J: Oh...alright I guess.

C: So...what can I do for you today?

J: Well... last term, I decided to drop out of my psychology class and now I am short a credit for this year. I just wanted to get some advice about what I should do.

C: Ok. Maybe we should first discuss why you chose to drop the class and we can go from there.

J: Sure. But it's somewhat hard to talk about. The whole thing was just so embarrassing. Lets just say that it wasn't because I didn't enjoy the course material, and the professor was ok. He was pretty new, but he was a greater lecturer. I actually thought that I would do quite well in the class.

C: Oh...so what happened? Would you like to talk about it?

J: Well...I was having problems with some of the other students in the class.

C: What kind of problems?

J: It's a long story...I don't even know where to start. I can't believe it got so out of hand.

J: Alright. The Psychology class is a really big one – it wasn't the ITV section or anything, but it was still a huge class. So the professor suggested that students learn to help each other out by setting up study groups. He also already told us that he wanted us to get our notes from each other if we missed anything because he didn't have them on the web yet, and couldn't give them to some students without giving them to everyone. So it all seemed like a pretty good idea. I also really wanted to do this because a lot of the course is about biological stuff and I hadn't taken Biology in high school after grade 10 – so I was just dreading that part. Well this is all easy enough if you know people, but a lot of us don't know other students in the class in our first year. So I asked some other students who usually sat near me if I could join them to set up our own group. There were 5 of us, and at first it seemed like a pretty good group. We all got along. We'd meet once a week at the Starbucks in the library, so it was pretty cool. Sometimes when we were done going over stuff, we'd just hang for a bit and talk about things happening on campus, places to go in Ottawa. Some of us like biking, so we'd talk about new paths. That sort of stuff. Anyway, a couple of weeks into the course, the biology stuff started, and it was actually not so bad. At least not for me – I was actually getting it. But that's when the problems started.

C: How so?

J: Well...I got it, but one of the other guys in my group really didn't. We all tried to explain it to him, but you know, some people just don't understand that stuff. He asked if he could pay me to tutor him through the stuff. I didn't really have time for this, and so instead I volunteered to lend him my notes, because I knew they were pretty clear - I was the best note-taker of our group, and between them and the text, he should have got it.

Even though I didn't mind helping him during our study groups, I was just too busy outside of that. I should have known better than to let him take my notes away though, because then he had something of mine that I needed. At the next class, he didn't bring them. He suggested that we get together for coffee the next day, and he'd return my notes then.

C: What happened next?

J: Well...the next day we met at the library as planned, and guess what? He forgot the notes again! I was a little confused, **and kind of upset**... I mean that was the only reason we were supposed to meet. Anyway...he said as long as we were there, would I be willing to help him with some questions he had about the stuff. Amazing – he had his list of questions, but just happened to forget my notes. He said he was sure it would only take him about 30 min, if that would be ok. **I was starting to find this all a bit weird.** But, I said no...I didn't have time for this, and could he please just bring my notes to the next class.

C: How did he respond to that?

J: At first he seemed ok. I think he was really trying to get me to like him, so that I'd help him out. But, when I made it clear that I didn't have time for his games, that I had other commitments and things to do, he got really rude.

C: How so?

J: Well, he started to get really loud – right there in the library. He just wouldn't let it go...asking why...what kind of person was I. He new I was dreading the biological stuff at first, and now that I got it, and he didn't, I couldn't be bothered helping out. His reaction was really starting to freak me out...so I just told him that I would see him next class.

C: What did he say?

J: He almost yelled, "fine...you obviously think you're too good for the rest of us" and then walked away. Everyone around was looking at me, **it was just sooo embarrassing.** I should have known better than to meet him. **I felt like crying. I could hardly bring myself to stand up to walk out of there, I felt so ashamed.**

C: So...did things end there?

J: No, not at all. He started emailing me a couple of times and day...saying that he was sorry about the way he acted, but he still hoped that I'd help out at the study group sessions. He realized that I was busy and that people have other things to do, and if he needed extra help, it was up to him to go see the prof. But maybe if we talked about this stuff more at the study group, he'd get it. He was so persistent, it was like he was obsessed. He even got the other members of our group to send me emails telling me that I wasn't being very helpful, and that my attitude really sucked. At first, I really tried hard to ignore these emails...in hopes that they would stop bugging me. **I just wanted them to go away and leave me alone.** But, I soon realized that was wishful thinking, so I finally responded back and told him thanks, but I wasn't going to be able to go to the next group, and I'd just get the notes I lent him from someone else.

C: Did he continue to email you?

J: Yeah. In one email he sent me, he wrote, "I really thought that you were smart, and that you like working with us and teaching people. I wish you would just give me a

chance.” He said I was obviously just acting that I liked helping people, when all I seemed to want to do was figure out what I could get from them. But I do like helping people. I want to be a teacher someday, and that was one of the reasons I’d actually been enjoying the study group. So **I was really upset, and kept trying to think of what I could have done differently.** But this guy just seemed over the top. Helping people is one thing, but he was really being manipulative.

C: How did he react towards you in class?

J: Well...I found another place to sit.... far away from him and from the rest of my study group too! **I just couldn’t face them.** But...after class, he caught up with me and demanded to know what was wrong with me and why I was ignoring him. I told him to leave me alone...that he was crossing the line. The rest of my study group was there, and they were actually pretty rude. They said, “We don’t like people like you – take what you can, but don’t give anything in return.” They made remarks like “it was no wonder teachers got such a bad rap, with people like you thinking that you’re good at teaching.” Thankfully, my bus came and I was able to get away from them. On the way home, **I felt sick. That night...I couldn’t sleep...I was so upset and worried,** I decided to skip the next class.

C: Did you tell anyone else about this?

J: I told my brother about it. But he wasn’t any help. He figured that this was the kind of thing that always happened in study groups ... one person finds things easy and another doesn’t and gets frustrated. I was just being too sensitive. He told me that if I really wanted them to stop giving me a hard time, I should get a sense of humour and lighten up. He just didn’t see what I was so uptight about. **After talking to him, I felt even more humiliated that I wasn’t able to work this kind of thing out on my own, and that I’d upset so many people.**

C: What about the professor? Did you say anything to him?

J: I sent him an email. But I was really disappointed in his response - he wasn’t at all helpful. I didn’t tell him all of the details. I just said that my study group took a turn for the worse, and that I had lent one of them my notes and he wouldn’t return them. I asked if it would be possible to get a copy of his lecture notes and gave him the dates.

C: Did he respond?

J: Yeah. He said that if he gave his notes out to every one whose study group turned sour, he might as well post them in the university newspaper. His ‘bit of advice’ was pretty much like my brother’s. If I can’t handle this kind of conflict, then I would have to learn to do things by myself. I couldn’t believe he said this. **It was like a slap in the face.** He seemed to be such an ok professor in class!

C: So, was that when you decided to drop the class?

J: No...I convinced myself to go to the next one.... to see how things went. I really enjoyed the lectures and I didn’t want to let this kind of experience affect my life. I thought that maybe things would cool down and that they would realize that this wasn’t my fault. **It wasn’t easy though – I couldn’t even eat that day because my stomach was in knots. I just dreaded it.**

C: How did it turn out?

J: Terrible. Again, I sat at the opposite side of the room. But, this time they had the nerve to sit behind me and whisper comments about me. You know, part of what upset me is that other people could hear these things, and they all just looked at me like if I didn't fight back it must be true. But how can you fight these kinds of stupid comments.

What can you say that isn't going to make them come back at you twice as much?

C: What did they say?

J: Well...pretty much everything they said before and more. They mimicked me, saying that I thought I was a genius, and that I just used people. They said that I should wear a sign on my back listing the price tag for my brilliant help. **I felt totally humiliated and couldn't concentrate. I felt as though I was going to start crying in the middle of class! I didn't know what to do,** so at the break I decided to drop the class...I couldn't bring myself to go back in there.

C: I see. So now we have to figure out where you can go from here.

**Social Conflict Scenario:
Anger**

C = Academic counsellor J = Student (Julie)

C: Hi Julie, come on in.

J: Hi, how are you?

C: Fine, thanks, and you?

J: Oh...alright I guess.

C: So...what can I do for you today?

J: Well... last term, I decided to drop out of my psychology class and now I am short a credit for this year. I just wanted to get some advice about what I should do.

C: Ok. Maybe we should first discuss why you chose to drop the class and we can go from there.

J: Sure. But it's somewhat hard to talk about. The whole thing was just so embarrassing. Lets just say that it wasn't because I didn't enjoy the course material, and the professor was ok. He was pretty new, but he was a greater lecturer. I actually thought that I would do quite well in the class.

C: Oh...so what happened? Would you like to talk about it?

J: Well...I was having problems with some of the other students in the class.

C: What kind of problems?

J: It's a long story...I don't even know where to start. I can't believe it got so out of hand.

J: Alright. The Psychology class is a really big one – it wasn't the ITV section or anything, but it was still a huge class. So the professor suggested that students learn to help each other out by setting up study groups. He also already told us that he wanted us to get our notes from each other if we missed anything because he didn't have them on the web yet, and couldn't give them to some students without giving them to everyone. So it all seemed like a pretty good idea. I also really wanted to do this because a lot of the course is about biological stuff and I hadn't taken Biology in high school after grade 10 – so I was just dreading that part. Well this is all easy enough if you know people, but a lot of us don't know other students in the class in our first year. So I asked some other students who usually sat near me if I could join them to set up our own group. There were 5 of us, and at first it seemed like a pretty good group. We all got along. We'd meet once a week at the Starbucks in the library, so it was pretty cool. Sometimes when we were done going over stuff, we'd just hang for a bit and talk about things happening on campus, places to go in Ottawa. Some of us like biking, so we'd talk about new paths. That sort of stuff. Anyway, a couple of weeks into the course, the biology stuff started, and it was actually not so bad. At least not for me – I was actually getting it. But that's when the problems started.

C: How so?

J: Well...I got it, but one of the other guys in my group really didn't. We all tried to explain it to him, but you know, some people just don't understand that stuff. He asked if he could pay me to tutor him through the stuff. I didn't really have time for this, and so instead I volunteered to lend him my notes, because I knew they were pretty clear - I was the best note-taker of our group, and between them and the text, he should have got it.

Even though I didn't mind helping him during our study groups, I was just too busy outside of that. I should have known better than to let him take my notes away though, because then he had something of mine that I needed. At the next class, he didn't bring them. He suggested that we get together for coffee the next day, and he'd return my notes then.

C: What happened next?

J: Well...the next day we met at the library as planned, and guess what? He forgot the notes again! I was a little confused, **and kind of ticked**... I mean that was the only reason we were supposed to meet. Anyway...he said as long as we were there, would I be willing to help him with some questions he had about the stuff. Amazing – he had his list of questions, but just happened to forget my notes. He said he was sure it would only take him about 30 min, if that would be ok. **I was starting to get pretty irritated with him.** But, I said no...I didn't have time for this, and could he please just bring my notes to the next class.

C: How did he respond to that?

J: At first he seemed ok. I think he was really trying to get me to like him, so that I'd help him out. But, when I made it clear that I didn't have time for his games, that I had other commitments and things to do, he got really rude.

C: How so?

J: Well, he started to get really loud – right there in the library. He just wouldn't let it go...asking why...what kind of person was I. He new I was dreading the biological stuff at first, and now that I got it, and he didn't, I couldn't be bothered helping out. His reaction was really starting to freak me out...so I just told him that I would see him next class.

C: What did he say?

J: He almost yelled, "fine...you obviously think you're too good for the rest of us" and then walked away. Everyone around was looking at me, **it was enraged.** I should have known better than to meet him. **I felt so angry. I could hardly bring myself to stand up to walk out of there, I was so mad.**

C: So...did things end there?

J: No, not at all. He started emailing me a couple of times and day...saying that he was sorry about the way he acted, but he still hoped that I'd help out at the study group sessions. He realized that I was busy and that people have other things to do, and if he needed extra help, it was up to him to go see the prof. But maybe if we talked about this stuff more at the study group, he'd get it. He was so persistent, it was like he was obsessed. He even got the other members of our group to send me emails telling me that I wasn't being very helpful, and that my attitude really sucked. At first, I really tried hard to ignore these emails...in hopes that they would stop bugging me. **If they kept it up, I was going to lose my cool, and who needs it.** But, I soon realized that was wishful thinking, so I finally responded back and told him thanks, but I wasn't going to be able to go to the next group, and I'd just get the notes I lent him from someone else.

C: Did he continue to email you?

J: Yeah. In one email he sent me, he wrote, "I really thought that you were smart, and that you like working with us and teaching people. I wish you would just give me a

chance.” He said I was obviously just acting that I liked helping people, when all I seemed to want to do was figure out what I could get from them. But I do like helping people. I want to be a teacher someday, and that was one of the reasons I’d actually been enjoying the study group. But this guy just seemed over the top. Helping people is one thing, but he was really being manipulative. **I started trying to think of ways to give this guy some of his own – who did he think he was that he could pull this number. I was fit to be tied I was getting so mad.**

C: How did he react towards you in class?

J: Well...I found another place to sit.... far away from him and from the rest of my study group too! **I just couldn’t stomach them, and didn’t want to blow in class.** But...after class, he caught up with me and demanded to know what was wrong with me and why I was ignoring him. I told him to leave me alone...that he was crossing the line. The rest of my study group was there, and they were actually pretty rude. They said, “We don’t like people like you – take what you can, but don’t give anything in return.” They made remarks like “it was no wonder teachers got such a bad rap, with people like you thinking that you’re good at teaching.” Thankfully, my bus came and I was able to get away from them. **I thought I was going to lose it. That night...I couldn’t sleep...I was so angry I couldn’t stop thinking about what jerks they were and how I could get them back.** So, I decided to skip the next class.

C: Did you tell anyone else about this?

J: I told my brother about it. But he wasn’t any help. He figured that this was the kind of thing that always happened in study groups ... one person finds things easy and another doesn’t and gets frustrated. I was just being too sensitive. He told me that if I really wanted them to stop giving me a hard time, I should get a sense of humour and lighten up. He just didn’t see what I was so uptight about. **After talking to him, I was even more disgusted. I didn’t see anything funny about this at all.**

C: What about the professor? Did you say anything to him?

J: I sent him an email. But I was really disappointed in his response - he wasn’t at all helpful. I didn’t tell him all of the details. I just said that my study group took a turn for the worse, and that I had lent one of them my notes and he wouldn’t return them. I asked if it would be possible to get a copy of his lecture notes and gave him the dates.

C: Did he respond?

J: Yeah. He said that if he gave his notes out to every one whose study group turned sour, he might as well post them in the university newspaper. His ‘bit of advice’ was pretty much like my brother’s. If I can’t handle this kind of conflict, then I would have to learn to do things by myself. I couldn’t believe he said this. **He was no better than they were.** He seemed to be such an ok professor in class!

C: So, was that when you decided to drop the class?

J: No...I convinced myself to go to the next one.... to see how things went. I really enjoyed the lectures and I didn’t want to let this kind of experience affect my life. I thought that maybe things would cool down and that they would realize that this wasn’t my fault. **It wasn’t easy though – I was pretty ticked, but trying to keep from lashing out. I would have loved to confront them, but it wasn’t worth the ongoing battle that would come of it.**

C: How did it turn out?

J: Terrible. Again, I sat at the opposite side of the room. But, this time they had the nerve to sit behind me and whisper comments about me. You know, part of what upset me is that other people could hear these things, and they all just looked at me like if I didn't fight back it must be true. But how can you fight these kinds of stupid comments. **What can you say that isn't going to make you look like the bitch? I wasn't going to give them that satisfaction.**

C: What did they say?

J: Well...pretty much everything they said before and more. They mimicked me, saying that I thought I was a genius, and that I just used people. They said that I should wear a sign on my back listing the price tag for my brilliant help. **I was shaking with anger and couldn't concentrate. I was on the verge of turning and yelling the guy in the middle of class!** So at the break I decided to drop the class... I just knew that I couldn't go back in there. **If I wanted to deal with him, it would have to be somewhere other than the classroom.**

C: I see. So now we have to figure out where you can go from here.

APPENDIX E

Ratings of Situation

In response to what you heard on the tape, please answer the questions that follow as best you can.

Do you think that the cause of this experience so far was due to something about the woman herself?²

Not at all -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely due to something about her

Was the cause of this experience due to something about the other people involved or the circumstances?

Not at all -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely due to something about other people or circumstances

Was the cause of this event due to sexism or sex discrimination?³

Not at all -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely due to sex discrimination

Was this an experience that you she could have avoided if she'd taken more control, or was it out of her hands entirely?¹

Not at all -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely could have been avoided in her control

Is the final outcome of this something that you feel is under her control so that an acceptable resolution could be achieved?¹

Not at all -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely under her control

How do you think the woman in the scenario is feeling?⁴

Afraid	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Angry	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Annoyed	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Anxious	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Ashamed	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely

² Used to assess perceived victim control.

³ Used to assess perceptions of discrimination.

⁴ Used to assess perceived victim emotions.

Contempt.....	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Determined.....	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Embarrassed	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Helpless.....	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Humiliated.....	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Indifferent	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Infuriated.....	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Responsible	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Strong.....	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely
Upset	Not at all	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely

APPENDIX F

Response

In response to the student whose experience you've just listened to, how much do you think you personally would have been able and willing to provide each of the forms of support listed below? Please read each statement carefully and circle or underline the answer that best describes your experience.

-
1. You would give some information to help her understand the situation	Not at all	A small possibility	Fairly likely	Absolutely
2. You would check back to see if she was able to follow your advice	Not at all	A small possibility	Fairly likely	Absolutely
3. You would gave information on how to do something	Not at all	A small possibility	Fairly likely	Absolutely
4. You would give feedback on how on what she doing without saying it was good or bad	Not at all	A small possibility	Fairly likely	Absolutely
5. You would tell her that she O.K. just the way she is	Not at all	A small possibility	Fairly likely	Absolutely
6. You would express interest and concern in her well-being	Not at all	A small possibility	Fairly likely	Absolutely
7. You would listen to her talk about her private feelings	Not at all	A small possibility	Fairly likely	Absolutely
8. You would have joked and kidded to try to cheer her up	Not at all	A small possibility	Fairly likely	Absolutely
9. You have provided her with transportation to and from the university	Not at all	A small possibility	Fairly likely	Absolutely
10. You have pitched in to help her do whatever needed to be done to overcome the situation	Not at all	A small possibility	Fairly likely	Absolutely
11. You would have provided her with a place where she could get away for a while	Not at all	A small possibility	Fairly likely	Absolutely

12. You would have loaned or given her anything (a physical object other than money) she needed

Not at all

A small possibility

Fairly likely

Absolutely

APPENDIX G

Advice

If you were to advise the student you just listened to regarding her response to her situation, to what extent would you have recommended each of the following. Please rate how advisable or appropriate you think each of the following actions would be for her.

1. Accept the situation as is, and just go on with her life ignoring what happened.

Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely appropriate

2. Avoid the individual(s) and places they may be, so that she doesn't have to deal with the situation.

Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely appropriate

3. Continue to meet with the academic counsellor until a satisfactory solution to her own situation can be determined.

Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely appropriate

4. Arrange mediation through the university mediation service in order to resolve the conflict with the other student(s).

Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely appropriate

5. Confront the other student(s) to make sure that this does not happen again.

Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely appropriate

6. File a formal complaint to the Dean of the Faculty to issue a disciplinary investigation, so that this student(s) won't do be able to do this to someone again.

Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely appropriate

7. Have instructors informed that these kinds of events can occur, so that they are more willing to help students in future.

Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely appropriate

8. Have this event highly publicized, so that the people involved who caused the problems or were unhelpful will never get away with it again.

Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely appropriate

9. File a legal suit outside the University, so that the student(s) have to pay for what was done.

Not at all 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely appropriate

APPENDIX H

Debriefing

Stressful experiences may include many kinds of events, ranging from minor day-to-day annoyances, or traumatic, such as assault. Clearly there are variations in how we interpret these events, and how we react to them. Factors that may influence a person's reactions to a given stressor include, the experience of previous stressful events, social support, how important the experience was to you, as well as the emotions that are raised by the various people who are involved in the situation.

In this study we are presenting participants with different social situations that could happen to a female student. These situations were fictional, as our interest is in how you interpret these events, and especially if you see them as entailing sex discrimination.

Very often individuals, including women, encounter situations of sexism or discrimination, but are reluctant to define them in that way. Some of the situations we have asked you to read contain cues that could be interpreted as reflecting discrimination (including the use of course language that is derogatory toward women), whereas other situations do not contain such cues. We are testing to see if these cues make a difference. We are especially interested in seeing if the emotional reactions of the woman involved make a difference in how you perceive the situation. For example, if the woman in the situation was angry, do you interpret it differently from when she expresses distress or sadness, or doesn't appear to be very emotional in her reactions at all? To test this, the woman in the tape you listened to would have expressed a particular set of emotions, including shame or distress, anger, or very little obvious emotion. We had you indicate your own emotional reaction as you listened to the tape, as this would also give us an idea of the factors that result in people having particular responses when they see or hear of something like this event occurring.

How people interpret and respond to various events is critical in terms of their ability to cope with them, and as well, in how they support others who might experience these events. Thus, we also included several measures, and in particular, we interviewed you regarding the advice and support that you would have been willing to provide to the student whose experience you heard about. Depending on her reactions, and the emotions and thoughts her experience evoked in you, you might have given very different advice or support.

We hope the results of this study will provide some insight regarding some of the factors that might influence our responses to stressful situations, and in particular those situations that comprise sex discrimination. Thank you for your participation in this study. The information you have provided is of great value to us.

Contacts

The following people are involved in this research project and may be contacted at any time if you have any further questions about the project, what it means, or concerns about how it was conducted:

Kelly Carroll, Researcher, Department of Psychology
Phone: (613) 520-2600 ext. 2683
e-mail: kcarrol2@connect.carleton.ca

Kate Raspopow, Researcher, Department of Psychology
Phone: (613) 520-2600 ext. 2683
e-mail: kraspopo@connect.carleton.ca

Dr. Kim Matheson, Faculty Member, Department of Psychology
Phone: (613) 520-2684
e-mail: kimmatheson@pigeon.carleton.ca

If you have any ethical concerns about how this study was conducted, please contact either of the following

Dr. C. Davis, Chair of the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee for Psychological Research, (613) 520-2600, ext. 2251
Dr. M. Gick, Chair, Dept. of Psychology, Carleton University, (613) 520-2648

If you have any worries or concerns about your personal well-being, or student skills, you can contact the following services:

Carleton University Health and Counseling Services 520-6674
Student Life Services 520-6600