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Abstract

Confrontation of prejudice may be socially costly to confronters, leading to them being disliked for their actions. Moreover, it appears that confronting antigay prejudice specifically bears an additional cost for males: people may question their sexual orientation following their confrontation. Relatedly, heterosexual males report being concerned with having their sexual orientation misclassified were they to confront antigay prejudice. This may act as a mental barrier to confrontation, leading them to remain silent in the face of blatant prejudice. Given that antigay prejudice remains rampant and that heterosexual people seem to be the most effective confronters of antigay prejudice, it is important to find ways to reduce their legitimate fears and help them confront. This program of research included five studies to further investigate confrontation of antigay prejudice in order to solidify and expand previous knowledge about its costs, as well as test different interventions aimed at removing barriers to confrontation and increasing confrontation by heterosexual people. Studies 1-2 sought to replicate previous findings in new social contexts and found that, across different situations, sexual orientation perception biases constitute a recurring cost for male confronters of antigay prejudice. Study 3 examined the efficacy of different confrontation tactics in response to varied bigoted comments and found that confronting clear bigotry using a suggestive tone and avoiding prejudice labels such as “homophobic” led to better outcomes for confronters than confronting ambiguous
bigotry with a personal attack using labels. Study 3 also compared confrontation of anti-lesbian and antigay bigotry and found that people are generally more positive toward antigay prejudice confronters. Studies 4-5 tested different interventions aimed at reducing barriers to help heterosexual individuals confront antigay prejudice. Study 4 showed that simply allowing males to disclose and affirm their orientation may not be enough to help them confront more, whereas Study 5 showed that giving information about confrontation may reduce beliefs that confronting is ineffective. Together, these studies not only shed light on allies’ antigay prejudice confrontation outcomes, but also offer valuable information as to how it may be possible to reduce costs to confronters in hopes of encouraging them to confront more often.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

A few years ago, Macklemore and Ryan Lewis released the song “Same Love” which makes a point of debunking myths about same-sex attraction and love and criticizes the derogatory use of words like “gay”. The song was nominated for Song of the Year at the Grammys, and topped the charts in many countries (Billboard, 2014). Although the song’s success benefited Macklemore and Lewis, it also came with a unique social cost to them: many people around the world suspected them to be gay. A quick Google search of the word “Macklemore” at the time instantly showed “Macklemore gay” as the most popular search term, and the artists addressed these rumors in many interviews, affirming their sexual orientation as being heterosexual.

Similarly, in 2012, Barack Obama became the first president of the United States to openly take a stance in favour of gay marriage during his presidency. In the days following his announcement, the cover of Newsweek magazine dubbed him “The first gay president” (Newsweek, 2012), and speculation over his wife Michelle Obama being a man masquerading as a transgender woman emerged on social networks. The late comedian Joan Rivers infamously made that joke popular in 2014, calling Obama gay and his wife trans (France, 2014). By openly defending gay rights, Obama was tagged as being gay, sparking ludicrous conspiracies along the way and being subjected to “jokes” mocking his sexual orientation. Even if Newsweek and Rivers probably meant to be facetious, it nevertheless hints at a reflex in assuming that someone who defends gays is gay.

This misperception of sexual orientation has been reported as being a concern among confronters of antigay prejudice: people (especially males) are afraid they will be viewed as gay if they defend gays (Kroeper, Sanchez, & Himmelstein, 2014). This fear of having one’s sexual orientation miscategorized has been found to predict increased distancing and dissociation from gay and lesbian targets (Buck, Plant, Ratcliff, Zielaskowski, & Boerner, 2013), and reduced action against blatant antigay prejudice (Kroeper et al., 2014). Despite this collection of anecdotal evidence, there is no robust empirical data reliably demonstrating that antigay prejudice confronters and allies are suspected of being gay because of their confrontation. I did find some initial evidence in my Master’s confirming that this may be the case (Cadieux, 2012;
Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)), but that study had not been replicated and included many methodological flaws, as discussed later. Therefore, I sought to replicate these results and extend them in this dissertation, specifically in Studies 1 and 2.

1 Confrontation: costs and benefits

Being suspected as gay may seem innocuous to some. In safe, privileged environments where there is legal protection for gays and where people have more liberal views of homosexuality, being suspected to be gay may appear trivial. However, sexual orientation is part of one’s self-concept, and accuracy in others’ perception of oneself is valuable to some and may lead to strong discomfort should their need for self-verification be thwarted (Swann, 1990; Swann, Stein-Seroussi, & Geisler, 1992). Furthermore, some males may feel it particularly threatening to their self-concept to be viewed as gay, thinking it would be emasculating and feminine (Bosson, Prewitt-Freilino, & Taylor, 2005; Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnaford, & Weaver, 2008). This is particularly true of men who believe masculinity is an impermanent state that needs to be constantly affirmed in order to be maintained, otherwise known as feelings of precarious manhood (Kroeper et al., 2014; Vandello et al., 2008).

Dwarfing concerns for one’s self-concept, being suspected as gay in an environment that is hostile towards gays could be a serious threat to one’s safety and lead to potential violence and harm. For example, in recent months it has been revealed that hundreds of men suspected to be gay in Chechnya are arrested, tortured, and killed in what some news outlets called “concentration camps” (Wong, 2017; Kramer, 2017). These allegations were denied by Chechnya’s leader, and his spokesman supported his claim by adding “you cannot arrest or repress people who just don’t exist [here]” (Wong, 2017). Being suspected as gay in these parts of the world may lead to extreme harm, and people might refrain from confronting antigay prejudice from fear of being suspected as gay. By not confronting antigay prejudice it is therefore allowed to exist, unchallenged, and this pressure to not identify or be associated with gays will continue to exist as well. Even in much less extreme environments, being suspected as gay can be a threat to one’s physical integrity and psychological well-being. In North American schools, being gay or even just suspected to be gay can lead to bullying and hostile treatment from peers (Best, 1983; Fagot, 1977; Schuster, Bogart, Klein, Feng, Tortolero, Mrug, Lewis, & Elliott, 2015). Therefore, if confronting antigay prejudice increases suspicion that one is gay, and
if people are aware of this potential suspicion that may arise in others from their actions, many may want to avoid the stigma and costs associated with being suspected to be gay and refrain from confronting at all.

In spite of these costs, support from allies such as Macklemore is critical because of the continued ubiquity of antigay bias. A meta-analysis encapsulating the experiences of 500,000 gay and bisexual people revealed that 55% experienced verbal harassment and 41% experienced discrimination on the basis of their sexual orientation (Katz-Wise & Hyde, 2012). Moreover, many youth are bullied because of their sexual orientation. Antigay comments are extremely frequent among youth (Dickter, 2012), creating more hostile environments for young gay people and leading to alarming suicide risks in this population (Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2008; Ryan, Huebner, Diaz, & Sanchez, 2009). Given the prevalence and potentially lethal consequences of antigay bias, it is vital to develop methods for reducing prejudice and improving the lives of gay men and women.

One possible way to reduce prejudice is to confront antigay comments when they occur. Indeed, voicing opposition to bigoted speech can act as a reminder of social norms against prejudice, which are almost perfectly correlated with expression of prejudice (Cary, Page-Gould, & Chasteen, 2014; Crandall, Eshleman, & O’Brien, 2002). In fact, with recent events showing that openly-bigoted politicians like Donald Trump can be elected president of the United States, this has created a safe space for expression of bigotry of all kinds, legitimizing privately held negative beliefs about minorities and allowing their public expression (Allport, 1954). In work commissioned by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC; the national public radio and television service in Canada), an analysis of online content from November 2015 to November 2016 (when the US election took place) shows a 600% increase in hateful language used by Canadians online (CBC News, 2017). Words related to White Supremacy surged 300% while other Islamophobic language increased by 200%. Note that these increases were observed in Canadian content despite the election taking place in the United States. In his analysis of the situation, James Rubec, a content strategist leading this investigation, said that this “dramatic increase” probably does not represent an increase in the number of “racists in Canada”, but instead that “they feel emboldened (…) by racist sentiments coming out of the United States” (CBC News, 2017). This shows that when bigotry is expressed and licensed by authorities, more bigotry tends to be voiced by the rest of the population. This probably shifts social norms about
the acceptability of prejudiced speech, which leads to that increase in public expression. The opposite is then also likely true: taking open stances against prejudice may shift norms towards equality and curb expression of bigotry. As more bigoted voices are heard, shifting the apparent consensus and social norms, it makes resistance and taking open stances against bigotry all the more valuable in order to shift social norms back towards equality.

However, confronting prejudice could be costly to the confronter. To date, research on confronting prejudice has focused mainly on confronting racism and sexism. Recurrent findings that emerge from previous work on confrontation of sexism and racism show that confronters are generally disliked for speaking out (e.g. Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006). Indeed, it appears that both the confronted and bystanders view confronters as complainers, especially if confronters are part of the group that is targeted by the prejudiced comment (Kaiser & Miller, 2003; Mark, Monteith, & Czopp, 2007; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). For example, a Black confederate was viewed more negatively than a White confederate when confronting racism, though both were seen more negatively than non-confronters for voicing their discontent with a prejudicial remark (e.g., Czopp & Monteith, 2003). To date, very few papers have focused on antigay prejudice confrontation. Until recently, it remained unknown whether these evaluations apply to gay confronters and confronters who have not disclosed their orientation, and whether confronters of antigay prejudice suffer costs other than decreased likability, such as being misperceived as gay.

In my Master’s thesis, I established some preliminary evidence showing that confronters of antigay prejudice are suspected of being more likely gay/less likely straight than non-confronters (Cadieux, 2012; Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)). Whereas past literature has often distinguished between target and non-target confronters of prejudice and how they may be affected differently by their action based on their group membership, not everyone is open about their sexual orientation and it is not as easily classifiable as race or gender (Freeman, Johnson, Ambady, & Rule, 2010) making membership more difficult to establish. Because orientation is a concealable group membership, confrontation of antigay prejudice may be used as a clue (albeit erroneously) to infer sexual orientation. This may be because people view the confronter’s action as being a reflection of his or her disposition and personal traits rather than due to the situation, therefore making a fundamental attribution error in explaining the motives behind the confrontation (Jones & Harris, 1967). In my Master’s study (Cadieux, 2012; Cadieux &
Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1), undergraduates were shown a script of a conversation in which one of the parties involved makes an antigay comment, which was either confronted by the other party or not depending on the condition assigned. That second character was male and I manipulated his sexual orientation through his relationship status on a detailed Facebook profile. Specifically, he was depicted as being in a relationship with another man, a woman, or someone undisclosed. Thus, that study used a 2 (Confront/No Confront) x 3 (Gay, Straight, Undisclosed orientation) between-subjects design. Results showed that participants estimated the confronter to be more likely gay/less likely straight than a non-confronter, regardless of the orientation condition assigned.

However, there were no effects of confrontation of antigay prejudice on perceived likability, adding to the inconsistencies already present in the confrontation literature. Unlike previous research which often reports decreased (e.g., Czopp & Monteith, 2003) or sometimes increased likability (e.g., Dickter et al., 2011, Mallett & Wagner, 2011) as a result of confronting prejudice, I did not find any such costs or benefits for confronters. This may be due to limitations in this initial study. First, the antigay comment targeted a well-liked character (Dumbledore from the Harry Potter books) that this generation of participants was exposed to during childhood, so defending this character may have seemed like a noble thing to do. As a result, the social context surrounding this prejudice confrontation may have buffered against the negative reactions observed when confronting prejudiced comments. Second, it could be that the undergraduate sample used in this study may not be representative of the broader population, especially since they come from a large, diverse metropolitan area, are younger, and more educated than average. People from this particular demographic are known to have more positive views of gays than those from other backgrounds (Hicks & Lee, 2006; Schellenberg, Hirt, & Sears, 1999). Due to this background, participants from this sample may view confronting antigay comments as the right thing to do, and thus did not feel negatively towards the confronter. Lastly, a variety of information was included on the confronter’s Facebook profile (e.g., personal preferences and tastes), which would not typically be available in real-world contexts in which prejudice confrontations occur. Though the profiles were pilot-tested before the experimental session to ensure their equivalence on multiple dimensions (including likability), and though they all were rated to be neutral on these dimensions, having more information about the confronter could have buffered against some of the negative perceptions that may result from the confrontation as
people had more information to base their evaluations on other than his behaviour. I address these limitations in Study 1 of my dissertation. In Study 2, I aim to verify whether sexual orientation perception biases and other social costs occur in live, interactive environments, and not just from passively viewing scripts.

Costs aside, it is important to highlight that regardless of the evaluations received from others, confrontation of bias was found to reduce prejudiced responses in the confronted (Blanchard, Crandall, Brigham, & Vaughn, 1994; Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006; Fazio & Hilden, 2001) and induce feelings of guilt in the perpetrator of prejudice (Czopp & Monteith, 2003), especially if the confrontation was made by a non-target. As well, confrontation of antigay prejudice by non-targets raised awareness among observers about the inappropriateness of the confronted comment (Cadieux, 2012; Dickter et al., 2011). Because Dickter et al. (2011) only focused on non-target confronters in their work, one cannot conclude from that research that targets would be less effective in raising awareness against antigay prejudice. However, in my Masters study (Cadieux, 2012), which examined both target and non-target confronters, only non-target confronters were effective at raising awareness against antigay prejudice, which then led participants to report an increased desire to confront antigay prejudice were they to be faced with it. Because non-target confrontations are a useful tool to provoke a desired social change and reap important social benefits, it is important to find ways to encourage people to confront antigay prejudice, especially non-target individuals.

2 Breaking down the dislikability cost

Another goal of this dissertation is to find ways people could confront antigay prejudice while minimizing costs to themselves (Study 3). It appears that people do not automatically view confronters as complainers, and that some confronters not only avoid this cost but also receive positive evaluations instead (Cadieux, 2012; Dickter et al., 2011). This is reflected in the literature, which is plagued with inconsistencies between studies when looking at this set of social costs and their association to confrontation of prejudice more generally. Some studies show a negative effect of confrontation for perceptions of the confronter (e.g., Czopp & Monteith, 2003), but others show the opposite, whereby confronters are more liked than non-confronters (e.g., Dickter et al., 2011). In Study 3, I aimed to determine what specific factors
determine the outcome of a confrontation, which would inform how it may be possible to confront antigay prejudice in a way that would yield positive reactions from others.

Because different studies use different bigoted comments and confrontation scripts, this may explain why reactions to the confronter differ across studies. Looking closely at the scripts that were used in five papers (Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015; Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp et al., 2006; Dicker et al. 2011) along with results that emerged from them, there may be clues as to what leads to better or worse outcomes for a confronter. Below I describe the methods and results of the five studies listed above and then compare and analyze their contents to identify potential variables affecting the outcome of a confrontation.

Czopp and Monteith (2003) found that confronters of racism and sexism are perceived differently whereby they are judged negatively and dismissed more for confronting sexism than for confronting racism. Reactions were different depending on the type of prejudice being confronted, highlighting that it may be a determining factor in the outcome of a confrontation. Indeed, sexism was not perceived as a legitimate cause to action in comparison to racism, and confronters were treated according to the perceived legitimacy of their action. For prejudices that are more offensive and less socially acceptable (e.g., racism), confrontation may be viewed as the right thing to do, leading to more positive (or less negative) evaluations of the confronter. In contrast, other prejudices that aren’t taken as seriously as racism (such as sexism) could lead to the confronter being judged more harshly for opposing since they would be viewed as oversensitive troublemakers. Therefore, it seems that prejudice type determines in part the legitimacy of a confrontation, which then determines people’s attitudes toward the confronter. Despite this difference, all confronters were perceived as overreacting a fair amount, regardless of the prejudice type they were confronting. Thus there might be something about the situation they were confronting or the way they all confronted that led to these global impressions.

In the situation set forth by Czopp and Monteith (2003), participants were asked to imagine having made racist or sexist comments that were subtle in nature. They were asked to imagine casting someone to play the role of a doctor in a play, and choosing a White/male actor instead of a Black/female actor. They were then asked to imagine being confronted about their sexist or racist choice. The authors point out that the racism and sexism scripts were purposefully made to be subtle so that they would typically go unnoticed. This may be a first key in understanding why
all confronters were seen as overreacting: they were confronting comments that were inadvertently and subtly biased, making their confrontation perceived to be overly sensitive. The prejudicial intention on the bigot’s part may be important in determining how confronters are evaluated. Indeed, people making blatantly offensive comments would be perceived as more deserving of a confrontation than those making inadvertent slurs. This may explain why all confronters were seen as overreacting in their study: they were all confronting someone who did not mean to be racist/sexist. Moreover, in the confrontation script they were asked to imagine, they were being called out for “racial/gender bias” specifically. It may be that people dislike the use of prejudice labels in confrontations as they may appear damning and rude. However, this study alone cannot establish whether prejudicial intention and the use of prejudice labels matters as they did not manipulate these variables.

Next, the intensity and tone of a confrontation could possibly change the outcome for the perception of confronters, though two papers seem to disagree as to whether more assertive confrontations are beneficial or not. Czopp and colleagues (2006) found that hostile confronters are less liked than suggestive confronters, whereas Dickter and colleagues (2011) found that assertive confronters were more liked. Looking at their methods reveals differences that may explain these seemingly divergent results.

Czopp et al. (2006) conducted a set of studies in which they tricked participants into making stereotypic associations, and had a confederate confront them in an online chat conversation. For example, they would show participants a photo of a Black person with a caption saying: “This person depends on the government for money”, or “You can find this person behind bars” and were asked to label that person. A vast majority of people would then respond “welfare recipient” and “prisoner” instead of other less instinctive choices such as a “government employee” and “bartender”, respectively, and a confederate would confront the participants for making these stereotypic associations. Therefore, participants were not being willfully bigoted before being confronted; their intent was not malicious but rather the inadvertent result of trickery. Furthermore, the confrontation scripts changed drastically from one condition to the other. The hostile confrontation script was targeted at the person and not the comment itself, using prejudice labels and referring to them as a “racist” specifically (i.e., “but you should really try to think about Blacks in other ways that are less prejudiced. it just seems that you sound like some kind of racist to me. you know what i mean?” [sic], p. 788). They contrasted this personal
attack to a more suggestive confrontation aimed at what was said (i.e., “but maybe it would be
good to think about Blacks in other ways that are a little more fair? it just seems that a lot of
times Blacks don’t get equal treatment in our society. you know what i mean??” [sic], p. 788).
They found that confronters using the more hostile script were more disliked than the milder
confronters. The difference between the two scripts is larger than a simple change of target, and
also includes an added call for fairness among many other changes. It makes isolating the effect
of changing the target from the person to the words impossible, though it hints that it is a
potential contributor to the effect.

In contrast, Dickter et al. (2011) varied the intensity of a bigoted comment along with the
assertiveness of the confrontation that opposed it. She did so using a racist comment and an
antigay comment. For the scripted bigoted comments that were clearly an attack towards Blacks
or gays, confronters were liked more for opposing them (i.e., “[speaking of a Black colleague]
People like him are (…) not as smart as the rest of us anyway. (…)”, p. 114; “[speaking of a gay
colleague] This makes sense given how gay [how much of a fag] he is (…””, p. 116). In the only
case that the scripted prejudiced comment was more ambiguous and not rated as being highly
offensive by participants (below midpoint of the scale), there is not a clear attack of a person on
the basis of their race (i.e., “[speaking of a Black colleague] We can’t rely on him too much
anyway, if we want good grades at least”, p. 114). This comment could be perceived as a
personal insult instead of a racial slur. In this case, confronters were less liked. Because
confronters were liked more when prejudice was blatant when compared to when it was unclear,
this lends support to the suggestion that prejudicial intention of a perpetrator can predict the
perceptions of confronters.

Also, though Dickter et al. (2011) varied the assertiveness of the confrontation, all were aimed at
what was said and did not make a personal attack at the expense of the bigot, and did not use
prejudice labels as they refrained from calling what was said “racism” or “homophobia”
specifically (e.g., “Hey man, you can’t dismiss his contribution (…) and insult his intelligence
just because he’s Black. He’s smart and what you are saying is offensive”, p.114; “Hey man,
that’s pretty messed up. You can’t insult him like that, or say what he thinks doesn’t matter just
because he’s a homosexual. I find that offensive so don’t say it again.”, p.116). In this study
overall, results show that confronters were generally liked for speaking out in this assertive way.
Therefore, it appears that three elements emerge as potential explanations for Czopp et al.’s (2006) and Dickter et al.’s (2011) divergent findings: (1) whether the intention behind the inappropriate comment is clearly bigoted or not, (2) whether the confronter is suggestive or attacks the perpetrator, and (3) whether the confronter makes a specific prejudice call or not using prejudice labels (e.g., bigot, racist, sexist). To this, we can also add (4) the type of prejudice being confronted, as highlighted in the Czopp & Monteith (2003) study comparing sexism with racism. Study 3 will combine these different elements and test which set of circumstances predict more positive outcomes for confronters and shed light in the seemingly confused literature.

3  Barriers to confrontation

As important as confrontations by heterosexual allies may be, there are barriers to confrontation that need to be addressed if more people are to confront antigay prejudice. Dickter (2012) asked heterosexual undergraduates, both male and female, to keep a daily diary of their encounters with antigay comments and their reactions to these comments. She found that although participants were faced with such comments regularly and most reported feeling uneasy with them, less than a third of her sample reported confronting these remarks at all at some point during the week-long experiment. She found that common reasons people cite for not confronting were the fear of retaliation and believing it would be ineffective. Importantly, Dickter (2012) found that social pressure was an important factor in facilitating whether males confront antigay prejudice, whereas it was not a predictor of females’ behaviour. However, social pressure can act both ways: it can facilitate or inhibit confrontation depending on where the pressure is from. As stated earlier, a recent study by Kroeper and colleagues (2014) suggests that heterosexual men believe that they will be perceived as gay by others if they confront antigay prejudice. This could act as an inhibiting pressure against confrontation as some men would choose to avoid appearing gay to others. One of the roots of this fear lies in feelings of precarious manhood (Vandello et al., 2008), which is a feeling that masculinity is an impermanent state that can be taken away by violating gender norms, and that, ultimately, masculinity needs constant reaffirmation in order to protect it. Males higher in feelings of precarious manhood elected to confront antigay prejudice less often than males who did not hold such beliefs (Kroeper et al., 2014), showing how important a mental barrier this is to heterosexual males for confronting antigay prejudice.
Therefore, a primary goal for any intervention aimed at increasing rates of confrontation of antigay prejudice should be to assuage these fears of miscategorization in heterosexual males, which will be tested in Study 4. More generally, it should also seek to dispel beliefs that confronting prejudice is ineffective and reduce fears of retaliation as well, as they appear to be the main reasons people report for not confronting prejudice when they encounter it, which will be the goal of Study 5.

4 Program of research outline

4.1 Study 1

In the first study, I collected further evidence in order to confirm whether skewed perceptions of sexual orientation are indeed associated with confrontation of antigay prejudice. Though I had found through a single study for my Master’s (Cadieux, 2012; Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)) that confronters are suspected as more likely to be gay/less likely to be straight than non-confronters, it warranted further attention and replication before it was established as an actual cost. That previous study only investigated perceptions of undergraduate participants through the reading of a scripted conversation and used a modest sample size, among other important limitations. In the first study of the current dissertation, I attempted to replicate these findings using a larger sample derived from the community and made adjustments to the materials and the script being used in order to improve the validity and reliability of my design. I hypothesized that people who viewed a man confronting antigay bigotry would assume he is more likely gay/less likely straight than those who viewed a man not confronting such comments. Because of inconsistent and contradictory findings in the literature and my previous study on this topic, I could not formulate a clear hypothesis regarding costs in likability and perceptions of complaining for confronters.

4.2 Study 2

For my second dissertation study, I attempted to replicate the findings from my Master’s (Cadieux, 2012; Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)) in a live conversation rather than using a passive script of a conversation which people then reacted to. In this second study, participants were involved in an online chat session with two other parties who were in fact confederates. One of them eventually made an antigay comment, which the other either confronted or not
depending on the condition assigned. This design allowed me to not only verify whether impressions people form in response to reading a script generalize to live situations, but also to capture their reaction as the conversation developed. I hypothesized that biases in perceptions of orientation should also occur in a live situation. Because of social norms surrounding the confrontation of antigay comments by heterosexual males and their potential fear of miscategorization, I expected men to confront less often than women when given the chance. Some of the results from these first two dissertation studies along with Cadieux (2012) were published in *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity* (Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015).

### 4.3 Study 3

Studies 1 and 2 aimed to solidify whether confronting antigay prejudice leads to social costs for the confronter across different contexts and samples, and also tested people’s responses to antigay bigotry in a live context. For Study 3 I aimed to reconcile the inconsistencies in the literature concerning the personal costs associated with confrontation. After comparing the methods and results of many studies, I identified 4 factors that appeared to affect the outcome of a confrontation in terms of social perceptions of a confronter. I hypothesized that they may also affect sexual orientation perceptions in the case of a confrontation of antigay bigotry. The 4 identified factors were the type of prejudice being confronted, the intensity of the bigoted comment being confronted, whether the confrontation is a personal attack or suggestive, and the use of specific labels referring to bigotry (e.g., racist, sexist, homophobe). I created 16 situations that varied along those 4 dimensions and systematically tested whether they predicted perceived likability, perceived complaining, and perceived sexual orientation of the confronter. I hypothesized that confrontations against weak bigotry that were formulated with strong, attacking language, and used labels such as “homophobia” would lead to increased costs for the confronter (more suspicion of homosexuality, more dislike, and more complaining). I also tested antigay and anti-lesbian comments, making this the first experiment to investigate the costs associated with the confrontation of anti-lesbian bigotry. This experiment allowed me to identify concrete ways to confront sexual prejudice while minimizing personal costs.
4.4 Study 4

In the first two dissertation studies, I established whether there were costs associated with confronting antigay prejudice. In the third study, I tested many ways to confront to determine which ones led to better outcomes for confronters. In the last two studies, I designed interventions structured around the findings from the first three studies and the literature more generally to test whether it is possible to improve rates of confrontation in real situations.

In Study 4, I tested whether affirmations of masculinity help increase rates of confrontation of antigay prejudice by heterosexual males. Because miscategorization of sexual orientation is a major concern to some heterosexual males, allowing them to communicate their sexual orientation to conversation partners may help in increasing confrontation of an antigay comment. Heterosexual males were involved in a chat session similar to that of Study 2 in which they were given one of two possible topics of conversation. They either discussed their favorite celebrity crush or their favorite male actor. To boost the affirmation of their sexual orientation, males in the celebrity crush condition also indicated their sexual orientation on a demographic sheet shared with their conversation partners. Those in the male actor condition did not get that opportunity to share their sexual orientation with others. In each of the conversations, a bigoted comment eventually occurred and participants were offered an opportunity to confront. By having participants discuss their celebrity crush and communicate their sexual orientation through the conversation and their demographic sheet, this verified whether alleviating fears of orientation misperception helps increase rates of confrontation of antigay prejudice. However, it may also be that structuring the task around affirmations of sexual orientation could lead heterosexual men to further pursue such affirmations and view a bigoted comment made in such a context as less problematic, thus leading to less confrontation.

4.5 Study 5

Lastly, in Study 5 I developed an intervention aimed at leading heterosexual people to confront antigay prejudice more often. I compiled findings from the first four studies as well as other findings from the literature on confrontation and created an information session and brochure about the “dos and don’ts” of antigay prejudice confrontation. I informed participants on how they can make a difference through confrontation, what costs they should expect to face, and how to minimize these costs to themselves through the techniques I had tested in previous
experiments. Some participants were assigned to partake in that information session and others not (control). All were followed for one week through daily diaries in order to determine whether having this extra information led to increased confrontation when faced with antigay bigotry in the real world, as well as how they felt when doing so. They were also asked to track instances in which they heard or saw bigotry online and in person. I hypothesized that participants who received more information on confrontation would confront more often and would feel more hopeful about their potential impact than participants who did not receive such information. This allowed verifying whether distributing knowledge on confrontation of antigay prejudice is a useful tool in engaging social change.
Chapter 2
Study 1

In my Master’s thesis, I found that confronters of antigay prejudice are suspected to be more likely gay/less likely straight than non-confronters (Cadieux, 2012; Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015, Study 1). I did not find, however, that confronters were more or less liked following confrontation, and they were not perceived as complainers either. This result was surprising given the extensive literature on confrontation of racism and sexism which typically finds that confronters of such prejudices are disliked (e.g., Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Kaiser & Miller, 2003). This inconsistency warranted further attention as it may have been the result of flaws in my original design. In my first dissertation study, I aimed to replicate my Masters findings using a larger community sample to verify whether those results generalize to a larger population.

I also wanted to take this opportunity to amend my original design and address some of its limitations by eliminating some confounding factors that were included. First, in my previous experiment (Cadieux, 2012), the use of an antigay comment targeting a well-liked fictional character was problematic as it may have increased the perceived likability of the confronter who defended the character by challenging the bigoted comment. In Study 1, I used a different antigay comment in a different social context to avoid this confound. Also, the information contained on the original Facebook profiles hinting at the confronter’s sexual orientation was too detailed, which may have led participants to consider more of this background information when forming an impression. That information is not typically available to observers in more real-world situations involving strangers. To address this, I eliminated superfluous information on the Facebook page given to participants in order to ensure people’s impressions of the confronter were mostly derived from variables of interest.

Based on previous findings from my Master’s (Cadieux, 2012; Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)), I expected that male confronters of antigay prejudice would be perceived as more likely to be gay/less likely to be straight than non-confronters. This biased perception of sexual orientation should not affect other ratings of the target such as likability, if trends from my first study were to replicate in this experiment. However, I had originally hypothesized that being perceived as gay would then lead to those confronters of antigay prejudice to be disliked, much
Like Black confronters of racism and women confronters of sexism were disliked (e.g., Czopp & Monteith, 2003).

Although Dickter et al. (2011) found that straight confronters of antigay prejudice were liked more than non-confronters, the consensus in most studies on prejudice confrontation tends to be that confronters are generally disliked compared to non-confronters (Czopp & Monteith, 2003). However, in my own previous study on antigay prejudice confrontation (Cadieux, 2012), there were no signs of disliking the confronter or seeing him as a complainer, which might have been due to limitations in the design. Because of the contradictions in previous findings, I could not hypothesize with confidence about the outcome in terms of likability or complaining perceptions of the confronter. However, given the majority of research on confronting other types of prejudice has shown negative evaluations of confronters, I anticipated more negative evaluations for confronters of antigay prejudice than non-confronters.

Lastly, following findings from both Cadieux (2012) and Dickter et al. (2011), I expected that confrontation of antigay prejudice would raise awareness about the antigay comment as being unacceptable and bigoted. Results from Study 1 were published in a peer-reviewed journal (Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 2)).

1 Method

1.1 Participants and design

Participants were recruited from Amazon.com’s Mechanical Turk and were compensated with $0.30 USD for their participation. The total sample included 352 participants, 64 of whom were excluded for failing multiple simple attention checks inserted throughout the task or because they admitted to not having paid attention when asked at the end of the task, and 3 did not provide post-debriefing consent to use their data. Of the 10 simple attention checks inserted (e.g., “Was [the target] part of the conversation you just read?” where the answer should be “Yes”), people having failed more than 2 were excluded so as to avoid adding noise to the data due to inattentive participants. I established this cut-off and performed the deletion before looking any further at the data. The final sample used for the following analyses included 285 heterosexual participants (162 males, 123 females; Age: $M = 29.89$, $SD = 10.49$; 70% White, 6% Latin American, 6% Asian, 5% African American, 13% Other) residing in the United States. This experiment used a 2
(confrontation condition: confront or not) x 3 (target orientation information: in a same-sex relationship, in an opposite-sex relationship, in a relationship with someone undisclosed) between-subjects design. Participants were assigned to a condition using a stratified randomization procedure to ensure males and females would be as equally distributed between the 6 conditions as possible.

1.2 Procedure

Participants were given a SurveyMonkey link and were told that they would participate in a study about how social media affects everyday communication. This cover story was used in order to minimize suspicion in regards to the main goal of this study. Suspicion checks included at the end of the study indicate that participants were not able to identify the exact hypotheses of this study.

Participants were shown a screenshot of two “randomly chosen” profiles of fictitious characters who were presented to the participants as being real individuals but in fact were created by the research team. Participants were instructed to pay close attention to these profiles as they would not be able to return to them later in the experiment. The relationship partner of the confronter varied depending on the experimental condition the participant was assigned to (same-sex, opposite-sex, or undisclosed) in order to hint at his sexual orientation. Very little supplemental information was available on the Facebook pages and only included the employment and education background that had been pilot-tested and shown to be neutral in Study 1. Manipulation and attention checks were included to ensure participants remembered critical information on the profiles.

Once they viewed the profiles, participants read one of two scripted chat logs between the characters they just read about. All logs depicted the same conversation about music and included the following derogatory antigay comment made by the bigoted character: “I was scared you’d say something gay like Justin Bieber or something haha. One of my friends had Bieber playing in his car last time I was like “Bro, you’re such a faggot!” hahaha”. Conditions varied in how the other character approached the situation. The target either confronted by saying: “Why would you say that? You just go around using the word gay and faggot as an insult for fun? That is so inappropriate” or did not confront the comment with: “haha well no Justin Bieber is not my favorite”. After having read the two profiles and the chat log, participants
completed the questionnaires including a conversation evaluation (filler questionnaire), a target evaluation questionnaire, their perceptions of the target’s sexual orientation, and the Modern Homonegativity Scale (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). After completing these measures, participants completed a demographics questionnaire and were then debriefed and compensated.

1.3 Measures

1.3.1 Target evaluation questionnaire.

This 21-item questionnaire measured participants’ perceptions of the target on several traits linked to likability, being a complainer, inappropriateness, as well as filler items by asking them to indicate their agreement with statements such as: “[The target] is likable”. Participants responded using 7-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). Participants filled this questionnaire to evaluate both the target and the bigot.

1.3.2 Perception of sexual orientation

In order to see whether confronters of antigay prejudice are viewed as more likely to be gay than non-confronters, an item assessing perceived sexual orientation was embedded among other questions in a demographics form that participants completed about the target. As opposed to other questions which asked a discrete categorization like a specific gender or ethnicity, sexual orientation was on a certainty continuum, asking participants “What is [the target's] Sexual Orientation?” from “Definitely gay” (1) to “Definitely straight” (7), with “Ambiguous/Unsure” as the midpoint (4). This was done to allow for a varying degree of suspicion concerning the target’s sexual orientation.

1.3.3 Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS; Morrison & Morrison, 2002)

The MHS is a validated 12-item scale that measures attitudes towards homosexuals (e.g. “Gay men should stop shoving their lifestyle down other people's throats”, “Gay men who are "out of the closet" should be admired for their courage”). All items are on scales ranging from 1 (Disagree) to 5 (Agree). Whereas the scale predicted dislike for gay targets in both Studies 1 and 2, it did not moderate or mediate relationships between the variables of interest, and scores did not vary across conditions for Studies 1 and 2. Therefore, it will not be discussed further.
1.3.4 Demographics

Since many variables are linked to increased negative attitudes towards gay people, such as lower education, gender, degree of familiarity with gay individuals, and ethnicity (Schellenberg et al., 1999; Walch et al., 2010; Waldner et al., 1999), demographic information was collected on the participants to use as potential variables for moderation analyses. When these variables were added as potential moderators or covariates in the following analyses, there were no effects found in the data and the patterns of results held with or without the inclusion of these variables, thus these factors will not be discussed further.

2 Results

2.1 Target's ratings

2.1.1 Likability

I used the same set of target ratings for my dissertation as I did in my Master’s study (Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)). I used 3 items from the target evaluation questionnaire to calculate mean target likability scores: likability, good personality, good to have as a friend. The Cronbach’s alphas were good for all studies (Master’s, $\alpha = .77$, 95% CI [.73, .81]; Study 1, $\alpha = .81$, 95% CI [.77, .84]; Study 2, $\alpha = .85$, 95% CI [.82, .87]). Similar to my Master’s (Cadieux, 2012; Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)), a 2 (Confrontation condition: Confrontation, No Confrontation) x 3 (Orientation condition: Gay, Straight, Undisclosed) ANOVA revealed no significant effects of experimental conditions on perceived likability (all $Fs < 1.17$, $ps > .28$), see Table 1 for detailed results.

2.1.2 Complainer perceptions

I also tested whether participants viewed the confronter as being a complainer for voicing his discontent with the bigoted comment. Using the mean of both “irritating” and “complainer” ratings ($\alpha = .81$, 95% CI [.76, .85]), I found a significant effect of confrontation condition, $F(1, 279) = 10.75, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = .02$, whereby the target was seen as more of a complainer when he confronted than when he did not (see Table 1 for details). No significant interaction or main effect were observed as a function of target orientation information (all $Fs < 0.53$, $ps > .59$), see Table 1 for detailed results. Likability and complainer perceptions were negatively correlated with one another ($r = -0.67$, $p < .001$).
2.2 Perceived sexual orientation

A 2 x 3 ANOVA on perceived sexual orientation revealed a similar pattern of findings as my Master’s (Cadieux, 2012; Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)). There was a main effect of target orientation information, $F(2, 279) = 278.49, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .67$, such that the target was rated as significantly more gay when his profile stated he was in a relationship with a man, but was rated as more straight when he was in a relationship with a woman ($p < .001$; see Table 2 for details). The undisclosed target fell in between and was significantly different from the other two, all $ps < .001$. This confirms that participants were attentive to the profiles they were given and factored in the partner information in their evaluation of the target’s sexual orientation.

Replicating my Master’s (Cadieux, 2012; Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)), there was a main effect for confrontation condition, $F(1, 279) = 12.52, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .04$, whereby the target was viewed as more likely to be gay when he confronted than when he did not (see Table 2 for details). No interaction effect was found ($F < 1$), showing that all targets were viewed as more likely to be gay for confronting. This also applied to targets in a relationship with a woman as they were perceived as less likely straight when they confronted.

2.3 Mediation analyses

As reported earlier, participants viewed the target as more of a complainer when he confronted than when he did not. However, this confrontation effect was not found for target likability. This is a puzzling finding given past research on the social costs of confronting, so I wondered whether the effects of confrontation condition on liking for the target might be mediated through perceptions of him as a complainer. Because of the possibility that two variables may be only related through full mediation (for a discussion of these topics, please see Cohen & Cohen, 1983; Hayes, 2009; Hayes, 2013), I tested whether likability was indirectly affected by confrontation condition through perceptions of the target as a complainer (see Figure 1). I also tested whether the target’s perceived sexual orientation mediated the relation between confrontation condition and target likability. I tested whether complainer perceptions and sexual orientation perceptions mediated the relation between confrontation condition and target likability by using Process by Hayes (2013). This analytic approach allowed me to simultaneously test three models with one omnibus test. The first model was Confrontation Condition affecting Target Likability through Perceived Orientation alone. The second model was Confrontation Condition affecting Target
Likability through Complainer Perception alone. The third model was a sequence of Confrontation Condition affecting Perceived Orientation, which in turn affects Complainer Perception, and then Target Likability. I also tested a fourth model, by switching the Complainer Perception and Perceived Orientation variables around, making Complainer Perception precede Perceived Orientation in the sequence. Thus, overall, this analysis allowed determining whether it was a single mediator, both mediators separately, or both mediators in a sequence that fit the data and bridged the relationship between confrontation and likability perceptions. I tested these potential models in Process by running a Bootstrap analysis using 10,000 resamples. I controlled for Orientation Condition assigned (because that would have important influence on Perceived Orientation) and found that only the indirect path through Complainer Perception alone had a confidence interval not containing zero, showing that this was the only statistically significant mediator of the relationship between confrontation condition and perceptions of liking (See Table 3 for results).

2.4 Confrontation effectiveness

In order to assess whether confronting the comment raised awareness as to its prejudicial content, I used participants’ ratings of the perpetrator to compute mean scores of inappropriateness. I calculated a mean score of how prejudiced he seemed, how unacceptable was what he said, and how respectful he was (reversed; $\alpha = .81$, 95% CI [.77, .84]). With a 2 x 3 ANOVA, I did not find any differences between perceptions of the perpetrator when he was confronted ($M = 5.11$, $SD = 1.52$) versus when he was not ($M = 4.79$, $SD = 1.73$), $F(1, 279) = 2.29$, $p = .13$. Only when the character opposite to him was depicted as gay did participants feel that he was marginally more offensive than in other conditions, but this difference did not reach statistical significance ($p = .08$) and did not vary according to whether that character confronted or not ($p = .44$).

I also asked participants what they would have done should they be part of a similar conversation. I coded their responses according to whether they would confront, not confront, or side with the bigoted comment. Chi square analyses showed that viewing a confrontation marginally increased participants’ intentions to confront the prejudiced speech, though this difference did not reach statistical significance, $\chi^2(2) = 4.80$, $p = .09$. 
3 Discussion

In Study 1, I sought to test my Master’s (Cadieux, 2012; Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)) findings in new contexts, using a different population and confrontation script. I obtained results similar to those obtained previously whereby participants estimated that those who confronted the prejudiced comment were more likely to be gay/less likely to be straight than those who did not. This applied to all targets, even the one who was depicted as being in a relationship with a woman.

In Study 1, using a much larger sample than I had previously, I did not find that there was a direct effect of confrontation on likability. Instead, I found that confronters were perceived as being complainers. These perceptions led to decreased liking for the target, which is more in line with findings from the confrontation of sexism and racism literatures (e.g., Czopp & Monteith, 2003). Viewing the confronter as a complainer was a necessary condition to disliking him, as confrontation condition alone did not have a direct effect on the likability of the target. I also tested whether participants’ perceptions of the target’s orientation played a role in affecting complainer or likability perceptions, but as predicted found that given or perceived orientation did not.

In Study 1, unlike in my Master’s study, the confrontation did not significantly influence how people perceived the bigoted comment, nor did it affect their expected reaction to the comment if they were faced with it. This may be due to the strong language used in this comment, which made it less subtle than in my previous study. This made a confrontation less useful in further raising awareness about the bigotry as it was blatant on its own. Confrontation here was thus not as useful in assisting bystanders in shaping their opinion of this situation as it did not add new information for them to consider.

Taken together, Study 1 along with my Master’s thesis (Cadieux, 2012) establish good evidence about social costs associated with confronting antigay prejudice. However, these studies have only examined perceptions of confronters in a transcript of a past situation and did not test how confronters would be viewed in a live context, or how people react to such situations when faced with them. Therefore, in Study 2 I wished to test whether similar perceptions occur during a live interaction, as well as capture people’s reactions to such situations in an experimental setting.
Chapter 3
Study 2

Whereas Study 1 served to replicate my original findings using similar methods in a new and larger community sample, for Study 2 I aimed to reproduce my results using a new paradigm. I asked participants to partake into a chat session with two confederates during which an antigay comment is made by one confederate, and the second confronts the bigotry. As in previous designs, I varied the sexual orientation of the target through his partner’s information on a social media profile (same-sex partner, opposite-sex partner, undisclosed partner). A strict turn order was enforced, whereby the participant was scheduled to go first after the comment was made. After the participants had a chance to react to the comment, the second confederate either confronted or did not confront the bigotry. The perpetrator then continued his previous comment, giving participants a second chance to confront before the chat session ended.

I expected that, as in Study 1, confronters would be viewed as complainers, which would make them seem less likable. I also expected that confronters would be viewed as more likely gay/less likely straight than non-confronters, regardless of their actual sexual orientation. I also predicted that there would be very few participants who confront the comment on their own, as previous studies have shown to be the case (Dickter, 2012), but that these numbers may increase as a result of viewing someone else confronting first. Lastly, based on the precarious manhood feelings and its effects on confrontation in heterosexual males (Kroeper et al., 2014), I expected men to confront less often than women would. Some of the results from this study were published in Cadieux & Chasteen (2015, Study 3).

1 Method

1.1 Participants and design

Participants were recruited from an introductory psychology course at the University of Toronto and were compensated either with partial course credit or $10. The total sample included 140 participants, 4 of whom were excluded because they did not declare being straight, 8 because of technical difficulties during the chat session, and 12 due to participants’ suspicion that their conversation partners were confederates. The final sample included 116 heterosexual participants (51 males, 65 females; Age: $M = 18.77, SD = 1.69$; 51% East Asian, 29% White, 10% South
Asian, 10% Other). This experiment used a 2 (confrontation condition: confront or not) x 3(target orientation information: in a same-sex relationship, in an opposite-sex relationship, in a relationship with someone undisclosed) between-subjects design. Participants were assigned to a condition using a stratified randomization procedure similar to the previous study to ensure males and females would be as equally distributed between the 6 conditions as possible.

1.2 Procedure

Participants were brought to the lab one at a time and were told that they would participate in a study about how social media affects everyday communication. They were told that they would participate in a Yahoo! Messenger chat session with two other participants located at various locations across campus, and that they would also view screenshots taken from the Facebook profiles of their conversation partners. To reduce suspicion, research assistants asked participants to provide us with some demographic background to share with their partners, but said we were too short on time to have them provide us with their own Facebook page. Instead, they were asked to fill a demographic sheet which we would ostensibly fax to the other locations.

Then, participants were given a paper copy of the Facebook profiles of their two fictitious chatting partners that were created by the research team. These were identical to those used in Study 1, except they were updated to match the more recent page layout that Facebook had been using. Again, the profile of the confronter varied across the same three relationship depictions as in the earlier studies. As in Study 1, very little supplemental information was available on the Facebook page screenshots and only included the same minimal employment and education background as previously used.

Once participants had a chance to view the profiles and the experimenter had “faxed” the demographic sheet to the other participants, the experimenter came back to the participant and announced that the chat session would begin, and that a strict turn order was enforced. This would ensure that the participant would not be able to disrupt the script too much and that the conversation would be under the control of the experimenter. The experimenter then indicated that the topic for the conversation would be “career goals”. The experimenter then went to the room adjacent to the one the participant was in and used two separate computers to chat as the two different characters. The conversation was scripted, and always included close-ended questions before the participant’s turn so as to subtly steer the conversation in the intended
direction. The confronting character (whose turn came after the participant) slightly adapted his response to give a natural feel to the conversation by acknowledging what the participant said, but always used language that was as neutral as possible so as to not affect the participant’s perception of him. The script eventually led to a derogatory antigay comment made by the bigoted character in response to an issue raised by the target: “That’s gay! Why don’t you just get [a student loan] so that you wouldn't have to work so much?” Participants were always next in the turn order enforced and were allowed to respond any way they liked. After their turn, they then saw the target’s response to the situation, and conditions varied in how the target approached the comment. He either confronted by saying: “Don’t use the word gay like that… I hate it!”, or did not confront the comment by saying: “Oh, I dunno…”. The conversation continued for one more turn, giving participants a second chance to confront the comment, and then the experimenter told the participant that they had chatted for the predetermined amount of time they were allotted (which was never identified as a specific amount of time as it would vary depending on how long the participant would take in the chat session) and that they would move on to the next portion of the study. The participants completed similar questionnaires to those in Study 1, with only a few items removed because they were not relevant to a live chat and the actual interaction that took place (e.g., “It would be nice to have a conversation with [the target]”, “It would be easy to get along with [the target]”). After completing all questionnaires, participants were debriefed and compensated. Chat session records were saved and I coded the participants’ responses to the bigoted comment, before and after their viewing of the target’s behaviour.

2 Results

2.1 Target’s ratings

2.1.1 Likability

I used the same 3 items as previous studies from the target evaluation questionnaire to calculate mean target likability scores: likability, good personality, good to have as a friend. The 2 (confrontation condition: confront or not) x 3 (target orientation information: in a same-sex relationship, in an opposite-sex relationship, in a relationship with someone undisclosed) ANOVA again revealed no significant effects on likability (all $F_s < 0.71, ps > .40$), see Table 1 for detailed results.
2.1.2 Complainer perceptions

I also tested whether participants viewed the confronter as being a complainer for voicing his discontent with the bigoted comment by computing mean complainer scores as in the previous studies (mean of “Complainer” and “Irritating” ratings). Although the scale had lower internal consistency ($\alpha = .57, 95\% \text{ CI} [.46, .66]$), I used the same items in order to be as consistent as possible with the previous studies. As in Study 1, there was a significant effect of confrontation condition on perceptions of the target as being a complainer, $F(1, 110) = 10.40, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .09$, where the target was seen as more of a complainer when he confronted than when he did not (see Table 1 for details). No significant interaction or main effects were observed with the sexual orientation information condition (all $F$s < 1.14, all $p$s > .32). Likability and complainer perceptions were again negatively correlated with one another ($r = -0.44, p < .001$).

2.2 Perceived sexual orientation

As in previous studies, there was a significant main effect of target orientation information on the perceived sexual orientation of the target, $F(2, 110) = 44.94, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .45$. The target was rated as more gay when he was in a relationship with a man and as more straight when he was in a relationship with a woman (see Table 2). The target’s orientation rating again fell in between the other two conditions when the sex of his relationship partner was undisclosed. There were significant differences among all conditions ($p$s < .001) except between the undisclosed and straight conditions. This confirms that participants were attentive to the profiles they were handed and factored in the partner information in their evaluation of the target’s sexual orientation. Importantly, I again found a significant main effect for confrontation condition, $F(1, 110) = 5.59, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .05$, whereby the target was viewed as more likely to be gay when he confronted than when he did not (see Table 2). No interaction effect was found ($p = .26$), showing that all targets were viewed as more likely to be gay or less likely to be straight for confronting regardless of their actual orientation, see Table 2 for detailed results.

2.3 Mediation analyses

I tested the same mediation model as in Study 1 (see Figure 1) and again found that the only indirect path to reach statistical significance was the one including Complainer Perceptions as a single mediator between Confrontation Condition and Target Likability (see Table 3 for results).
2.4 Confrontation effectiveness

As in Study 1, I used participants’ ratings of the perpetrator to compute mean scores of inappropriateness. I calculated a mean score of how prejudiced he seemed, how unacceptable was what he said, and how respectful he was (reversed; $\alpha = .76$, 95% CI [.67, .83]). With a 2 x 3 ANOVA, I did not find any differences between perceptions of the perpetrator when he was confronted ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 1.16$) versus when he was not ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 1.45$), $F(1, 110) = 1.58$, $p = .21$. The orientation of the target did not influence these perceptions (all $ps > .46$).

2.5 Confrontation from participants

Unlike in Study 1 where I measured people’s intentions to confront, in Study 2 I captured participants’ actual behaviour in real time as part of the chat session. I coded their responses to the bigoted comment according to whether they confronted, did not confront, or sided with the bigot, both before and after they viewed the target’s reaction to the comment. Results show that prior to viewing the target reacting to the comment, participants were no more likely to confront the bigoted comment in either condition, showing that both conditions were equivalent as they should have been up to this point, $\chi^2(2) = 3.53$, $p = .17$, see Figure 2 for details. Only 8 people (3 males) confronted the comment at that point. Importantly, participants’ behaviour was significantly changed after seeing the target confront, whereby 57.63% of participants actively confronted the comment after seeing the confederate confront, compared to 3.40% before seeing that reaction, $\chi^2(2) = 49.97$, $p < .001$, see Figure 3 for details.

I also predicted that males would tend to confront less often than females would, given possible feelings of precarious manhood and gender norms associated with the confrontation of antigay bias. I found no difference in confrontation rates in men and women, both before and after seeing the target’s behaviour (all $ps > .13$).

3 Discussion

In Study 2, using a live interaction setting, I replicated findings from my previous studies. Across all studies I found that confronters were perceived as more likely gay/less likely straight than non-confronters, regardless of the target’s actual sexual orientation. These biased perceptions did not affect other ratings of the target such as likability or being a complainer. As well, Study 2 replicated Study 1’s result that confronters were viewed more as complainers than non-
confronters, which in turn led them to be disliked. Once again, I did not find that confronters were less liked than non-confronters because of their sexual orientation, actual or perceived, showing that group membership seems to play a different role in perceptions of antigay prejudice confronters than it does for other prejudice confrontations such as sexism and racism (e.g. Czopp & Monteith, 2003).

On the upside, confrontation broke the silence and led nearly 60% of participants to actively join the confronter and express disagreement with the antigay comment. These results suggest that despite receiving negative evaluations, confronters can elicit positive action in bystanders. By having more people confront the comment, there are chances that the perpetrator and other witnesses would feel that there is consensus against those ideas and that it is not only the representation of one person’s thoughts. This would give more weight to the confrontation, making it more likely to succeed in reducing prejudice.

Lastly, I did not find significant differences in responses from male and female participants. This may be due to the implied social pressures involved in an experimental setting and the social norms surrounding academic activities (they were participating as part of a university assignment). Because males tend to yield more to prevalent social pressures when responding to antigay bias (Dickter et al., 2011), they may have chosen to follow these standards to respond to the comment. This experiment does not allow us to safely conclude that males’ and females’ responses to antigay bias would be similar to one another in the real world.
Chapter 4
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Thus far, I found that confronters of antigay prejudice are thought to be more likely gay and less likely straight than non-confronters. These reactions occurred in a Canadian undergraduate sample as well as in a sample drawn from the general population in the United States. I also found that these results were obtained when people viewed passive conversation scripts as well as participated in live online conversations. Moreover, in most of these samples and situations, people viewed confronters as complainers, which led to confronters being disliked.

1 Rationale

The complainer/dislikability cost that I found in Studies 1 and 2 of this dissertation did not occur in my original Master’s thesis study (Cadieux, 2012; Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)). In that study, confronters were marginally more liked than non-confronters. As discussed previously in the introduction, there may be several factors at play that could explain why confronters faced different outcomes (see Introduction section 2.1), namely (1) whether the intention behind the inappropriate comment is clearly bigoted or not, (2) whether the confronter targets the comment itself or the person who said it, (3) whether the confronter makes a specific prejudice call or not using prejudice labels (e.g., bigot, racist, sexist), and (4) the type of prejudice being confronted. Taking these elements into account can perhaps explain my own inconsistent results as well.

For example, I found that confronters were marginally more liked in my Master’s thesis study (Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)), whereas they were seen as complainers in Studies 1 and 2 of this dissertation (Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Studies 2 and 3)). Looking closely at the scripts used and considering the prejudicial intent of the bigot, it seems that there were differences on that dimension between studies. For example, in my Master’s thesis study (Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1)), I used an inappropriate comment which had clearly bigoted intentions by insinuating that a gay person would be a pedophile, leading to a marginal increase in the confronter’s perceived likability. Confronters in that study were not perceived as complainers. In Studies 1 and 2 of this dissertation, however, the intention behind the comment was not as clearly bigoted. In Study 1, the comment was a slur used to emasculate a friend as a joke (i.e., that it is “gay” to like Justin Bieber), and Study 2 featured the derogatory use of the word “gay”
as a synonym for “lame” (i.e., that having to work a student job is “gay”). Although the use of these words is inappropriate, the intention was not to denigrate gay individuals. Confronters in those studies were seen as complainers, and disliked indirectly as a result of that shift in perceptions. Indeed, it may appear overly hostile to confront someone for something they did not mean to say, resulting in greater dislike for these confronters. If prejudicial intent of the perpetrator can successfully predict the outcome of a confrontation in terms of likability and complaining of the confronter, this would resolve these discrepancies.

Turning to the target of the confrontation, if a confronter retaliates by insulting someone personally instead of attacking the words that were said, this may result in greater dislike for the confronter as they may be viewed as inappropriate themselves. Though I have found that confronters are sometimes viewed as complainers (Studies 1 and 2 above), and that this can in turn lead to them being disliked (which may be due to the lack of prejudicial intent on the bigot’s part, as mentioned above), I never found a direct confrontation – dislike relationship in any of my data. This may be because all of the confronting scripts targeted what was said and not who said it. For example, in Study 1, the confronter says “Why would you say that? You just go around using the word gay and faggot as an insult for fun? That is so inappropriate”. Though the confronter highlights the inappropriate nature of the comment in a lecturing tone, he specifically targets what was said and not who said it. Again, in Study 2, by saying “Don’t use the word gay like that, I HATE it”, the confronter uses strong language but focuses on the words that were used. Therefore, the actual target of a confrontation may be critical in determining how likable someone is perceived to be, whereby people may prefer confronters who do not attack others personally. This would help resolve some of the discrepancies in the literature.

Also, it appears that confronters are liked less when they make a specific claim of racism/sexism, rather than just highlighting the inappropriateness of what was said. This may seem as damning and harsh on the confronter’s part to use labels like that, even if they may be appropriate to describe what has happened. People may prefer confrontations that do not directly make claims of prejudiced intentions, as they may be seen as an insult rather than useful to the point being made. In Dickter et al. (2011) and all my studies thus far, language used by the confronter may have been assertive but never used specific labels such as homophobic, sexist, or racist, and our studies combined did not find that confronters were overtly disliked. In contrast, Czopp and Monteith (2003), and Czopp and colleagues (2006) used explicit labels relating to prejudice in
their confrontation scripts, and observed that confronters were disliked and/or seen as overreacting as a direct cost to their confrontation. From looking at past studies, word choice and tone were often confounded, making it impossible to tell if these labels would have an effect on their own. Therefore, I wanted to test whether using prejudice labels mattered in the outcome of a confrontation, or whether it was simply an issue of tone and personal attack. No studies to date have looked at that specific variable, let alone all the variables together (clear/unclear intention of the bigoted comment, suggestive tone aiming at the words used/personal attack, use of prejudice labels/not) in predicting the perceived likability of a confronter and how much of a complainer they seem to be, a gap which I aimed to address in Study 3.

1.1 Other goals of this study

In addition to the previously mentioned objectives, in Study 3 I also aimed to compare whether confronting antigay prejudice is similar to confronting anti-lesbian prejudice. People hold different attitudes towards lesbians than they do towards gays, whereby they are typically more tolerant of lesbianism than they are of male homosexuality (Herek, 1988; 2000; 2002; Schellenberg et al., 1999). Because of this, and based on the fact that people appear to judge a confronter based on the legitimacy of their confrontation, people’s reactions to antigay prejudice confronters may be different from reactions to anti-lesbian prejudice confronters. Study 3 was a first attempt to ascertain whether confronters of anti-lesbian prejudice suffer costs similar to antigay prejudice confronters.

Lastly, though I have found (and replicated) that confronters are suspected to be likely gay or less likely straight after confronting, I have not detailed whether this is moderated by how one confronts prejudice. Also, no studies have yet focused on whether these costs appear for confronters of other types of prejudices. I used this opportunity to test whether the way someone confronts changes how much people think they might be gay (or lesbian) for confronting. Thus, Study 3 is one of the first attempts to systematically vary the elements of a confrontation to examine the effects they may have on the assumptions people make about a confronter’s group memberships, and served as a first test to assess whether there are ways to minimize these suspicions by confronting a specific way.
1.2 Hypotheses

Though this study represents a first attempt at using an anti-lesbian comment, I expected that an unidentified confronter would be suspected as more likely to be female and lesbian in the case of an anti-lesbian comment, whereas an unidentified confronter of antigay prejudice would be seen as more likely male and gay. Such findings would be in line with my previous studies and would show that assumptions made about confronters’ membership to the defended group generalize to another type of concealed (or concealable) identity (gender and lesbian). This was also the first study to verify whether the intensity and the content of a confrontation can change these biased assumptions in group membership perceptions following confrontation. I expected that, for cases where the confrontation is perceived as more extreme than is warranted by the bigoted comment, participants will more likely perceive the confroner as being gay/lesbian than in cases when the confrontation is viewed as more reasonable.

As for likability and complainer costs, I expected confronsters of clearly intended bigotry, who used a suggestive tone and refrained from using prejudice labels, would be perceived more positively than their counterparts. I also expected confronsters of antigay prejudice to be perceived more positively than anti-lesbian prejudice confronsters because of the relative perceived legitimacy of their confronsters.

2 Method

2.1 Participants and design

Participants were recruited from an introductory psychology course at the University of Toronto and compensated either with partial course credit or $10. This study used a 2 (prejudice type: antigay or anti-lesbian) x 2 (intention behind the comment: clearly bigoted or ambiguous) x 2 (tone of the confrontation: personal attack or suggestive) x 2 (mention of homophobia: present or absent) between-subjects design. Because this study focuses exclusively on confronsters and seeks to find differences between types of confronsters, this design does not include a condition without confronster as opposed to my previous designs.

The targeted sample for Study 3 was 505 heterosexual participants, as estimated by using G*Power to yield an a priori power of 90%, while expecting an effect size of $f = 0.15$ (a small effect size). In the end, 667 participants were run in the experiment. All participants who
indicated a sexual orientation different from straight, who failed simple attention or manipulation checks spread throughout the experiment, or expressed correct suspicions about the goals of the study were deleted before looking any further at their data. Four questions asked participants whether “Person X was part of the conversation [they] just read” (the answer would always be “yes”), which acted as attention checks, and two questions asked participants to recall in their own words what each person said immediately after reading the script, which acted as a manipulation check. Those who failed any of those questions were deleted from the study to ensure the highest quality of data. The full sample after deletions was 532 participants (55% female, \(M_{age} = 18.96, SD_{age} = 2.55\)). Participants were assigned to a condition using a stratified randomization procedure similar to the previous studies to ensure males and females were as equally distributed between the 16 conditions as possible.

2.2 Procedure

Participants were brought to the lab and told that they would participate in a study about perceptions of conflict in online situations. They were told that they would view screenshots of news articles and the respective comment sections. All participants were assigned two news stories to read, the first being a filler story about the CNE (a yearly fair in the city of Toronto). In the comments section of that article, two people argue lightly over which is best between the CNE and Canada’s Wonderland (an amusement park near Toronto). This was used in order to minimize suspicion about the actual research goals.

Then, participants read one of two key news articles, featuring either the gay pride parade or the Dyke March (see Appendix 1). The articles displayed a neutral story about each event and showed a photo of either men wearing colorful outfits with balloons, or women in a similar pose (see Appendix 1 for screenshots of the news articles). At the bottom of those screenshots made to resemble an actual news website, the comment section displayed a derogatory comment which either was ambiguous (“I don’t want to hear about that every time I turn on CP24”) or clearly bigoted (“I don’t want to hear about that every time I turn on CP24, that’s just gross”). Then, someone else confronted that comment by either personally attacking the perpetrator or not, as well as either using a prejudice label (homophobia) or not within that same confrontation. In the suggestive, no-label condition, the confrontation was: “What do you mean by that? This is a major event in our city...”. In the non-personal with label condition, the confrontation was:
“What do you mean by that? This feels inappropriate and homophobic…”. In the personal attack without label condition, the confrontation was: “What do you mean by that? This is a major event in our city so maybe you should shut up…”. Lastly, in the personal attack with label condition, the confrontation was: “What do you mean by that you homophobe? This is a major event in our city maybe you should shut up…” (for a summary of conditions used, see Table 4 and Appendix 1). By adding pieces to each of these confrontation scripts and keeping the root the same, it allowed isolating which parts of the script are affecting the outcome. In all conditions, both commenters were anonymized to verify whether participants make different assumptions about who these people might be according to their behaviour. In order to make this feel natural to participants, they were told that this was done in order to preserve the anonymity of these unsuspecting people.

Participants then completed similar questionnaires to those in Studies 1 and 2, evaluating both commenters on multiple dimensions including likability, complainer perception, inappropriateness, and group memberships, as well as the Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS; Morrison & Morrison, 2002). Conditions were equivalent in their levels of homonegativity (ps > .28). Controlling for MHS scores did not change the results hereafter. After completing all questionnaires, participants were probed for suspicion, debriefed, and compensated.

3 Results

3.1 Piloting of inappropriate comments

I first used a different sample of 102 participants (53% female, $M_{\text{age}} = 18.79$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 2.34$) to test whether the two versions of the inappropriate comments were seen differently in their level of inappropriateness (average of “Prejudiced”, “Unacceptable”, “Inappropriate”, “Respectful (r)”, and “Appropriate (r)”; $\alpha = .79$). The more clearly bigoted version (adding “that’s just gross” to the comment) yielded a higher score of inappropriateness ($M = 5.67$, $SD = 1.19$) than the milder comment ($M = 4.95$, $SD = 1.22$), $t(100) = -2.98$, $p = .004$, showing that the manipulation had the intended effect.

3.2 Analytic strategy

Omnibus tests were conducted by entering all 4 manipulated variables (Prejudice Type (antigay/anti-lesbian), Bigoted Intention (ambiguous/clear), Confrontation Intensity
(suggestive/personal attack), and Prejudice Labels (absent/present)) as predictors of the dependent variable in an ANOVA. Interactions were then analyzed using simple effects through the EMMEANS function in SPSS syntax.

3.3 Likability scores.

3.3.1 Omnibus test.

Likability was computed as an average of 4 different ratings of the confronter (“Likable”, “Has a good personality”, “Nice”, and “Kind”; $\alpha = .93$). The 4-way interaction was not significant ($p = .64$) as well as most 3-way interactions ($p > .08$). Controlling for MHS scores made the one marginal interaction less significant, $p = .12$, and thus it will not be interpreted further.

3.3.1.1 Confrontation Intensity

Of importance, Confrontation Intensity had a significant main effect on likability ($F(1, 516) = 306.17, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .37$) which was not qualified by significant interactions with other variables. As expected, confronters who made a confrontation that was a stronger personal attack were much less liked ($M = 2.89, SD = 1.27$) than those who made a suggestive confrontation aimed at what was said ($M = 4.70, SD = 1.18$).

3.3.1.2 Prejudice Type x Bigoted Intention x Prejudice Labels

This 3-way interaction was significant, $F(1, 516) = 4.72, p = .03, \eta^2_p = .01$ (see Figure 4 for graphed 3-way results). Interpreting the 3-way interaction is eased by viewing Figure 4 which shows clear differences and patterns. The best combination of these 3 independent variables in terms of being seen as likable is to confront clear antigay bigotry by avoiding use of prejudice labels ($M = 4.32, SD = 1.52$), which confirms the research hypotheses. The most costly scenario for confronters of prejudice, in contrast, was to confront ambiguous anti-lesbian prejudice by using prejudice labels ($M = 3.16, SD = 1.58$).

Further examining Figure 4, it appears that confronting clear bigotry ($M = 4.06, SD = 1.50$) leads to better outcomes than confronting ambiguous bigotry ($M = 3.52, SD = 1.51$) in all cases, regardless of the approach used or the type of prejudice being countered (main effect: $F(1, 516) = 24.85, p < .001$). Keeping in mind that 4 is the midpoint of a 7-point scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree, all confronters of clear bigotry were either liked or
perceived neutrally (scores ≥ 4), whereas confronters of ambiguous bigotry were disliked in all cases (scores < 4).

Additionally, confronting antigay prejudice leads to being more liked \((M = 3.89, SD = 1.50)\) than confronting anti-lesbian prejudice \((M = 3.69, SD = 1.54)\) in most cases (except when confronting clear bigotry using prejudice labels, where both targets were liked the same and yielded neutral appraisals). All main effects were statistically significant at \(p < .05\), except Prejudice Type which was marginally significant, \(F(1, 516) = 3.59, p = .059, \eta^2_p = .01\).

### 3.4 Complainer scores

#### 3.4.1 Omnibus test

Complaining was computed as an average of 3 different ratings of the confronter ("Irritating", "Complainer", and "Whiny"; \(\alpha = .83\)). All interactions did not reach significance \((p > .28)\) as well as the main effect for Prejudice Type \((p = .13)\). The other main effects were all statistically significant.

#### 3.4.1.1 Bigoted intention

Confronters who spoke against ambiguous bigotry were seen more as complainers \((M = 3.32, SD = 1.41)\) than their counterparts who confronted clear bigotry \((M = 2.87, SD = 1.35)\), \(F(1, 516) = 16.52, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .03\).

#### 3.4.1.2 Confrontation intensity

Confronters who personally attacked the perpetrator were viewed more as complainers \((M = 3.62, SD = 1.39)\) than those who were suggestive and focused on what was said \((M = 2.56, SD = 1.20)\), \(F(1,516) = 89.23, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .15\).

#### 3.4.1.3 Prejudice labels

Confronters who used prejudice labels by calling the person or the speech "homophobic" were viewed more as complainers \((M = 3.34, SD = 1.49)\) than those who refrained from using prejudice labels \((M = 2.84, SD = 1.25)\), \(F(1,516) = 18.69, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .04\),
3.4.2 Complainer – Likability correlation

Complainer and likability ratings were correlated strongly with one another \( r = -.65, p < .001 \).

3.5 Perceived inappropriateness of comment

3.5.1 Omnibus test

Inappropriateness was computed as an average of 5 different ratings of the perpetrator (“Prejudiced”, “Unacceptable”, “Inappropriate”, “Respectful (r)”, and “Appropriate (r)”; \( \alpha = .79 \)). All interactions did not reach significance \( (p > .18) \) except one (Bigoted Intention x Prejudice Type; \( F(1, 516) = 3.90, p = .05, \eta^2_p = .01 \)). Most main effects were not significant \( (p > .16) \) except for Bigoted Intention \( (F(1, 516) = 54.62, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .10) \) which shows that the manipulation had the intended effect: a clearly bigoted comment was perceived as more inappropriate \( (M = 5.58, SD = 1.11) \) than the ambiguous comment \( (M = 4.87, SD = 1.12) \), but this was qualified by an interaction with Prejudice Type, which is detailed below.

3.5.1.1 Bigoted Intention x Prejudice Type interaction

When comparing ambiguous and clear bigotry at different Prejudice Type levels, all comparisons were significant \( (p < .001) \) showing that clear bigotry was perceived as more inappropriate than ambiguous bigotry in the context of both the antigay and anti-lesbian comments (see Figure 5).

When comparing anti-lesbian and antigay comments at different Bigoted Intention levels, there was no difference between anti-lesbian and antigay comments when the bigotry was clear \( (F(1,516) = 0.30, p = .58) \), showing that a clear antigay and a strong anti-lesbian comment (calling the parade and dyke march “gross”) were perceived as equally inappropriate. However, there was a significant difference in the perception of inappropriateness of an ambiguously bigoted comment depending on the type of prejudice, whereby an ambiguous anti-lesbian comment \( (M = 4.71, SD = 1.16) \) was perceived as less inappropriate than an ambiguous antigay comment \( (M = 5.02, SD = 1.06) \), \( F(1,516) = 5.01, p = .03, \eta^2_p = .01 \). Thus, people felt it was more acceptable for a perpetrator to say they “don’t want to hear about that every time they [turn on the news]” in relation to a lesbian-focused event (dyke march) than a gay-focused event (pride parade).
3.5.2 Inappropriateness of a perpetrator and perceptions of the confronter

Results show that a perpetrator’s perceived inappropriateness is positively related to how liked a confronter is, \( r(532) = .34, p < .001 \), as well as negatively related to how much a confronter is seen as a complainer, \( r(532) = -.38, p < .001 \).

3.6 Perceived sexual orientation of confronter

3.6.1 Omnibus test

Sexual orientation of the confronter was a single-item scale identical to that used in previous studies (1- Definitely gay, 4- Ambiguous/Unsure, 7- Definitely straight). All interactions did not reach significance \( (p > .08) \) except one (Confrontation Intensity x Prejudice Type; \( F(1, 516) = 4.26, p = .04, \eta^2_p = .01 \), see Figure 6 for results. There was also a main effect of Prejudice Labels \( F(1, 516) = 13.71, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .03 \) which showed that someone who confronted by using an explicit label referring to homophobia was perceived to be less likely straight \( (M = 4.24, SD = 1.47) \) than someone who abstained from using such language \( (M = 4.71, SD = 1.37) \).

3.6.1.1 Confront intensity x Prejudice Type interaction

Confrontation intensity only changed perceptions of sexual orientation in the case of an antigay comment \( (p < .001) \), not an anti-lesbian comment \( (p = .32) \). Personally attacking a perpetrator of an antigay comment \( (M = 4.05, SD = 1.51) \) led to people viewing the confronter as less likely straight than someone confronting suggestively \( (M = 4.72, SD = 1.32) \).

3.6.2 Orientation perception and likability/complainer perceptions

Results show that the more people assume a confronter is gay (lower scores on the orientation perception scale), the more they view him/her as a complainer, \( r(532) = -.15, p = .001 \), and dislike him/her more as well, \( r(532) = -.18, p < .001 \).

3.7 Perceived gender of confronter

3.7.1 Logistic regression

Because confronter gender was a binary variable (male, female), I entered all four independent variables as main effects into a logistic regression predicting gender perceptions of the confronter. The omnibus test of model coefficients reached statistical significance \( (\chi^2 (4) = \)
21.77, \( p < .001 \)). Specifically, among all predictors, Prejudice Type and Confrontation Intensity changed perceptions of the confronter’s gender. First, as hypothesized, participants were 1.75 times more likely to think the confronter of an anti-lesbian comment would be a woman than a man (vice versa for antigay comments; \( b = 0.56, SE = 0.18, \chi^2 (1) = 9.29, p = .002, \) Odds Ratio = 1.75:1, 95% CI Odds [1.22, 2.50]), showing that people were more likely to believe that confronters’ gender matched the defended group’s gender, see Figure 7 for results. Second, participants were also 1.90 times more likely to think that personal attacks were made by males than females (vice versa for suggestive confrontations; \( b = -0.64, SE = 0.18, \chi^2 (1) = 12.25, p < .001, \) Odds Ratio = 0.53:1, 95% CI Odds [0.37, 0.75]). Other predictors failed to reach significance (\( p > .53 \)).

4 Discussion

In this study, I tested many subtle variations to a confrontation script so as to isolate which portions affect perceptions of a confronter in hopes of finding a more cost-effective way to confront sexual prejudice. I had 2 different types of prejudiced comments (antigay and anti-lesbian) made in 2 different ways (ambiguous and clear), paired with a confrontation that had one of 2 tones (suggestive and personal attack) and either included or not a prejudice label (mentions homophobia specifically or not). All of these variables were successful in predicting outcomes of likability and complaining perceptions, as well as biases in perceptions of gender and sexual orientation of the anonymous confronter.

4.1 Likability perceptions

The literature was plagued with inconsistencies when reporting costs facing confronters of prejudice. Some reported positive outcomes whereby confronters were more liked and respected for confronting than non-confronters, even assertive ones (e.g., Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1); Dickter et al., 2011; Mallett & Wagner, 2011), whereas others showed that confronters were generally disliked for confronting (e.g., Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Studies 2 and 3); Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Kaiser & Miller, 2003). In the present study, whenever a confronter personally attacked the perpetrator with a harsh tone, they were seen as dislikable. This was not qualified by any interactions and was a very strong effect. This is not surprising; someone who speaks in a harsh, attacking way to others is by definition an unlikable person. It seems that whenever previous studies did find that confronters were liked, even assertive ones used more
tact and were generally more respectful of the person being confronted. Assertiveness does not mean hostility, and confronters should seek to strike a balance between getting their point across clearly and directly while avoiding personal attacks at the expense of the perpetrator (if they want to avoid being disliked, that is).

The intensity of the comment being confronted, the use of prejudice labels, and the type of prejudice also predicted the confronter’s perceived likability. A significant interaction between the three showed that the best possible combination for a confronter is to confront clear antigay prejudice while avoiding prejudice labels, leading to the confronter being liked (above midpoint on a scale). On the flipside, confronting ambiguous anti-lesbian bigotry by using prejudice labels led to the worst outcome and being disliked (below midpoint). Confronting someone who did not have clearly bigoted intentions may appear damning, just as much as labeling them as homophobic, and participants disliked confronters who did so.

Interestingly, participants felt that confronters of anti-lesbian bigotry were often more dislikable than those confronting anti-gay bigotry using the exact same comments in the exact same way. For example, people felt it was more acceptable for a perpetrator to say they “don’t want to hear about that every time they [turn on the news]” (a subtle prejudiced remark) in relation to a lesbian-focused event (dyke march) than a gay-focused event (pride parade). Because ratings of inappropriateness of a bigot are negatively related to how likable a confronter is perceived to be, this may explain why confronting subtle anti-lesbian bigotry with prejudice labels led to the worst outcomes for the confronter. It may be that people feel the dyke march is less newsworthy than the pride parade, but this fact alone may hint at aversive sexism. Much like women’s sports and women’s issues are often degraded and viewed as less worthy of attention, perhaps this was also the case with this event geared toward lesbians. People felt that the expression of exasperation in reaction to being shown this event on the news was more justified than a very similar event about the gay community at large.

4.2 Complainer perceptions

Complainer perceptions were predicted by 3 separate main effects. Confronting subtle bigotry, confronting more harshly, and using prejudice labels all led to the confronter being perceived as more of a complainer. This is not surprising and is consistent with the research hypotheses. There was no interaction between these variables, however, so it is not the case that confronting
harshly by attacking a perpetrator becomes okay when the bigoted comment was overt and very inappropriate. Confronting harshly always led to increased complainer perceptions, regardless of the comment being confronted. This may be because the more hostile confrontation in this study was particularly harsh and personal. There may be ways to increase the intensity of a confrontation when faced with a similarly intense bigoted comment without being seen as a complainer. Other research has already established that some assertive confronters can receive more positive evaluations than their softer counterparts (Dickter et al., 2011). It remains unclear, however, what the boundary conditions are to these effects tilting one way or the other.

4.3 Perception of group memberships

4.3.1 Sexual orientation perceptions

This was the first experiment testing how aspects of a confrontation of homophobic bigotry affect perceptions of sexual orientation. Moreover, it is the first study to do so by seeing whether the same bias in sexual orientation perceptions occur for confrontations of both antigay and anti-lesbian bigotry.

It appears that the use of prejudice labels (calling someone or some speech “homophobic”, specifically) led to participants thinking the confronter was more likely gay or lesbian, regardless of other variables and the context in which it was used. Because the confronter attached a specific term labeling the offensive comment as being prejudiced towards a group, this might have made the confronter seem more defensive and perhaps triggered by the comment. By playing the “prejudice card”, confronters may have been thought to act on a self-serving basis, leading to the inference that they may be part of the group. It may also be that the use of the word is more typical of the gay community, but to my knowledge it does not represent a commonly held stereotype.

The strength of a confrontation also led people to think a confronter is likely homosexual, but only in the case of a confrontation of an antigay comment, not an anti-lesbian comment. This may have to do with gender perceptions whereby personal attacks were more likely thought to be made by men than women. Therefore, a man confronting anti-lesbian prejudice would not necessarily be gay, but a man confronting antigay prejudice would be, according to gender norms of expression of masculinity (Poteat et al., 2011; Vandello et al., 2008). It may also be that there
are stereotypes of gay men as being confrontational and feisty, whereas the same stereotype would not exist for lesbians. This would need to be tested further before it can be safely concluded, however. It is nevertheless interesting that antigay and anti-lesbian prejudice confrontations may not lead to the same “guilty-by-association” types of costs.

For the first time in my studies, the confronter’s assumed orientation was linked to him/her being viewed as a complainer and disliked. In line with other studies like Czopp and Monteith (2003) which found that confronters who are part of the group they defend are disliked (Blacks opposing racism, women opposing sexism), people who suspect a confronter to be more gay also rate them as more dislikable and complaining more. Because this is correlational data, it is impossible to tell whether people dislike (and view as a complainer) a confronter they suspect to be gay, or if they suspect to be gay someone they dislike and is a complainer. This correlation was weak but reached significance due to the large sample. Because the effect size is low, it may explain why I had not found that effect in my earlier studies. Future studies could try and replicate this effect with an experimental manipulation to test directionality but should keep in mind that this effect was weak and would probably require a large sample to detect.

4.3.2 Gender perceptions

With the addition of anti-lesbian prejudice, it was interesting to test whether assumptions that a confronter’s group memberships match the group being defended generalize to traits other than sexual orientation. Due to the experimental setup which maintained the anonymity of the purported confronter, gender (and all other traits for that matter) were now concealed, much like sexual orientation is in many contexts. And like sexual orientation, people assumed the gender of the confronter more likely matched the gender of the defended group (i.e., female confronter in anti-lesbian scripts, male in antigay scripts). One can therefore assume that this rule would hold for many other groups under similar circumstances. Confronters who belong to the group being defended are often dismissed and seen as self-serving (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Eagly et al., 1978; Petty et al., 2001; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). The present research confirms a complementary idea: people tend to match the confronter’s assumed memberships to those of the group they defend because they infer others would act on a self-serving basis, in other words defending a group they belong to.
4.4 Conclusion

This is one of the first studies to test many different components of a confrontation in one comprehensive design. As predicted, the intensity of the bigoted comment and the confrontation matched against it, as well as the use of prejudice labels and the type of prejudice being confronted were all useful variables in predicting outcomes of likability, complainer perceptions, and group membership perceptions of the confronter. As well, this was one of the first studies empirically investigating anti-lesbian prejudice confrontation. As predicted, this study shows that anti-lesbian prejudice has unique dynamics that do not translate 1-to-1 with antigay prejudice and that make it worth studying on its own.
Chapter 5
Study 4

Studies 1-3 focused on establishing whether confrontation of antigay prejudice comes with certain costs, and whether some situations and approaches moderate these costs. In Studies 4 and 5, I investigated whether there are possible ways to increase confrontations by heterosexual people. Previous research has found that non-targets of prejudice (in this instance, heterosexual individuals) have a unique opportunity in terms of prejudice reduction, whereby they are more effective at provoking change in the confronted because they are perceived as more convincing and less self-serving (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Eagly, Wood, & Chaiken, 1978; Petty, Fleming, Priester, & Feinstein, 2001; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Similarly, in Cadieux (2012), I found that non-targets were the only ones effective at raising awareness against antigay prejudice through confrontation. This makes confrontations of antigay prejudice by heterosexual people valuable to the gay cause. However, many barriers to confrontation exist and need to be addressed in order to encourage heterosexual people to confront more often, especially males. For example, in Study 2, when they were first given a chance to confront, only 3 heterosexual males out of 49 confronted the antigay comment in the live chat session (this was not different from straight women who also had low confrontation rates). Kroeper et al. (2014) found that concerns over having their masculinity compromised may be at the root of these males’ reluctance to confront. Males in Kroeper et al. (2014) reported being aware that they may be perceived as likely gay for defending gays, which I have found to be a correct meta-perception based on my findings (Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015).

Therefore, it may be that alleviating fears of sexual orientation miscategorization as well as threats to masculinity would increase rates of confrontation by heterosexual males, a proposition I tested in Study 4. One such way of alleviating these fears may be by allowing males to disclose their sexual orientation to their conversation partners before they make a confrontation. In previous studies, allowing people to disclose their sexual orientation prior to performing gender norm-violating behaviours (e.g., males asked to perform hairstyling on a mannequin) reduced discomfort with and increased positivity toward the activity (Bosson et al., 2005). This may be due to a reduction in feelings of precarious manhood (Vandello et al., 2008). Therefore, it could be that allowing males to disclose their sexual orientation to their peers prior to and during a conversation with them would address their fear of misclassification and help them confront
antigay prejudice whenever it arises during conversation. However, this could easily backfire and increase perpetration of bigotry as well, since participating in antigay bigotry could serve as a way to further boost the affirmation of one’s masculinity (Poteat, Kimmel, & Wilchins, 2011). Because a sexual orientation affirmation manipulation could prime men into wanting to showcase their masculinity to their peers more, they may see participating in antigay slurs as the perfect opportunity to do so. For my fourth study I investigated whether allowing men to disclose and affirm their sexual orientation before and during a conversation increases their confrontation of an antigay comment, or whether it increased agreement with and perpetration of antigay comments.

1 Method

1.1 Participants and design

This study used a protocol similar to Study 2 by recreating a similar live chat environment. Participants were recruited from an introductory psychology course at the University of Toronto and compensated either with partial course credit or $10. The total sample included 78 heterosexual male participants from various ethnic backgrounds ($M_{age} = 18.89$ years, $SD_{age} = 1.95$). Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: sexual orientation disclosure and affirmation, or control.

1.2 Procedure

Participants were brought to the lab one at a time and were told that they would be participating in a study about how social media affects everyday communication. They were told that they would participate in a Skype chat session (text only) with two other participants located at different locations across campus. Depending on the condition assigned, they either shared a short demographic information sheet with their partners including their sexual orientation, or a demographic information sheet without that information. Then, participants were given a paper copy of the demographic sheet from their fictitious chatting partners indicating generic information typical for heterosexual male undergraduates (i.e., late teens, single or in a relationship, straight (in the disclosure condition), and a first name).

Once participants had a chance to view the profile and the experimenter had ostensibly faxed the demographic sheet to the other participants, the experimenter came back to the participant and
announced that the chat session was about to begin and that a turn order would be enforced during the conversation (more details to follow). Participants who had a chance to disclose their sexual orientation on a form prior to the chat session then discussed their “female celebrity crushes” with two confederates, and those who were not given the chance to disclose their sexual orientation prior to the conversation discussed their “favourite male celebs” instead. Both conversations mapped on to one another with the exception that they referred to female or male actors respectively, and talked about how “hot” or how “funny” they were respectively. In both conversations, the same inappropriate comment was eventually made by one of the confederates, saying “ugh san francisco is great but too many gay people man…” [sic]. As in Study 2, a strict turn order was enforced and the participant’s turn was always set to come immediately after the antigay comment was made, before the other confederate confronted. This allowed me to capture participants’ immediate reactions to the comment. After, the second confederate confronted the slur by asking what the problem would be with there being many gays, and the perpetrator goes again saying “its kinda weird lol theyre all over the place” [sic], allowing the participant to confront a second time before the conversation ended. See Appendix 2 for the script used. I attempted to use scripts with harsher antigay comments, but all caused unacceptably high levels of suspicion in participants. After piloting other scripts with 37 participants, this version yielded very little suspicion and was thus used for the experiment.

Participants then filled measures similar to my earlier studies, with some measures added to assess feelings of precarious manhood (Vandello et al., 2008) and internal/external motivation to respond without prejudice (IMS/EMS; Plant & Devine, 1998).

1.3 Measures

1.3.1 Precarious manhood scale (Kroeper et al., 2014; Vandello et al., 2008)

The scale assessing feelings of precarious manhood was created by Kroeper et al. (2014) who slightly changed the original items by Vandello et al. (2008) in order to make them more easily understood. Items ask about one’s views on masculinity on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from “1- Strongly disagree” to “7- Strongly agree”, and higher scores indicate a greater perception that one’s status as a masculine man is fragile and impermanent. Items used were the following: “It’s fairly easy for a man to lose his status as a man”, “A male's status as a real man sometimes
depends on how other people view him”, “A man needs to prove his masculinity”, “A boy needs to become a man; it doesn't just happen”, “The title of "manhood" needs to be reserved for those who deserve it”, and “You're not a man if you don't like masculine things”. Reliability was low ($\alpha = .61$) but would not be improved by the removal of single items, and some suggest a cutoff of $\alpha < .60$ is acceptable (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2009; Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991). To remain consistent with previous studies on this topic, I therefore kept all items and computed precarious manhood scores by averaging all items.

1.3.2 IMS/EMS (Plant & Devine, 1998)

This dual scale measures people’s sources of motivation to appear non-prejudiced. I slightly edited the original items so that they would focus on antigay prejudice specifically. High IMS scores indicate that someone is non-prejudiced due to their personal beliefs against prejudice (e.g., “I am personally motivated by my beliefs to be nonprejudiced toward gay people”, “According to my personal values, using stereotypes about gay people is okay” (reversed); $\alpha = .78$), whereas high EMS scores indicate that someone is non-prejudiced due to external factors such as social desirability and peer pressure (e.g., “I attempt to appear nonprejudiced toward gay people in order to avoid disapproval from others”, “Because of today's political correctness, I try to appear non-prejudiced towards gay people”; $\alpha = .83$). Both scales comprise 5 items each to be rated on 7-point Likert scales ranging from “1- Strongly disagree” to “7- Strongly Agree”. Opposite-meaning items are reverse coded and the 5 items for each scale are averaged separately, yielding an IMS and EMS score for each participant.

2 Results

2.1 In-chat behaviours

Participants are given 2 opportunities to confront the antigay comment: once immediately after it is made and before a second confederate confronts, and once again after the perpetrator adds to his initial comment in response to the second confederate’s confrontation. Open-ended responses were sorted into one of four possible categories: no confrontation (all responses not questioning the nature of the comment made nor opposing it), confrontation (all responses questioning or expressing disapproval for the comment), and bigotry (all responses agreeing overtly with or
expressing antigay comments). The fourth category was different for the first and second opportunity to confront as there was a unique, recurring response type for each occasion.

For the first opportunity to confront, the fourth category was laughing (all responses that expressed only laughter such as “lol” or “haha”). These were relatively common and difficult to categorize as confrontation, no confrontation, or bigotry because they could be construed as someone encouraging the perpetrator and agreeing to some extent, or could be interpreted as someone who was uncomfortable with the comment and nervously laughed. Therefore they were coded as a separate category.

The fourth category for the second opportunity to confront was mediation (all responses trying to resolve the conflict between the two confederates and agreeing with both the perpetrator and the confronter). Because these responses did not take a clear stance in favour or in opposition to the comment and could be construed as both agreeing with the antigay comment and agreeing with the confronter, they were sorted into their own category. All participants entered something on their first opportunity to confront, and only 2 participants skipped their turn on the second opportunity to confront and were recorded as “no confrontation”.

2.1.1 First opportunity to confront

Out of all 78 participants, 22 confronted when given the chance to do so (28.2%). Only 3 expressed prejudice (3.8%), and 12 laughed at the comment (15.4%). The rest did not confront the comment (52.6%). A chi-square test did not reveal significant differences in how those response types were distributed between conditions, $\chi^2 (3) = 3.22, p = .36$.

Despite there not being a statistical difference between conditions, it is interesting to note that all 3 participants who perpetrated prejudice themselves at this point were in the sexual orientation affirmation condition. In order to test whether perpetration of bigotry by participants was distributed differently between conditions, I coded behaviours into “bigotry” or “no bigotry” categories. Some expected counts for cells were < 5 when conducting a chi-square. Fisher’s Exact test was not significant, $p = .24$. 
2.1.2 Second opportunity to confront

On their second opportunity to confront, 41 participants confronted the comment (52.6%), 7 tried to mediate the situation (9.0%), 6 expressed bigotry (7.7%), and 24 refrained from confronting (30.8%). A chi-square test did not reveal significant differences in how those response types were distributed between conditions, $\chi^2(3) = 5.48, p = .14$.

Despite there not being a statistical difference between conditions, 5 out of 6 participants who expressed bigotry at this stage were in the sexual orientation affirmation condition. After coding behaviours into “bigotry” or “no bigotry” categories, some expected counts for cells were < 5 when conducting a chi-square. Fisher’s Exact test was not significant, $p = .20$.

2.2 Precarious manhood

Both conditions did not differ in their levels of precarious manhood, $t(74) = 1.21, p = .23$.

2.3 IMS/EMS

Both conditions did not differ in their levels of IMS, $t(72) = -1.70, p = .09$, or EMS, $t(72) = -0.38, p = .71$.

2.4 Confronter’s likability

Likability was computed as an average of 3 different ratings of the confronter (“Likable”, “Has a good personality”, “Would like to be friends with”; $\alpha = .82$). Both conditions did not differ in their liking of the confronting confederate, $t(76) = -1.34, p = .19$.

2.5 Perpetrator’s inappropriateness

Inappropriateness was computed by averaging 5 ratings of the perpetrator (“Prejudiced”, “Unacceptable”, “Acceptable” (reversed), “Inappropriate”, “Appropriate” (reversed); $\alpha = .66$). Conditions differed in how unacceptable the perpetrator was seen for making the comment. The perpetrator was viewed as less inappropriate when making an antigay comment in the sexual orientation disclosure and affirmation condition ($M = 4.32, SD = 1.25$) than in the control condition ($M = 4.98, SD = 1.30$), $t(76) = -2.28, p = .03$. That is to say that making a disparaging comment about gays in the context of a conversation about how hot women celebrities are is seen as more acceptable than in a neutral conversation about male actors.
When I entered all measures (Precarious Manhood score, Modern Homonegativity Score, Familiarity with gays score, IMS, and EMS) in a regression model predicting Perpetrator Inappropriateness, only Precarious Manhood scores, $b = -0.35$, 95% CI [-0.64, -0.06], $SE = 0.14$, $t(73) = -2.41$, $p = .02$, and IMS scores, $b = 0.44$, 95% CI [0.21, 0.66], $SE = 0.11$, $t(73) = 3.90$, $p < .001$ were significant predictors of inappropriateness perceptions (other $ps > .53$). Removing the other non-significant predictors, these effects still held ($ps < .004$). Participants high in precarious manhood and low in IMS viewed the bigoted comment as less inappropriate than their counterparts. Mediation and moderation models using these variables to predict behavioural outcomes failed to reach significance.

3 Discussion

In Study 4, I tested whether allowing heterosexual men to express their sexual orientation through a demographic form and a conversation about attractive women would ease their concerns about misclassification of sexual orientation and help them confront antigay prejudice more. Though I found greater rates of confrontation in the first confrontation opportunity compared to Study 2 (28.2% vs. 6.1%) and replicated my previous finding that a majority of participants lend their support to a confronter whenever they break the ice, this was not a result of the orientation affirmation manipulation and was the same across experimental conditions. Instead, the experimental manipulation, which involved a conversation about women’s attractiveness, led participants to feel that an antigay comment made in that context was less inappropriate than the same comment made in the context of a conversation about male celebrities. It appears that by creating an environment where such a discussion was taking place, it not only allowed participants to affirm their sexual orientation but also created a macho environment that made expression of antigay comments more acceptable. This lends support to the idea that expression of antigay bigotry and expression of masculinity are often associated with one another (Poteat et al., 2011).

In fact, though the study was underpowered when it came to observing perpetration of prejudice from participants (a rare event in monitored conversations taking place in a lab environment at a university), it bears mentioning that all but one instance of perpetration of antigay remarks by participants occurred in the orientation affirmation condition. One can only imagine that these occurrences would be far more common if the conversations were not recorded in a university
lab as needs for self-presentation may shift. Furthermore, I found that precarious manhood feelings uniquely predicted viewing antigay comments as acceptable when considering many competing predictors, whereas homonegativity scores did not. This effectively replicates Kroeper et al.’s (2014) findings, suggesting that precarious manhood is an important predictor of males’ appraisal of antigay bigotry, above and beyond their own prejudice levels.

There were many limitations to this work. First, because of the hefty design of a live chat experiment, only a smaller sample size was achievable and thus did not allow for the inclusion of many independent variables and conditions. The simpler design limited the reach of the experiment. It would have been interesting to have an additional condition in which the second confederate never confronts, and another in which the second confederate also perpetrates antigay bigotry to test whether participants still confront in such cases or if they participate in the perpetration of prejudice. Furthermore, it would have been ideal to have a condition in which participants are allowed to share their sexual orientation through a demographic form but go on to have a conversation about male celebrities. By not having this additional condition, some of the results might have been confounded. For example, it could be that disclosing one’s sexual orientation on a demographic form (or through other means) would help heterosexual men confront more often in the context of a conversation that was not about objectifying women. As reported by participants, antigay comments made in the female celebrity crush condition were viewed as more acceptable. The conversation topic might have nullified the positive effects the disclosure of sexual orientation might have had. New research should attempt having men disclose their orientation in some meaningful way, and then participate in an identical situation to those who have not made that disclosure.

As it stands from the results obtained here, it appears that allowing men to disclose and affirm their sexual orientation might not be enough to help them confront antigay prejudice more. Fears of misclassification may require more than a mere disclosure of orientation to dispel and may be anchored in a deeper masculinity complex. Besides, as we have seen in my own previous research, disclosing a confronter’s relationship status that would hint at heterosexuality was not enough to remove all suspicion of gayness from witnesses, and men might know that it would not give them a free pass to confront to first disclose their orientation. Future research should investigate whether men suspect that disclosing their orientation would not shield them from misclassification following a confrontation. Also, because expression of masculinity and antigay
prejudice are intertwined, the way in which researchers prime or allow men to express masculinity should be thoughtfully orchestrated as it may affect the validity of their methods and have serious repercussions on the outcome of the manipulation. Because of the many limitations to the design and the null results obtained, the findings from the present study are to be interpreted with caution and warrant further research before any conclusions may be drawn.
Chapter 6
Study 5

In Study 4, I tested an experimental manipulation to incite heterosexual males to confront an antigay comment in the lab. In Study 5, I attempted to encourage heterosexual individuals to confront antigay prejudice (and prejudice more broadly) in their everyday lives. Dickter (2012) followed heterosexual participants through a daily diary and found that only one third of participants reported confronting antigay prejudice when seeing it in their everyday lives. She also found that one of the reasons this rate was low was because people believed that it would be useless. By combining findings from the previous studies I have conducted and the literature more broadly, I created an informative brochure on the costs, benefits, and effectiveness of confronting prejudice, and developed an information session to be paired with the brochure. I then asked participants to fill a daily diary for 1 week about their encounters with prejudiced comments, including antigay prejudice.

The goals of the experiment were threefold. First, I wanted to test whether receiving more information on confrontation would help dispel beliefs that confronting is ineffective and help heterosexual individuals confront prejudice. I expected that those who had received more information about antigay prejudice confrontation would confront antigay prejudice (and other prejudices) more often when given the chance than those who did not get additional information. Second, I wanted to determine what types of prejudice are most encountered by undergraduates at the University of Toronto and compare these rates with Dickter’s (2012) data, as well as compare the number of comments people encounter online versus in person. I expected that due to the exceptionally high diversity of Toronto as a city and its more liberal leanings, that there would be overall fewer prejudiced comments heard here than in Dickter’s study which took place in a smaller town in Virginia. Nevertheless, I expected the distribution of type of comments relative to one another to remain similar (antigay comments being the most common). I also expected that there would be more prejudiced comments encountered online than in person due to the online disinhibition effect whereby people feel freer to express toxic views under the cover of anonymity than face-to-face (Suler, 2004). Third, I wanted to profile who tends to confront more often in their day-to-day lives by including some individual differences measures to see whether they predict confrontation behaviour.
1 Methods

1.1 Participants and design

In this study, 78 heterosexual undergraduates were recruited from ads posted around the University of Toronto campus (40 female; $M_{age} = 19.87$, $SD_{age} = 1.83$) and compensated with up to $20 ($10 for the intake and exit survey, each). They also received a ticket for a $100 draw with each daily entry filled, and those who filled all 7 daily entries were entered into a bonus $100 draw. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: reading an information brochure and participating in an information session about research findings on confrontation of prejudice, or a control condition in which they only received information on how to fill daily diary measures.

1.2 Procedure

Participants were recruited using flyers and posters posted around campus as well as Facebook posts in student groups, and those interested in participating contacted the research team through email. All were sent a screening questionnaire asking for their student status and sexual orientation, embedded among other demographic questions. Those indicating any status other than currently enrolled in undergraduate studies, and those who indicated any sexual orientation other than heterosexual were not allowed to participate. Also, preference was given to students who indicated being enrolled in programs other than psychology given that many psychology students participated extensively in psychological experiments as part of the PSY100 participant pool.

Participants were scheduled in pairs for an in-lab intake survey session (Day 0). Pairs of participants were always assigned to the same condition. They were given a unique participant number and logged in on the Qualtrics survey system using their personal email address. A personalized survey link was sent to them and they were instructed to save that email (either by flagging it or sending it to a special folder) because they would reuse that same link every day for the upcoming week. They then filled the intake survey using that link, asking them about their attitudes towards minorities and confrontation of prejudice, various individual differences measures, as well as their demographic information.
After the extensive set of questionnaires was completed, they met with me to go over the daily diary procedure alone or in pairs depending on when they finished the survey. They were instructed to keep track of the number of instances in which they heard inappropriate comments (racist, sexist, antigay, ageist, and others), and to report back at night using the survey link they had in their inbox (for the daily diary instruction brochure, see Appendix 3). Those assigned to the control condition were compensated for their intake survey and were excused at this point. Those assigned to the extra information condition received an additional brochure on confrontation of prejudice (Appendix 3), and I briefed them on its contents using a script including a confrontation practice trial (Appendix 4). These participants were then compensated and excused.

Starting the following day and for 7 days (Day 1 to 7), participants used the provided link to fill a short set of questionnaires. Research assistants sent two daily email reminders to participants; one around 7pm and another at 10pm. Participants were asked for the number of inappropriate comments they heard for each type (racist, sexist, antigay, ageist, other; online and in person). If participants reported hearing at least one antigay comment, they were asked to provide more details about that event. If they did not encounter antigay comments but reported hearing other types of inappropriate comments, they chose one comment and provided more details about it. In the event that someone reported hearing no comments at all on a given day, they were asked about a past event in which they did hear an inappropriate comment as well as their reaction to it. This was to ensure all would get similar-length surveys, but this past-event data was excluded from analyses. Participants were notified that their entry was successful and that they received their participation for the $100 draw, and the process was repeated for 7 days. For a summary of the total number of daily entries recorded for each day, see Table 5.

On Day 8, participants were contacted by research assistants to schedule a return visit in the following week for their exit survey and debriefing. Only 5 of the 78 participants did not return for the exit survey. After the exit survey was completed, all were debriefed, thanked, and compensated.
1.3 Measures

1.3.1 Intake survey

All measures from the intake survey except the Big 5 personality scale, the Social desirability scale, and the demographic questionnaire were also included in the exit survey.

1.3.1.1 Attitudes measures

Most items were taken from the Intolerant Schema Measure (ISM; Aosved, Long, & Voller, 2009) which combines many previously validated attitude scales. Attitudes towards gays and lesbians (6 items, $\alpha_{\text{intake}} = .94$, $\alpha_{\text{exit}} = .95$; Herek, 1997), attitudes towards women (5 items, $\alpha_{\text{intake}} = .70$, $\alpha_{\text{exit}} = .77$; Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1973), attitudes towards older adults (5 items, $\alpha_{\text{intake}} = .77$, $\alpha_{\text{exit}} = .83$; Fraboni, Saltstone, & Hughes, 1990), attitudes towards racial and ethnic minorities (5 items, $\alpha_{\text{intake}} = .76$, $\alpha_{\text{exit}} = .79$; adapted from the Symbolic Racism Scale, Henry & Sears, 2002), and homonegativity (11 items, $\alpha_{\text{intake}} = .82$, $\alpha_{\text{exit}} = .93$; Morrison & Morrison, 2002) were measured using a subset of items from the original scales due to the extensive nature of the overall survey (for a list of items used, see Appendix 5). All items were rated on 7-point Likert scales ranging from “1 - Strongly disagree” to “7 - Strongly agree”. When conducting a Varimax-rotated factor analysis on the computed scores for all these scales, only the ageism score loaded on a different factor. Removing this scale and rerunning the analysis showed all other measures remained on one factor. An overall prejudiced attitudes score was calculated by scoring each individual measure, averaging the scales pertaining to attitudes towards gays and lesbians and homonegativity, and then averaging all three types of attitudes (racism, sexism, and sexual prejudice). No differences were found between conditions, or within-subject comparing intake and exit surveys on all these measures.

1.3.1.2 Prejudiced personality scales

Right-wing authoritarianism (RWA; 12 items, $\alpha_{\text{intake}} = .84$, $\alpha_{\text{exit}} = .85$; Altemeyer, 1988, 1996), Humanitarianism and Egalitarianism (5 items, $\alpha_{\text{intake}} = .83$, $\alpha_{\text{exit}} = .83$; Katz & Hass, 1988), and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO; 10 items, $\alpha_{\text{intake}} = .81$, $\alpha_{\text{exit}} = .88$; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) were measured using a subset of the original items which were all presented as 7-point Likert scales ranging from “1 - Strongly disagree” to “7 - Strongly agree”. Because all 3 scores loaded on a single factor when conducting a Varimax-rotated factor
analysis, a prejudiced personality score was calculated by reverse scoring Humanitarianism and Egalitarianism, computing a score for each scale separately, and then averaging the three. No differences were found between conditions, or within-subject comparing intake and exit surveys on these measures.

### 1.3.1.3 Implicit theories of personality (Chiu, Hong, & Dweck, 1997; Rattan & Dweck, 2010)

This 5-item scale assessed whether participants believe others are immutable or changeable on 7-point Likert scales (“1- Strongly disagree” to “7- Strongly agree”; \( \alpha_{\text{intake}} = .79, \alpha_{\text{exit}} = .80 \)). Items included “The kind of person someone is, is something very basic and it can't be changed very much” and “People can always substantially change their basic characteristics”. No differences were found between conditions, or within-subject comparing intake and exit surveys.

### 1.3.1.4 Big 5 personality questionnaire (John & Srivastava, 1999)

Personality was assessed using the Big 5 personality questionnaire (Openness, \( \alpha = .76 \); Conscientiousness, \( \alpha = .78 \); Extraversion, \( \alpha = .84 \); Agreeableness, \( \alpha = .77 \); Neuroticism, \( \alpha = .77 \)) with 44 statements on 7-point Likert scales (“1- Strongly disagree” to “7- Strongly agree”). No differences were found between conditions. This measure was not administered in the exit survey.

### 1.3.1.5 IMS/EMS (Plant & Devine, 1998)

These are the same scales used in Study 4 assessing people’s internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice (IMS, \( \alpha_{\text{intake}} = .73, \alpha_{\text{exit}} = .87 \); EMS, \( \alpha_{\text{intake}} = .78, \alpha_{\text{exit}} = .84 \)). No differences were found between conditions, or within-subject comparing intake and exit surveys.

### 1.3.1.6 Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960)

This scale measures participants’ tendency to respond in a socially desirable way with 33 true/false statements like “Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates” and “When I don’t know something I don’t mind at all admitting it.” (\( \alpha = .67 \)). No differences were found between conditions. This measure was not administered in the exit survey.
1.3.1.7 Satisfaction with life scale (Diener, Emmons, Larson, & Griffin, 1985)

This is a 5-item scale asking participants on 7-point Likert scales (“1- Strongly disagree” to “7- Strongly agree”) how satisfied they currently are with their lives ($\alpha_{\text{intake}} = .79$, $\alpha_{\text{exit}} = .91$). Items included “In most ways my life is close to my ideal” and “I am satisfied with life”. No differences were found between conditions, or within-subject comparing intake and exit surveys.

1.3.1.8 Self-esteem scale (Rosenberg, 1965)

In this 20-item questionnaire, participants are asked to rate their sense of self-worth on 5-point Likert scales (“1- Not at all” to “5- Extremely”; $\alpha_{\text{intake}} = .89$, $\alpha_{\text{exit}} = .91$). Items included “I feel satisfied with the way my body looks right now.” and “I am worried about whether I am regarded as a success or failure”. No differences were found between conditions, or within-subject comparing intake and exit surveys.

1.3.1.9 Beliefs about confrontation and prejudice

I asked participants how many times they think they encounter prejudiced comments (racist, sexist, antigay, ageist) online and in person (open-ended), how often they make these types of remarks themselves (5-point Likert from “Never” to “All of the time”), how often they see these types of comment be confronted (5-point Likert from “Never” to “Always”), how often they confront prejudiced comments (5-point Likert from “Never” to “Always”), whether these types of comments should be confronted (Yes/No), and whether confronting these types of comments is effective in reducing prejudice (7-point Likert from “Very ineffective” to “Very effective”, with “Neither effective nor ineffective” as the midpoint). All prejudice types were rated similarly on all these dimensions except ageism which was reported to be less frequent and less important to confront than the other three ($p = .001$). Because this is outside the scope of this dissertation, it will not be discussed further. There was a significant effect of condition on some of the repeated measures which will be discussed in the results section.

1.3.1.10 Demographics

Demographic information was collected at the end of the intake survey.
1.3.2 Daily measures

1.3.2.1 Prejudiced comments encounters

Each day, participants were asked to report the number of racist, sexist, antigay, ageist, and other inappropriate comments they heard online, and in person (open-ended).

1.3.2.2 Detailed report on one instance

For those who reported hearing at least one antigay comment, the survey inquired about one of those. Otherwise, participants had to choose one comment among those they heard to fill this questionnaire. Participants were asked open-ended questions about what happened, who made the comment, their reaction to the comment and why they reacted that way. They were then asked to sort their responses using many close-ended options (e.g., online or in person, categorizing their reaction, satisfaction with their own response, comment’s offensiveness, how upset they were, demographics of the target and perpetrator).

1.3.2.2.1 Categorizing their reaction

When giving more information about one prejudiced comment from their day, participants gave an open-ended account of their reaction to the comment and then sorted that response into as many categories as applicable. The possible choices were “Verbally disagreed”, “Verbally insulted”, “Confronted the person”, “Disapproved of the comment with a facial expression or gesture”, “Avoided the person”, “Laughed”, “Agreed with the comment”, “Ignored the comment”, “Did not mind the comment”, “None applicable”, or “Other”. Those who chose “Other” provided an open-ended explanation for their choice.

1.3.2.2.2 Satisfaction with one’s response

Participants indicated their level of satisfaction with their own response on a 7-point Likert scale from “1- Very dissatisfied” to “7- Very satisfied”, with “4- Neutral” as the midpoint.

1.3.2.3 Day summary

Before concluding their daily entry, the system piped the total number of comments they reported hearing in the first part of the daily diary and asked participants the following 3
questions: “Out of the X comments you heard today, how many did you [agree with, think were offensive, confront]”.

1.3.3 Exit survey

1.3.3.1 Week recapitulation

Participants were asked a series of questions asking them to compare their experience during the week with the expectations they had during the intake survey. Among others, questions included “Do you feel prejudice is more, less, or equally as common as you thought it would be?” and “Do you find that there were more prejudiced comments online or in real-world situations?” on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “1- A lot more online” to “5- A lot more in person” with the midpoint “3- Equally as much online and in person”.

1.3.3.2 Confrontation brochure ratings

In addition to most of the scales administered during the intake survey, all participants were given a photocopy of the confrontation information brochure that was distributed as part of the additional information condition. They were asked about their impressions of the brochure (open-ended), its usefulness, how convincing and clear it is (7-point Likert scales), and whether it (would have) motivated them to change their behaviour during the experiment (yes/no).

1.3.3.3 Debriefing questions

Before debriefing with a research assistant, participants were asked if they had closing thoughts about the experiment and whether they learned anything valuable from their experience (open-ended).

2 Results

2.1 Comments heard

Participants were asked to report the number of racist, sexist, antigay, and ageist comments they heard, separately. For each type, they were to keep a separate count of those found online and in person. I conducted a repeated measures ANOVA with Prejudice Type (4 levels) and In-Person/Online (2 levels), and found that there was a main effect of Prejudice Type, $F(3, 464) = 21.76, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .12$, but no effect of the In-Person/Online component or interaction
between Prejudice Type and In-Person/Online, ps > .17, meaning that each type of comment was heard equally as much online and in person. Tukey’s LSD post-hoc comparisons revealed that racism was the most reported type of prejudiced comment (ps ≤ .002), followed by sexism and antigay prejudice (not significantly different from one another, p = .11), followed by ageism which was the least reported type of prejudice encountered (ps < .001; see Figure 8). For an overview of the number of comments heard per day, see Table 5.

The fact that people witnessed as many comments online versus in person went against predicted outcomes as I expected people to report more instances of prejudiced comments online. This intuitive expectation was reflected in participants’ exit survey answers to the question “Since starting this experiment, did you find that there were more prejudiced comments online or in real-world situations?” (with the midpoint (3) being equally as much in both environments, lower scores representing more comments heard online, and higher scores representing more comments heard in person; see Measures section), where people reported they found overall more comments online than in person (M = 2.13, SD = 1.16; One-sample t-test with midpoint (3) test value: t(71) = -6.39, p < .001). This result contradicts their daily counts.

2.2 Confrontation behaviour

In daily measures, confrontation behaviour was assessed through two different means. First, I asked participants to recall one specific comment from their day and say how they reacted to it. Participants were to sort their response into as many of the following categories as applicable: verbally disagreed, insulted the perpetrator, confrontation, disapproval with facial expression or gesture, avoidance, laughter, agreement, ignoring, did not think it was important, other (specify). Behaviours that were classified as being part of at least one of the first four categories by the participant (disagreement, insult, confrontation, and non-verbal disapproval) were then coded as being confrontation and the rest were coded as no confrontation. For the few who selected “other, specify” (n = 8), I read the description of the event and sorted it accordingly.

Second, at the end of the daily entries, I asked participants how many comments they confronted out of the total number of comments they heard that day. Because many participants did not report hearing inappropriate comments on every day, and because some failed to produce an entry each day (for a summary see Table 5), I used a Generalized Estimating Equations (GEE) analysis to conduct some of the statistical tests below. GEEs perform better than Generalized
Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) when there are few observations from each subject and assumes that missing data is Missing Completely at Random (MCAR), have relaxed assumptions of homogeneity of variances, and can model non-normal responses (Hardin & Hilbe, 2012). This allowed including all subjects into the analyses, even those who recorded few responses. Results for these two confrontation-related questions are presented below.

2.2.1 Reactions to a specific comment

2.2.1.1 Antigay comments

I selected only cases in which antigay comments were reported and conducted a GEE with a binary distribution and a logit function with Participant as a subject variable and Condition as a between-subjects variable to predict confrontation/no confrontation. There was no effect of condition on confrontation of antigay prejudice, $\chi^2(1) = 0.47, p = .49$.

2.2.1.2 All comments

I repeated the process above by including all types of comments and found no effect of condition on confrontation of comments, $\chi^2(1) = 1.52, p = .22$.

2.2.2 Overall confrontation ratios

First, I calculated the percentage of comments confronted by dividing the number of confronted comments in a day by the number of comments heard that day, then multiplying that result by 100.

2.2.2.1 Evolution of confrontation over 7 days

I conducted a GEE with a scale distribution, a linear function, and an exchangeable covariance matrix with Participant as a subject variable, Day as a within-subject variable, Condition as a between-subjects variable, and the interaction Day x Condition to predict confrontation percentages. In absence of an interaction effect, $\chi^2(6) = 2.10, p = .91$, the model was rerun without the interaction term to obtain a global condition effect for 7 days, which showed no effect of condition, $\chi^2(1) = 1.10, p = .30$. There was, however, a significant effect of Day, $\chi^2(6) = 21.30, p = .002$. Conducting a Helmert contrast comparing any given day to the ones coming after (combined) indicates that participants had a tendency to confront less often in the first 3 days (Day 1 vs. Later: $M_{\text{day1}} = 22.91, SE = 4.63$, Contrast Estimate = -13.33, $SE = 4.42$, $\chi^2(1) =$
9.02, \( p = .003 \); Day 2 vs. Later: \( M_{day2} = 26.71, SE = 5.63 \), Contrast Estimate = -11.43, \( SE = 5.47 \), \( \chi^2(1) = 4.37, p = .04 \); Day 3 vs. Later: \( M_{day3} = 26.00, SE = 5.68 \), Contrast Estimate = -15.19, \( SE = 5.67 \), \( \chi^2(1) = 7.19, p = .007 \) than they did later in the experiment (\( M_{day4} = 33.87, SE = 6.96 \); \( M_{day5} = 48.71, SE = 6.73 \); \( M_{day6} = 48.86, SE = 6.78 \); \( M_{day7} = 33.28, SE = 7.07 \); \( ps > .09 \); for daily means see Figure 9). Controlling for social desirability scores, these results still held.

Conducting a Deviation contrast which calculates each day’s deviation from the mean shows that Day 1 was lower than average (Day 1 vs. Mean: Contrast Estimate = -11.42, \( SE = 3.79 \), \( \chi^2(1) = 9.07, p = .003 \)) and Days 5 and 6 were higher than average (Day 5 vs. Mean: Contrast Estimate = 14.37, \( SE = 5.20 \), \( \chi^2(1) = 7.65, p = .006 \); Day 5 vs. Mean: Contrast Estimate = 14.37, \( SE = 5.20 \), \( \chi^2(1) = 7.65, p = .006 \)), while Days 2 and 3 were marginally below average (Day 2 vs. Mean: Contrast Estimate = -7.62, \( SE = 4.48 \), \( \chi^2(1) = 2.90, p = .09 \); Day 3 vs. Mean: Contrast Estimate = -8.34, \( SE = 4.36 \), \( \chi^2(1) = 3.66, p = .056 \)). Days 4 and 7 were average (\( ps > .86 \)).

### 2.2.3 Belief about efficacy of confrontation

Though there was no effect of condition on confrontation behaviour, I still tested whether receiving more information about confrontation improved participants’ beliefs about the efficacy of confrontation. I performed a repeated measures ANOVA (intake-exit) with Condition as a between subjects variable and found a significant interaction between condition and the repeated measure, \( F(1, 70) = 6.41, p = .01, \eta^2_p = .08 \), though both main effects were non-significant, \( ps < .54 \). There was a cross-over effect between conditions whereby people who had not received more information during the intake session had a decrease in their perception that confronting is useful in reducing prejudice, whereas those in the brochure condition had an increase in their perception that confronting is useful in reducing prejudice following their participation in the experiment (see Figure 10).

### 2.2.4 Satisfaction with one’s response

I conducted a GEE with a scale distribution, a linear function, and an exchangeable covariance matrix with Participant as a subject variable, Confrontation (coded as Confrontation/No Confrontation as outlined in section 2.2 above) and Condition as between-subjects variables, and the interaction of Confrontation x Condition to predict satisfaction with one’s response. In absence of an interaction effect, \( \chi^2(1) = 0.82, p = .37 \), I reran the model without the interaction
term and found no effect of condition, $\chi^2(1) = 0.88$, $p = .35$. There was, however, a significant effect of Confrontation, $\chi^2(1) = 4.26$, $p = .04$, whereby people who said they confronted the prejudiced comment were more satisfied with their response ($M = 4.37$, $SE = 0.15$) than those who did not ($M = 3.94$, $SE = 0.12$).

2.2.5 Individual differences predicting behaviour

First, I computed a mean aggregate of confrontation percentages for each participant so as to get an overall weekly percentage of confrontation for each person. Then, I entered individual differences measures in a regression predicting confrontation (Big 5, implicit theories, prejudiced personality, attitudes towards minorities, IMS/EMS, social desirability). None predicted confrontation percentages, $p < .12$.

3 Discussion

In Study 5, I asked participants to report prejudiced comments and behaviours they witnessed as well as their responses to these events for a week using a daily diary. Some received an intervention prior to the daily diary period giving them more information on confrontation of prejudice through a brochure and a discussion with the experimenter, whereas others were part of a control group and did not receive that information. The brochure and information session (Appendix 3 and 4) laid out in simple terms that confronting prejudice is effective and necessary to help reduce prejudice and that psychological experiments found that there are ways to confront while minimizing individual costs, outlining tips on how to do so (highlighting results from Study 3). I found that the distribution of prejudiced comments by type was different from that found by Dickter (2012; see Figure 8). I also found that confronting behaviour varied significantly during the 7 days of the experiment and that, though the information session was viewed positively by most participants and that many thought the information received was helpful and important to spread, it did not affect their behaviour during the observation period (see Figure 9). However, it did increase their perception that confronting prejudice is effective after the week had passed as opposed to control subjects who had a decreased perception that confronting would have a significant impact (see Figure 10). Though I had included many individual differences measures, none actually predicted confrontation behaviour.
3.1 Prejudice encountered

3.1.1 Prejudice type

Participants were to report the amount and types of prejudiced comments they encountered every day as well as whether they found those comments online or in person. As opposed to Dickter (2012) who found that antigay comments were the most frequent type of slurs used and heard by college students, I found that racism was more common, followed by sexist and antigay comments, and lastly ageism. In fact, there were nearly 4 times fewer antigay comments reported over the course of a week compared to Dickter’s (2012) study. There are many potential explanations for this difference. First, Dickter’s (2012) study was conducted in a less urban area in Virginia, USA whereas this study was set in Toronto, Canada, a city reputed for its diverse population. Urban areas are known to be more tolerant of homosexuality when compared to less urban areas, and Canada as a whole has more positive attitudes toward gays than the United States (Anderson & Fetner, 2008; Elliot & Bonauto, 2005; Hoover, Martinez, Reimer & Wald, 2002; Smith, 2005). Also, many campaigns against the use of casual slurs like “that’s gay” to mean something is lame have taken place in recent years, possibly curbing the use of that expression which was popular back when Dickter conducted her experiment. It is encouraging to see that participants encountered fewer antigay comments, but they still reported hearing on average one every second day. Despite the fact that Toronto is known to be a more liberal city tolerant of gays, and the University of Toronto a safe campus with organizations celebrating and protecting the rights of sexual and gender minorities, participants still encountered bigotry in person. In fact, online and in-person rates of prejudice encounters did not differ from one another in daily reports. This supports the fact that there needs to be continued efforts to curb prejudice, and that these efforts might have a positive effect given the fewer instances in which prejudice occurred.

3.1.2 Prejudice online vs. in person

One intriguing result was that participants reported equally as many comments witnessed online and in person on their daily reports but, in contrast, when asked about their overall observations during the exit survey, they said that prejudice was encountered more often online. These results contradict one another. Though there are no certain explanations for this contradiction, there are many potential reasons why it may have occurred.
First, there is a shared intuition that there is more prejudice online than in person, so perhaps people answered this retrospective question factoring in common knowledge about the Internet and prejudice, and not just their own observations. Also, it may be that, despite their equal numbers, comments online may have been more offensive on average than those in person, making them more memorable a week or two later. It could also be because participants were tasked to only count comments to which they could reply to and which happened recently. They may have encountered older comments online which they did not account for in the daily diary but still affected their overall impression of how common prejudice is online. Besides, a comment posted online has a wider reach potential than one made in person, and could be seen at a later time as well, not just when it is made. Last but not least, it may also be due to a methodological issue whereby participants had to report online and in-person counts at the end of the day, and they might have estimated these counts instead of making a formal one. Some might have forgotten to keep separate track of online and in-person comments and estimated them to be equal. Tracking those instances with a phone app throughout the day, for example, might have provided more reliable counts. Therefore, more research should be conducted before this null result can be verified.

### 3.2 Evolution of confrontation over 7 days

Confrontation was measured two ways. First, participants were asked to focus their daily entry on one specific comment heard that day and to report their reaction to that comment, confrontation or otherwise. I did not find significant differences between the intervention group and control group in rates of confrontation through that question. Because this information was collected as part of a series of questions asking participants to focus on one comment during the day that they select (and did not impose one randomly), this means participants were as likely to select an inappropriate comment they confronted as the comment they discussed more in detail in both conditions. It cannot rule out the possibility that participants perhaps confronted more often in one condition overall during the week.

Addressing this gap, confrontation was also assessed through an overall question at the end of each daily entry which asked participants “Out of the [#] comments you heard today, how many did you confront?” Again, conducting a generalized estimating equations analysis did not reveal significant differences between conditions. However, it did show that confrontation rates varied
during the 7 days of the experiment, whereby participants confronted much less in the first 3 days of the experiment (about 20% of comments) than they did during the rest. As of day 4, confrontation started to increase to reach its peak on the 5th and 6th day (almost 50% confronted). Those rates are quite high when compared to my in-lab studies (live chat studies; Study 2 and 4) as well as previous experiments by Dickter (2012) and others (e.g., Swim & Hyers, 1999). I suspect that demand characteristics might have made participants report higher percentages throughout the week, but these results still held when controlling for social desirability scores. Assuming that this possible inflation was constant throughout 7 days, it is still interesting to see that participants reported confronting more on days 5 and 6 than previously during the week. This may be because participants needed a few days to overcome initial fears, reflect on prejudice, build confidence, and finally attempt confrontation, or because they had built-up frustration over prejudice as they kept tracking it for days.

Either way, being part of the experiment eventually increased participants’ confrontation after a few days, regardless of the condition assigned. Indeed, in the debriefing questions, participants in both conditions stated that tracking prejudice for a week was eye-opening and informative, and that they never noticed how prevalent it was until they were asked to be mindful about it. This means that the control condition might have served as an intervention as well, not just the information session. It may be that tracking was the more powerful intervention, and that the brochure and information session did not further add to this effect during those 7 days. Perhaps the seemingly inflated confrontation rates reported truly are an honest representation of how much participants attempted to confront, and that these numbers were boosted because of the tracking. The information session and tracking activities should be used again in future experiments to see whether higher confrontation rates replicate in a new sample.

### 3.3 Perception of confrontation effectiveness

It appears that having more information about confrontation of prejudice made participants gain hope about the efficacy of confrontation over the course of the experiment, whereas those who had not received that information lost hope instead. Though the brochure and additional information session did not differently impact participants’ confrontation rates during the experiment, it may be that it would shield them from completely losing faith in a long-term, uphill battle against prejudice. The brochure and information session could serve as a reminder
that despite not seeing immediate change in the confronted, that their speaking out may be the start of a butterfly effect of change as they had learned in the information session. Those in the control condition who were asked to simply track prejudice might have attempted to confront more out of frustration and awareness, as seen in the equally high rates of confrontation across both conditions, but lacked the proper tools in order to optimize their confrontation and might not be aware of their invisible impact. This boost in confrontation might be short-lived since they lost hope about their efficacy by the end of the experiment. Those in the brochure condition, however, had increased perceptions that they were effective through confrontation, which means that they might sustain this effort in the future more. It would be interesting to extend the observation period and see whether the tracking-alone condition would have sustained higher confrontation over a longer period of time. Perhaps the brochure would have a delayed effect that did not fully develop by the time the experiment was over; it might have given people tools to be resilient in the face of apparent failure by making them maintain hope about their effectiveness. Future studies should test whether this is the case by including longer-term call backs.

3.4 Satisfaction with one’s response

In line with findings from previous experiments (Dickter, 2012), I found that people who confront prejudice also report being more satisfied with their response, regardless of the condition they were assigned. Though half of the participants were not told about the benefits of confrontation nor briefed on its importance, all were more satisfied whenever they confronted a prejudiced comment. This highlights a benefit to confrontation whereby people feel positively about themselves after confronting. They probably felt like they did something right, which might have boosted their feelings of self-worth. This benefit is not to be underestimated since it is an immediate personal reward, and though it was highlighted in the confrontation brochure (Appendix 3), it could be the focus of a future intervention aimed at increasing confrontation. Indeed, by making confrontation seem beneficial to the self immediately instead of an altruistic sacrifice with long-term benefits, it may incite people to do so more often. Future research should attempt framing confrontation as a self-centered, beneficial action instead and see whether it can be successful at increasing confrontation rates.
Chapter 7
General Discussion

Confronting sexual prejudice is important as it signals that perpetration of bigotry is unacceptable, and it becomes a voice for equality. Confronting bias helps create positive spaces for sexual minorities and extends visible support to that community. Often times, people disagree with prejudiced comments and behaviours but remain silent when they occur (e.g., Dickter, 2012; Swim & Hyers, 1999), and this may inadvertently create a sense that prejudice is acceptable, or at least tolerated to some extent. This then creates a social norm favourable to expression of bigotry as it remains unchallenged by the silent majority, which is known to predict increased expression of prejudice (Cary et al., 2014; CBC News, 2017; Crandall et al., 2002). However beneficial to minority groups confronting may be, it remains costly to confronting individuals. Indeed, it jeopardizes their social reputation and may make them seem dislikable (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp et al., 2007; Kaiser & Miller, 2003; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010) which could explain why so many people prefer to not speak up.

Through some of my studies (Studies 1-2), I found that confronters were seen as complainers, which then led to them being disliked. This effect occurred both when using a script of a past conversation (Study 1) and by having participants interact with a confronter and a perpetrator through a live chat system (Study 2). However, other studies found that confronters are sometimes equally or more liked than non-confronters (Cadieux, 2012; Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015 (Study 1); Dickter et al., 2011; Mallett & Wagner, 2011). After a thorough analysis of my own studies and others in the literature, I pinpointed different factors that could moderate likability appraisals and explain these divergent results (Study 3), namely the type of comment being made, the clarity of the prejudiced intention of the comment, the target and tone of the confrontation, and the use of specific prejudice-related labels when confronting. By using 16 small variations of the same situation, I was able to test the effect each of these different elements could have on the perception of anonymous confronters in isolation as well as their interactions. As hypothesized, all of these 4 factors were significant predictors of the likability of the confronter. Confronting ambiguous bigotry, personally attacking the perpetrator, using prejudice labels such as “homophobic”, and confronting anti-lesbian bigotry led to viewing the confronter as less likable. Some of these findings are detailed below.
Confronting with a harsh, attacking tone led to greater dislike of the confronter than suggestive confrontations aimed at what was said. This is unsurprising since someone who attacks someone else personally with a harsh tone is by definition less likable than someone who behaves in a kinder way. What was less intuitive was that these confronters were always disliked the same, regardless of the context in which their confrontation took place. Indeed, there were no interactions with other variables which would have shown that using this approach would lead to better outcomes in certain contexts (such as going against blatant bigotry). Based on this strong effect that I found, a first take-home message from this dissertation is that confronters should avoid personally attacking perpetrators of prejudice and instead focus on the problematic speech or behaviour. One can be assertive and receive positive appraisals from others (e.g., Dickter et al., 2011) as long as the confrontation does not become a personal attack at the expense of the perpetrator.

Though I found different factors that led to confronters being disliked, it remains unclear whether being disliked is a necessary cost to suffer in order to be an effective confronter. It may be that the gentler confronter in the face of blatant prejudice would not leave a trace at all and be ultimately ineffective. It could be that, in order to transform minds and become a force for change, one needs to bother others to a certain extent. Change is bothersome and stressful, after all (Holmes & Rahe, 1967). There may be an optimal level of (dis)agreeableness that one needs to strike in order to be both influential and respected. Swinging too far either way (too gentle or too harsh) may either lead others to not even see the point being made, or, at the other extreme, simply dismissing the confronter entirely as unreasonable. Alternatively, there may be a positive relationship between agreeableness and effectiveness, whereby the most effective confronters are also the most likable ones. In fact, past studies show that more controlling, forceful calls to being non-prejudiced backfired and increased prejudice whereas more autonomy-eliciting ones worked best (Legault, Gutsell, & Inzlicht, 2011). It may be the same for confronters, whereby those who push the least may drive the biggest effect. Future research should test how likability affects the effectiveness of a confrontation of prejudice.

That being said, operationalizing success of a confrontation remains a great challenge in an experimental setting. Confrontation effectiveness is critically important to investigate in future research and constitutes a limitation for this dissertation. Prior work on confrontation found that confronting can increase feelings of hypothetical guilt in confronted participants in an imagined
setting (Czopp & Monteith, 2003), reduce the use of stereotypes by participants in a specific lab task (Czopp et al., 2006), or highlight bias in speech (Cadieux, 2012; Mallett & Wagner, 2011; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). This highlight did not occur in Studies 1 and 2, however, as people felt a bigoted comment was equally inappropriate whether someone else confronted it or not. It may be that this benefit only appears when bigotry is subtle and confrontation highlights something not readily visible, and that some comments are already clear enough on their own without confrontation that confronting them does not make them appear more inappropriate than they were originally thought of. Though I did not find this positive effect of confrontation, I found that by seeing someone else confront prejudice, bystanders were more willing to join and support the confronter by also voicing a confrontation of their own (Study 2 and 4). Breaking the silence helped others join in and allowed more people to voice their true feelings about prejudice. These are encouraging findings and constitute small victories against prejudice.

However, after researching confrontation for many years, I have not found convincing evidence that confrontation can lead to a powerful shift in attitudes in those who hold bigoted attitudes. Most of the positive effects listed above were obtained with undergraduate students who are low- or moderately-prejudiced, and would behave in more socially desirable ways given the lab context in which experiments occur. It remains doubtful that confrontation would obtain effects that would have a reach outside the specific context in which they occur or would positively affect someone who is highly bigoted. In fact, confrontation could cause psychological reactance and increase prejudice if people were to feel that their need for autonomy is under attack (Brehm & Brehm, 1991; Legault et al., 2011). I have not found that witnessing confrontation in a script or live changed attitudes toward minority groups in any of my studies, in this dissertation or otherwise. Maybe confrontation is not the key to changing attitudes directly, despite what people would hope to achieve through it. Perhaps the ultimate goal of confrontation is to gain indirect benefits instead, like those listed above. It may be that a successful confrontation is one that makes explicit a social contract for tolerance and equality, and acts as a social correction of behaviours that go against it. This could be useful for bystanders as well who may be equally affected by confrontation after witnessing it, whereby they may become more aware of their own attitudes and speech and perhaps make them more likely to break the silence on their own in the future. If one expects to immediately change bigots through confrontation, they may find that they are fighting for a lost cause and lose hope (Study 5). The brochure and intervention used in
Study 5 framed the effectiveness of confrontation as a potential butterfly effect of change, whereby silence is assuredly ineffective in changing attitudes but speaking up has a chance of success if it is joined by others in the future. When presented with this information, participants gained hope about their effectiveness through the course of their participation in the daily diary study. It would still be interesting for future experiments to empirically test whether confrontation can change attitudes at all in those who hold bigoted views, and whether confrontation can lead to a shift in social norms.

Through my extensive work on antigay prejudice confrontation, I found that male confronters not only put their likability on the line when they confront such prejudices, but people may also call into question their sexual orientation and suspect them to be less likely straight (Studies 1-3). This is a high price to pay for those who have feelings of precarious manhood (Vandello et al., 2008) or high needs for self-verification (Swann et al., 1992) which can explain their lower rates of confrontation (Kroeper et al., 2014). There are multiple reasons why male confronters of antigay prejudice could be suspected to be gay. First, there seem to be social norms linking antigay prejudice perpetration with affirmation of masculinity (Poteat et al., 2011). Therefore, logically speaking, opposing antigay prejudice may be equated to being less masculine, and therefore lead to suspicion that one might be gay. Second, people may simply be making a fundamental attribution error in interpreting the motives of the confrontation (Jones & Harris, 1967), thinking confronters are doing so out of internal dispositions (and thus being gay). People disregarded situational cues (relationship status, Studies 1-2) and inferred that the confronter was acting out of dispositional inclinations (making him more likely gay). Lastly, the emotionality of a confrontation as well as word choice seemed to be linked to being suspected gay as seen in Study 3, whereby angrier confronters and those using prejudice labels like “homophobia” were viewed as being more likely gay than calm confronters and those refraining from using specific language about prejudice. It seems that the more impassioned one is with their confrontation of antigay bias, the more they are suspected to be gay. This may be because the negative feelings signalled through the heightened emotion are thought to indicate personal hurt, which would bolster the suspicion of the confronter potentially being gay. This links back to the fundamental attribution error whereby the emotion is thought to represent the person’s identity, and not the fact that the situation might have been upsetting on its own. In Study 3, I found that there are ways to minimize these suspicions by confronting using a more suggestive, calmer tone and
avoiding the use of prejudice labels like “homophobic”. Those concerned with appearing gay could therefore still voice their opposition to prejudiced speech while minimizing their appearing gay to others.

Knowing that males report being concerned with appearing gay should they confront antigay prejudice (Kroeper et al., 2014), I attempted to reduce these concerns by having male participants disclose their sexual orientation before participating in a live conversation where a bigoted comment occurs (Study 4). I wanted to test whether allowing men to make their orientation clear to their chatroom partners would alleviate their fears of sexual miscategorization and make them confront an inappropriate antigay comment more often. However, the disclosure condition was different from the non-disclosure condition in two important ways: participants had the opportunity to disclose their orientation to their conversation partners through a form prior to the conversation, and through the different topic of conversation assigned. Participants who had disclosed their orientation on a form then went on to discuss their female celebrity crush, debating which female celebrities were hottest, whereas those who were in the non-disclosure condition discussed their favourite male actors. I did not find that males confronted the same bigoted comment more in either conversation. The methods were problematic and might have confounded the effect of disclosure of orientation. Participants reported that an inappropriate comment (saying “there are too many gays in San Francisco” and that “it’s weird”) made in the context of debating relative hotness of female celebrities was more acceptable than when discussing funny male actors. This is in line with previous findings indicating that perpetration of bigotry and affirmation of masculinity are intertwined with one another (Poteat et al., 2011), whereby the former is often used to boost the latter. It may therefore appear more customary and acceptable to speak ill of gays in the context of a conversation objectifying women where affirmations of masculinity are taking place than in other conversations. In fact, though this difference failed to reach statistical significance due to a probable lack of power, all but one instance of perpetration of prejudice by participants in the conversations occurred in that female crush conversation. This conversation topic may have nullified the potential positive effects of simply disclosing orientation so as to alleviate fears of miscategorization and help males confront antigay bigotry. Also, as my own studies highlighted (Studies 1-2), hinting that a confronter’s sexual orientation is straight was not enough to clear them of suspicions of being gay. Perhaps men know that disclosing their orientation to others is
not sufficient to give them a free pass at confronting antigay bigotry and would not shield them from others questioning their orientation. Future research should investigate further whether addressing males’ concerns for appearing gay to others (Kroeper et al., 2014) in other meaningful ways can help them confront antigay prejudice more. However, researchers should be mindful in how they allow males to express their orientation as this may also shift the context of the situation, making perpetration of bigotry more acceptable in that new context.

This dissertation was one of the first to investigate confrontation of anti-lesbian bigotry (Study 3). Interestingly, people matched the gender of a confronter to the gender of the defended group, whereby people thought confronters of anti-lesbian prejudice were more likely female and confronters of antigay prejudice were more likely male (Study 3). They did not think, however, that confronters of anti-lesbian prejudice were more likely to be gay. This might mean that it is a unique cost for confronters of antigay prejudice, though the design used in Study 3 limits my ability to reach that conclusion. Because there was no condition without confrontation to compare these results with, it may be that non-confronters would be viewed as more likely straight than confronters. Copying my other designs (Study 1 and 2) for anti-lesbian bigotry may show that confronters are more suspected to be lesbians than non-confronters. Also, confronting anti-lesbian prejudice was generally more disliked than confronting antigay prejudice, especially when the comment was ambiguous in nature (Study 3). Participants felt that a comment saying one “[doesn’t] want to hear about that [on the news]” in relation to a lesbian-focused event is more acceptable than in relation to a gay-focused event. Because confronter evaluations are closely tied to how inappropriate a perpetrator is, confronters were judged more negatively for confronting anti-lesbian prejudice. As discussed previously, this may be a double-jeopardy situation (Beale, 1970) whereby lesbian issues are inherently women’s issues, which often times receive aversive reactions and are judged in sexist ways. Though both the gay and lesbian identities may be recouped under the broader “homosexuality” category, they are very different from one another in their interplay with social norms, their relative status, and confrontation as well. Future experiments should investigate anti-lesbian prejudice confrontation more as it merits separate attention from antigay prejudice confrontation, and findings from the antigay prejudice confrontation field do not apply identically to this other domain.

Confronting prejudice can be a risky endeavour. Two people were recently stabbed to death in Oregon for confronting an Islamophobic white supremacist harassing a Muslim woman on a
train (Marco, Hanna, & Almasy, 2017). This is an extreme example of how confrontation can go awry, and certainly highlights that confronting bears risks that should be evaluated carefully. Individual confrontation should not be used systematically against every offender as some may pose a serious safety threat and could be better dealt with by law enforcement. However, most instances of confronting bigoted speech would do not pose a threat to one’s life. Nevertheless, there are other, more common social costs associated with confrontation, such as being seen as dislikable, a complainer, and in the case of antigay prejudice confrontation, suspected to be likely gay (Studies 1-3). My work has outlined ways to minimize these costs (Study 3), such as confronting when the prejudicial intention of the perpetrator is clear, with a suggestive tone targeting what was said while avoiding the use of labels. This advice can probably lead to more courteous exchanges between the confronter and the confronted and potentially avoid the escalation of violence sometimes associated with confrontation. I also found that confrontation can increase involvement of bystanders in the act of confronting prejudice speech (Studies 2 and 4) and increase satisfaction with oneself (Study 5). LGBT allies find it rewarding to be social advocates, such that they experience reduced feelings of guilt and increased personal satisfaction derived from having done something they felt was morally right (Russell, 2011). Confronting antigay prejudice can potentially lead to more positive environments for the gay community by reminding and enforcing norms of equality. Through my work, I was able to highlight the costs awaiting confronters of sexual prejudice, but also found concrete ways to help allies minimize these risks. As such, this dissertation can be used as an informative tool to help optimize confrontation of sexual prejudice by allies, thus making a valuable contribution to the social psychological field of prejudice reduction.
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Table 1. Likability and Complainer ratings of non-confronters and confronters across studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation hint condition</th>
<th>Likability ratings</th>
<th>Complainer ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-confront condition</td>
<td>Confront condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 285)</td>
<td>5.23 (1.14)</td>
<td>5.15 (1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 116)</td>
<td>4.76 (1.32)</td>
<td>4.81 (0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher scores represent an increased perception that the target is likable or a complainer. Scales range from 1 to 7. * p < .05; ** p < .01.
Table 2. Sexual orientation ratings of non-confronters and confronters across studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation hint condition</th>
<th>Study 1 (n = 285)</th>
<th>Study 2 (n = 116)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-confront condition</td>
<td>Confront condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>$M (SD)$</td>
<td>$M (SD)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>2.04 (1.82)</td>
<td>1.48 (1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>6.70 (0.60)</td>
<td>5.87 (1.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>5.24 (1.51)</td>
<td>4.82 (1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.71*** (2.43)</td>
<td>3.96*** (2.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>5.60 (1.82)</td>
<td>5.24 (1.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>5.93 (1.21)</td>
<td>4.45 (1.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.45* (2.28)</td>
<td>3.98* (2.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lower scores represent an increased perception that the target is likely gay. Scales range from 1 to 7. * $p < .05$; *** $p < .001$. 

Scales range from 1 to 7. * $p < .05$; *** $p < .001$. 
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Table 3. Indirect effects of Confrontation Condition on Target Likability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediators</th>
<th>Point Estimate of Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>BCa 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Orientation</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complainer</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation + Complainer&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complainer + Orientation&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived orientation</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complainer</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation + Complainer&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complainer + Orientation&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: BCa: bias corrected and accelerated, 10000 bootstrap samples. Orientation Condition was added as a covariate. * Confidence intervals not containing zero are interpreted as statistically significant. <sup>a</sup> In this model, both Orientation (1<sup>st</sup>) and Complainer (2<sup>nd</sup>) were used as mediators sequentially. <sup>b</sup> In this model, both Complainer (1<sup>st</sup>) and Orientation (2<sup>nd</sup>) were used as mediators sequentially.
Table 4. Summary of conditions in Study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Prejudiced comment</th>
<th>Confronter's response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prejudice type</td>
<td>Bigoted intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antigay comment</td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-lesbian comment</td>
<td>Clearly bigoted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the contents of these conditions and the materials used, see Appendix 1
Table 5. Summary of comments heard each day for the daily diary (Study 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entries recorded</th>
<th>No comments reported</th>
<th>Racist</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Antigay</th>
<th>Ageist</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total confronted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intake</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Total n = 78.
Figure 1. Mediation model tested in Studies 1 and 2, controlling for Orientation condition assigned.
Figure 2. Participants' first reaction to the bigoted comment in Study 2
Figure 3. Participants' reaction after viewing the target's response in Study 2
Figure 4. Confronter's likability scores in Study 3 – Prejudice Type x Bigoted Intention x Prejudice Label interaction

![Bar chart showing likability scores for different conditions.](image-url)
Figure 5. Perceived inappropriateness of prejudiced comment in Study 3, Bigotry Intensity x Prejudice Type interaction
Figure 6. Orientation perceptions in Study 3 – Prejudice Type x Confrontation Intensity interaction

* Sexual orientation was rated on a scale from 1- Definitely gay to 7- Definitely straight, with 4- Ambiguous/Unsure as the midpoint of the scale.
Figure 7. Perceived gender of the confronter according to Prejudice Type in Study 3
Figure 8. Comments encountered weekly in Study 5
Figure 9. Evolution of confrontation rates over 7 days in Study 5
Figure 10. Beliefs about efficacy of confrontation in Study 5
Appendix 1. Scripts of comments and screenshots of simulated articles used in Study 3

**Prejudice type**
Antigay comment: A pride parade news article (see screenshots on the following pages)

Anti-lesbian comment: A dyke march news article (see screenshots on the following pages)

**Bigoted intention**
Ambiguous: “I don’t want to hear about that every time I turn on [the news].”

Clear: “I don’t want to hear about that every time I turn on [the news], that’s just gross.”

**Confronter’s response**
Suggestive confrontation, does not mention homophobia: “What do you mean by that? This is a major event in our city…”

Suggestive confrontation, mentions homophobia: “What do you mean by that? This feels inappropriate and homophobic…”

Personal attack, does not mention homophobia: “What do you mean by that? This is a major event so maybe you should shut up.”

Personal attack, mentions homophobia: “What do you mean by that, homophobe? This is a major event so maybe you should shut up.”
Anti-lesbian prejudice condition (ambiguous bigotry and suggestive confrontation)

CP24 to cover Toronto Dyke March live on TV and online

Participants walk in the Dyke March in Toronto on Saturday, June 28, 2008. (Pride Toronto photo)

Web Staff, cp24.com
Published Tuesday, June 17, 2014 11:55PM EDT

CP24 will bring TV viewers to the heart of the Toronto Dyke March action on Saturday, when it airs Toronto's live broadcast of the event.

Beginning at 2 p.m., the coverage will be repeated again on Sunday at 8 p.m.

The event, part of the second largest festival in Toronto, is expected to attract about one million people.

CTV and CP24 have planned coverage for many of the events happening that weekend.

RELATED LINKS
- Cops laud new relationship with gay community at Police Pride reception
- When language is a barrier, Latin American queer women use art to voice change
- Queer video art comes to the people on massive LED screen
- Toronto’s other gaybourhood shows its stripes with Queer West Fest
- Pride gets $400K to improve accessibility, website
Read more: http://www.cp24.com/cp24-to-cover-dyke-march-live-on-tv-and-online-1.410446#ixzz3C5HYMegs

Showing 5 - 6 of 9

A

I don’t want to hear about that every time I turn on CP24

Jul 9, 2014

Like · Reply

B

What do you mean by that? This is a major event in our city...

Jul 9, 2014

Like · Reply
Antigay prejudice condition (ambiguous bigotry and suggestive confrontation)

CP24 to cover Toronto Gay Pride Parade live on TV and online

Participants walk in the Gay Pride Parade in Toronto on Sunday, June 29, 2008. (Pride Toronto photo)

Web Staff, cp24.com
Published Tuesday, June 17, 2014 11:55PM EDT

CP24 will bring TV viewers to the heart of the Gay Pride Parade action on Sunday, when it airs Toronto’s live broadcast of the massively popular event.

Beginning at 2 p.m., the coverage will be repeated again on Sunday at 8 p.m.

The event, part of the second largest festival in Toronto, is expected to attract about one million people.

CTV and CP24 have planned coverage for many of the events happening that weekend.

RELATED LINKS
- Cops laud new relationship with gay community at Police Pride reception
- When language is a barrier, Latin American queer women use art to voice change
- Queer video art comes to the people on massive LED screen
- Toronto’s other gaybourhood shows its stripes with Queer West Fest
- Pride gets $400K to improve accessibility, website
Read more: http://www.cp24.com/cp24-to-cover-pride-parade-live-on-tv-and-online-1.410446#ixzz3C5HYMegs

A
I don’t want to hear about that every time I turn on CP24

B
What do you mean by that? This is a major event in our city...
Appendix 2. Scripts used in Study 4

Sexual orientation disclosure and affirmation condition

Kevin: hello?
Mark: hi kevin! anyone else here?
Participant: _______________________________________
Kevin: ok! well... ehh, I guess i'll say that i like jennifer lawrence? she’s cool.
Mark: but megan fox is hotter than jennifer... lol. and you *****X******, whos ur fav?
Participant: _______________________________________
Kevin (ADAPT): jennifer lawrence is still my fav!
Mark: whats that terrible movie sshe was in again?
Participant: _______________________________________
Kevin (ADAPT): shes in hunger games! so many good options… its hard to pick just one…
Mark: right! imagine a date with all of them? .... thatd be unreal. did any of you ever meet any of them in person?
Participant: _______________________________________
Kevin (Adapt): yea!! I once saw Jlaw in san francisco 2 years ago at starbucks…
Mark: ugh san francisco is great but too many gay people man…
Participant: _______________________________________
Kevin: so what if there’s a lot of gay people?
Mark: its kinda weird lol theyre all over the place
Participant: _______________________________________
Kevin: there’s nothing wrong with being gay
**Control condition**

Kevin: hello?

Mark: hi kevin! anyone else here?

Participant:_______________________________________________

Kevin: ok! well... ehh, I guess i'll say that i like bradley cooper? he’s cool.

Mark: but chris pratt is funnier than bradley... lol. and you *****X******, whos ur fav?

Participant:_______________________________________________

Kevin (ADAPT): bradley cooper is still my fav!

Mark: whats that terrible movie hhe was in again?

Participant:_______________________________________________

Kevin (ADAPT): hes in american sniper! so many good options... its hard to pick just one...

Mark: right! imagine a movie with all of them? ...that might be good. did any of you ever meet any of them in person?

Participant:_______________________________________________

Kevin (Adapt): yea!! I once saw bradley in san francisco  2 years ago at starbucks...

Mark: ugh san francisco is great  but too many gay people man...

Participant:_______________________________________________

**Suggestions for Confrontation Condition**

Kevin: so what if there’s a lot of gay people?

Mark: its kinda weird lol theyre all over the place

Participant:_______________________________________________

Kevin: there’s nothing wrong with being gay
Appendix 3. Brochures used in Study 5

**Starting on next page:**

Brochure 1: Daily diary instructions, 2 pages (given to all)
Brochure 2: Confrontation of antigay prejudice information, 2 pages (given to condition Brochure only)
Welcome to our study!

Who We Are

About Us

We are a psychology lab at U of T focusing on prejudice and stereotyping.

We are interested in knowing more about these issues and how they evolve in the real world. The study you are participating in is part of a Ph.D. dissertation, so your continued involvement and serious commitment is greatly appreciated.

This study can only be successful if you provide us with honest responses. We thank you for your help!

Contact Us

Phone/Voicemail: (416) 946-5857
Email: diarystudyuoft@gmail.com
Address: 100 St-George St, Room 55 SG floor (Sidney Smith Hall)

Your Lab PIN:
Your next visit:
What is this study about?

We are interested in people’s daily experiences in life in general as they relate to issues of prejudice.

Over the next 7 days, as you go about your daily routine, we would like you to pay closer attention to prejudiced / inappropriate comments and behaviours you may receive or witness. Then, you will report back on them in short surveys in the evening.

It is important that you fill your daily surveys by midnight on any given day.

What is a prejudiced comment?

Everyone is part of multiple social groups. Social groups are formed by people who have similar traits in common, such as gender, sexual orientation, age, or race.

Whenever someone makes fun of, insults, denigrates, or humiliates another on the basis of the groups they belong to, or expresses disgust towards or speaks ill of a group in general, it is considered to be a prejudiced comment. These take many shapes and forms, from a “harmless joke” all the way to actual threats of violence.

What should I keep track of?

We want you to count the number of instances in which you hear the following types of comments in the real world, and in online interactions:

- Racist comments
- Sexist comments
- Homophobic comments
- Ageist comments
- Other prejudiced comments

Be mindful that we do not want you to keep track of bigotry you would hear in passive media such as TV shows or movies. Only social media or other active media with real people count, as well as real-world interactions you may be a part of or witness.

If you do hear or see prejudiced comments or behaviours, be mindful that we will ask you details about the event so try and remember a bit about what happened for your diary entry.

Tip: “I’m not racist but…” or other similar sayings often preface prejudiced comments

What are the steps to follow?

You were emailed a link for your daily entries. Save this email and, starting tomorrow, use the link to fill 1 entry every evening, for 7 consecutive days.

You will be asked for your Lab PIN to start the survey (see back of this brochure) as well as which daily entry (e.g., Day 3) you are logging in for. If you missed a calendar day, you must skip a daily entry and move to the next.

If you haven’t heard or seen any prejudiced comments on any given day, you still need to fill a diary entry to tell us!

Tip: Set yourself daily reminders in your phone along with your Lab PIN!

You will get a chance to win a $100 prize with every daily entry. If you complete all 7 you will have a chance to win another $100 bonus prize.

- You must complete the diary every evening by midnight.
- Do not fill more than 1 entry a day. The system tracks/deletes repeats.

After the week is up, you will come back for another short visit with us.
Welcome to our study!

What will others think of me?

Depending on how you confront, others may have positive or negative thoughts about you.

Some might even suspect you as being gay for defending gays and lesbians. These social costs have been found in previous research [8]. However, all of these costs were minimized, or were completely avoided by using the more moderate tone outlined in this brochure. So make sure that you remain friendly, calm, and respectful when you approach others for a better chance of success! Remember that your voice matters!

Contact Us

Phone/Voicemail: (416) 946-5857
Email: diarystudyuoft@gmail.com
Address: 100 St-George St, Room 55 SG floor (Sidney Smith Hall)

References:

YOUR LAB PIN:
Is homophobia that big a deal?

Despite recent advances in legal rights, antigay prejudice is still a widespread issue.

Recent research shows that out of 500,000 gay and bisexual people surveyed, 55% experienced verbal harassment and 41% experienced discrimination on the basis of their sexual orientation [1]. Moreover, many youth are bullied because of their sexual orientation as antigay comments are extremely frequent among teenagers and young adults [2].

So what if there is prejudice?

Seemingly harmless jokes and prejudiced comments add up and cultivate intolerance.

This creates more hostile environments for young gay people and leads to alarming suicide risks in this population [3].

Though a comment may be intended as a joke, it has aversive psychological and physical effects on those around, and in some cases can lead to extreme distress.

How can I change this?

Though many people think it doesn’t change anything, research shows that there are clear benefits to speaking up against prejudice [1, 4-6]:

- It actually reduces prejudice expression
- It strengthens social norms against prejudice, ensuring a positive environment for all
- It can foster positive contact between people of different groups
- It increases satisfaction with oneself for doing something that felt morally right

When people who aren’t targeted by a prejudiced comment confront it (e.g., when straight people confront homophobia, men confront sexism, or Whites confront racism), research shows confrontation is even more effective! [5, 6]

If the concerned minorities confront comments addressed to their group, they are often dismissed as complainers and not taken seriously. This is why non-targets have a unique opportunity to give a helping hand.

These findings were replicated again and again, showing how important it is for everyone to play their part.

How should I speak up?

There are more and less effective ways to confront prejudice.

Recent research finds that [7]:

- overreacting to a comment,
- accusing others of bigotry,
- and attacking personally the people who made the comment...

...can backfire! It leads to increased negative social perceptions from others and does not yield more positive results than a more moderate approach.

Instead:

- confronting by suggesting that what was said is inappropriate,
- without insulting the person who made the comment,
- and without calling the other racist/sexist/homophobic specifically...

...gets the same results as more extreme confrontations, while minimizing social costs and risks of backfiring.

Confronting does not mean conflict. It can be quite positive and friendly.

Tip: Take a deep breath and keep it short and simple!
Appendix 4. Script used to discuss with participants in Study 5

**Steps:**
Ask person to provide an email address they use, and name.
Go to computer in lab, ask person to log on to their email account and retrieve email.
“You need to save this email, it’s critical you keep it and return to it every day. This link will be what you use to complete your daily entries from home. Take your time, because the quality of the data you provide is critical for the success of this experiment. ”

**After**
Read through the brochures carefully, don’t just skim, and we’ll talk about them after you’re done.
This is a really important step because it sets the stage for what you will be doing this week.
Do you have questions about what you’ll be doing?
Just so we’re clear, you need to pay attention to prejudiced comments you hear or read over the week, on the INTERNET and in the REAL WORLD. Don’t count things on TV or movies, only social media where you can interact with the person who made the comment counts.
It’s critical that you fill the diary every EVENING, BEFORE MIDNIGHT.

**In the brochure condition, add:**
So here is additional information about prejudice that comes from research that comes from this lab and from the literature more generally. Take some time to read through that. (hand brochure, wait)
So as you read, confronting prejudiced comments works in reducing prejudice. You may not see an immediate effect to the confrontation, but if you and eventually other people say something against the person, eventually the person may learn from that and reduce their prejudiced responses. Confronting prejudice can be quite simple…. So let’s do a practice run together… say I say “omg that video game is so gay”… what could you say?
(coach on response given)
So do you have any questions?
Great so let me give you your $10 for coming today. You will be getting another one of these when you come see us next after you are done with your daily entries.
Don’t talk about this experiment with anyone, even if they are part of it just like you.
Appendix 5. Items used in measures, Study 5

**ATT. TWD. GAYS & LESBIANS (Herek, 1997)**
I think male homosexuals are disgusting.
Male homosexuality is a perversion.
Sex between two men is just plain wrong.
I think lesbians are disgusting.
Female homosexuality is a perversion.
Sex between two women is just plain wrong.

**ATT. TWD. WOMEN (Spence et al., 1973)**
In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in bringing up the children.
There are many jobs in which men should be given preference in being hired or promoted.
Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
It is ridiculous for a woman to repair cars and for a man to knit scarves
Women’s requests in terms of equality between the sexes are simply exaggerated.

**ATT. TWD. OLDER ADULTS (Fraboni et al., 1990)**
It is best that old people live where they won’t bother anyone.
The company of most old people is quite enjoyable.
I sometimes avoid eye contact with old people when I see them.
I don't like it when old people try to make conversation with me.
I personally would not want to spend much time with an old person.

**ATT. TWD. RACIAL AND ETHNIC MINORITIES (Henry & Sears, 2002)**
Racial minorities are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights.
Interracial marriages are a bad idea. People should marry others within their own race.
It's really a matter of some people not trying hard enough; if ethnic and racial minorities would only try harder they could be just as well off as whites.
The racial tension that exists in Canada today because of minorities making a fuss.
There is discrimination against ethnic and racial minorities in Canada today, limiting their chances to get ahead

**EGALITARIANISM (Katz & Hass, 1988)**
One should be kind to all people.
One should find ways to help others who are less fortunate.
A person should be concerned about the well-being of others.
Those who are unable to provide for their basic needs should be helped by others.
Acting to protect the rights and interests of other members of the community is a major obligation for all persons.

**IMPLICIT THEORIES (Chiu et al., 1997; Rattan & Dweck, 2010)**
The kind of person someone is, is something very basic and it can't be changed very much.
People can do things differently, but the important parts of who they are can't really be changed.
Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change their basic characteristics.
People can always substantially change their basic characteristics.
No matter what kind of person someone is, they can always change very much.