INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Lucido, David James

ROLE EXPECTATIONS AND BEHAVIOR TOWARD THE PHYSICALLY DISABLED

City University of New York PH.D. 1984

ROLE EXPECTATIONS AND BEHAVIOR TOWARD THE PHYSICALLY DISABLED

by

DAVID JAMES LUCIDO

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1984

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4/24/84
date

Chairman of Examining Committee

April 24 1984
date

Executive Officer

Professor Alden Wessman

Professor Glen Hass

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

ROLE EXPECTATIONS AND BEHAVIOR TOWARD

THE PHYSICALLY DISABLED

by

David James Lucido

Adviser: Professor Irwin Katz

This paper addressed some issues raised by ambiguities in the findings of previous studies concerning the efficacy of acknowledgement of disability by the physically disabled in facilitating social interaction with the nondisabled. It was proposed that the positive effects of disability acknowledgement found in these previous studies were mediated by subjects' anticipation that their own behavior in social interactions could lead to embarrassing self-disclosures. An experiment was devised to test the hypothesis that open acknowledgement of a physical disability by a disabled individual would lead to greater liking, more favorable personality evaluations, less social and physical distancing as well as less anxiety, depression and aggression when the content of the interaction was expected to be relatively intimate but that acknowledgement would have no effect when a relatively neutral or nonintimate interaction was anticipated. All subjects viewed a videotaped interview

of a handicapped confederate who either acknowledged or did not acknowledge his disability and were told that they would meet the confederate at a later point in the experiment to have an open-ended discussion. The topic for the discussion was described to subjects as either being neutral and potentially unrelated to disability or the topic given was directly relevant to the issue of physical disability. The results of this study confirmed that subjects would show more favorable evaluations of a disabled stimulus person when he acknowledged his disability but only when subjects perceived a significant potential for embarrassing self-disclosures. The predicted interaction effects of disability acknowledgement and situation intimacy were strongly supported for subjects' perceptions of the stimulus person but were only weakly supported for their expressions of social distancing from him. The predicted interaction effects of disability acknowledgement and situation intimacy were not supported for any measures of physical distancing. The impact of the stimulus person's self-description on subjects' moods was found to be independent of whether subjects expected to interact with him in an intimate or nonintimate setting. Subjects expressed greater aggression and depression when expecting to interact with a stimulus person who acknowledged his disability than when expecting to interact with a stimulus person who made no acknowledgment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would especially like to thank my dissertation sponsor, Dr. Irwin Katz for his guidance and encouragement throughout every phase in the development of this dissertation. His skill as a scientist and as a teacher is exceeded only by his patience, which was surely taxed beyond measure in seeing me through to the end of this project. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. Alden Wessman and Dr. Glen Hass for their helpful insights which added considerably to the research of which this thesis is the final product. I would also like to thank Dr. Hass for making facilities available to me at Brooklyn College for the collection of my data.

I owe a special debt of gratitude to Dr. Roger Mazze of the Diabetes Research and Training Center of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine who encouraged, cajoled, embarrassed and finally threatened me into finishing this dissertation. His support and friendship is greatly appreciated.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Randye , who has given me more help than she knows and who has given me more reasons to finish my thesis than even I could find arguments against.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The research literature regarding the psychological response of normals to the physically disabled has focused upon the concept of stigmatization, the notion that certain unusual personal attributes operate as special stimuli which in and of themselves occasion behavior ranging from helping and other pro-social acts to avoidance and denigration. The model underlying much of this work has been described by Katz (1981) as an "attribute as cause model". The "problem" of physical disability, in a social sense, has been located by this approach in the generally negative attributions and ascriptions made by the observer about the individual who is physically disabled.

The range of disabilities investigated has been broad and has included leg amputation (e.g. Kleck, Ono, and Hastorf, 1966 ; Kleck, 1968), wheelchair confinement (e.g. Katz, Glass, Lucido and Farber, 1977,1979; Katz, Farber, Lucido, Glass and Emswiller, 1978), facial and bodily disfigurement (e.g. Piliavin, Piliavin, and Rodin, 1975; Langer, Fiske, Taylor, and Chanowitz, 1976; Doob and Ecker, 1970) and a number of non-specific bodily related stimuli such as an invalid in an emergency situation (e.g. Piliavin and Piliavin, 1972). Additionally a number of studies have used manipulations of "apparent" disability including mental illness (e.g. Gergen and Jones, 1963; Farina, Holland

and Ring 1966; Farina and Felner, 1973) and epilepsy (e.g. Kleck, Buck, Goller, London, Pfeiffer, and Vukcevic, 1968). The most persistent findings in this body of research have been that the nondisabled experience discomfort in the presence of the physically and mentally disabled and generally tend to avoid contact of a potentially intimate nature.

Kleck (1968) found that subjects who interacted with a confederate with an apparent leg amputation, as compared with those who interacted with a nondisabled confederate, showed greater motoric inhibition and distortion of previously stated opinions away from expressing high regard for athletic involvement. Kleck, Ono and Hastorf (1966) had subjects participate in face-to-face encounters with a confederate who appeared disabled or able-bodied. Subjects in the presence of the handicapped confederate tended to avoid stating they attended parties frequently, reported fewer male friends and alleged that sports, physical appearance and dating were not as important as did subjects who were interviewed by the nondisabled confederate. In a second experiment subjects showed greater emotional arousal, as measured by a GSR, in the presence of a handicapped confederate; took longer to select from a set of questions to ask the confederate, where a number of the questions in the set were potentially "sensitive" for a disabled person; terminated the interaction sooner; and distorted previously stated attitudes in a way that was intended to make the handicapped confederate feel more comfortable.

Kleck, Buck, Goller, London, Pfeiffer and Vukcevic (1968) conducted two studies to examine the use of personal space by individuals when

interacting with a stigmatized as opposed to normal partner. In an abstract figure placement task, subjects placed figures representing the self on pages with figures described as various "types" of individuals. The ascriptions included Black, ex-mental patient, epileptic and blind person. Figure placement (distance from self to other) was correlated with attitudes toward various groups. The results showed that subjects placed the figures representing "self" further away from those figures representing stigmatized individuals. Measures of attitudes toward epilepsy and amputation were correlated with figure placement, with individuals who expressed generally more negative attitudes towards the target groups placing figures of "self" further away from the figures representing members of the target groups. A second experiment examined how closely subjects sat to someone who either had indicated a history of epilepsy or had provided no such information. The results showed subjects sitting significantly further away from the "epileptic" confederate.

Langer, Taylor, Fiske and Chanowitz (1976) found that subjects sat further away from a pregnant or handicapped confederate than from a "normal" confederate when interacting with the person. When given the opportunity to view the confederate before a meeting occurred, the subjects sat significantly closer. On a number of interpersonal attraction measures, confederates were evaluated more positively and were seen as more similar to the subjects when subjects were allowed to view them before the interaction. The authors interpreted the findings as an indication that subjects were motivated to stare but threatened by the

possibility of being caught doing so. The opportunity to stare unobserved was said to satisfy that motivation. Doob and Ecker (1970) had a "stigmatized" experimenter ask subjects to fill out a lengthy questionnaire or to sit for a 15-20 minute interview. For one-half of the subjects the requests were made by an experimenter wearing an eyepatch. While there were no differences across the two stigma groups in the interview condition, it was found that significantly more subjects complied with the request to fill out a questionnaire by the stigmatized experimenter than by a nonstigmatized experimenter. The results were taken by the investigators as suggesting that the behavioral manifestations of sympathy for the disabled will emerge in situations in which feelings of discomfort associated with face-to-face interaction can be minimized or avoided entirely. Soble and Strickland (1974) replicated the findings of the Doob and Ecker study using a permanent impairment (hunchback) as opposed to the ambiguous impairment (eyepatch) used in the original study.

The picture that emerges from these studies is a general rejection of the handicapped and disabled by the nondisabled with the nondisabled showing uneasiness in their presence and a preference for social interaction which minimizes social and emotional contact. In much of the current theoretical and research literature on stigma there is a strong emphasis on the similarity of response to different types of stigmatizing conditions (e.g. race, physical disability) with the aim of developing a unified theory of the stigmatization process. The concept of a "minority parallel" among stigmatized groups has its roots in atti-

tudinal research which has shown that individuals who tend to have negative stereotypes and attitudes about a particular outgroup will react similarly to other minorities.[1] Cowen, Underberg and Verillo (1958) found that negative attitudes toward the blind correlated with measures of anti-minority, anti-Negro and authoritarian sentiments. Similarly, Cowen, Bobgrove, Rockway and Stevenson (1967) found that rejection of the deaf was associated with negative attitudes towards other minority groups. Chesler (1965) found that ethnocentrism or rejection of outgroups correlated with rejection of the physically disabled. Kogan (1961) found that unfavorable attitudes toward the aged were associated with feelings of anomie and negative attitudes toward ethnic minorities and a number of physically disabled groups.

The desire to extract a unifying principle with which one can predict the general form of response to all so-called discredited minorities tends to lead to oversimplification of the model of the process underlying the rejection of some of the groups. At the very least this unified approach ignores a number of critical features of the one attribute we will focus on here, physical disability. The physically disabled have problems which are distinct from those problems experienced by members of ethnic or religious minorities.

---

1. see Schrodel, J.G. and Jacobsen, R.J. Employer Attitudes Towards Hiring Persons with Disabilities Pp. 34-35 for a further discussion of this concept.

For the handicapped individual there is rarely any form of group sanction endorsing behavior which spotlights their disability. For example, while one might often hear someone excuse himself before making disparaging remarks about a particular group by saying he is a member of that group, jokes or remarks about disability would seem singularly inappropriate when told by the handicapped individual. Proper adjustment for the handicapped person is seen as behaving in such a way as to mimic as closely as possible the behavior of the nonhandicapped. In contrast to racial and ethnic minorities the physically handicapped are not expected to take pride in their group identification. Sagarin (1975) has described this problem in poignant detail:

> The physically disabled, however, as outrageous and irrational as the stigmatization may be, are involved in the more difficult problem of self-pride and self-acceptance. The reaction against the black man for all the deep roots of racism in American society, is lacking in intellectual respectability. Blacks are on the side of law, righteousness, and history; suffer as they do, they can know that their enemies, like anti-Semites, are the ones who contravene the rules of conscience and morality. Whatever one's views as to whether black is beautiful, who can doubt but that anti-black is ugly? Involuntary deviance, other than the racial, lacks such defense. (Pp. 214-215)

Without social or familial support the disabled individual tends to hold the same beliefs about his identity as do the nondisabled. The disability is quite often seen by the disabled person as pervading aspects of his life quite removed from the inherent limitations imposed on the range of physical activities he may engage in. Since physical disabilities are not typically inherited there is no transmission of cultural values of the disabled group. The disabled individual must

face the restrictions on his behavior and his inferior status position with little or no group identification to bolster himself.

The physically disabled do not comprise a distinct minority group or subculture. Disabilities range widely along a number of dimensions including the severity of impairment experienced by the individual and the degree of visibility of the disability to people within the social sphere of the disabled person. A common set of understandings or beliefs about the disabled subgroup cannot be said to exist to the same degree that can be said of the beliefs held about racial or ethnic minorities such as the athletic ability of Blacks or the criminal activity of Italians. Consequently, interactions between handicapped and nonhandicapped individuals are more subject to ambiguity and posturing than when conventional stereotypes exist within which the interaction may be framed.

An examination of the beliefs and stereotypes held about the disabled as opposed to ethnic or religious minorities suggests widely differing understandings about the implications of the respective group identities for the group members. Katz and Glass (1978) point out that in the United States the common stereotype of Blacks is a hostile, negative one while the physically disabled are regarded as unfortunate victims of a tragic fate who are worthy of sympathy. Of the handicapped Wright (1960) makes the observation:

> The stereotype of a person with a disability typically describes one who has suffered a great misfortune and whose life is consequently disturbed, distorted and damaged forever. Unlike the bereaved person in whom the pain of loss formally

> ceases after a year and who is expected gradually to reap once again the fullness of life, the person with a disability is expected to be permanently enmeshed in the tragedy of his fate. (P. 17)

As has been noted by Katz (1981), public, verbalized attitudes about the disabled are often favorable and a number of investigators report predominantly positive evaluative ratings of handicapped individuals. Yet, it is apparent that the findings regarding the behavior of the nondisabled in the presence of the disabled in experimental settings are inconsistent with verbalized attitudes and with commonly held values which would dictate concern and sensitivity for the plight of the disabled. The uneasiness of the nondisabled in these encounters is probably not well explained in terms of negative attitudes and beliefs. Rather, it can be best understood in terms of the roles and norms appropriate to all social interactions and in light of the special problems presented by the disabled for the management of appropriate social expression by the nondisabled.

Norms of Face to Face Encounters

Every social encounter of a conversational nature carries with it a set of moral obligations whose lack of fulfillment can mean disruption, embarrassment and alienation for any or all of its participants. Goffman (1957) argues that conversation or "conjoint spontaneous involvement" is a small social system which makes demands on its own behalf, carries its own boundary maintaining conditions and can reward or punish those who facilitate or disrupt its flow. In Goffman's dramaturgical scheme each participant or actor in a face-to-face encounter acts out

what is called a line or a pattern of verbal and non-verbal behavior through which he expresses his view of the situation. More specifically the line an individual takes expresses his evaluation of his co-participants and himself. Individuals who find themselves in the presence of others must be aware of the fact that information contained in almost every word or gesture they may make is available to those others for interpretation. Their attitudes and sentiments are conveyed continuously whether intentionally or unintentionally, and the individual must take care that his expressions are not inconsistent with our system of etiquette which dictates the proper image of oneself that may be conveyed as well as the appropriate level of respect one must have for the setting and the other participants in it. Goffman (1955) further develops the dramaturgical model in his concept of face. Face is defined as the claim each participant makes for a positive social evaluation based upon the line he is assumed to take during his contact with others. Goffman notes :

> Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes--albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself. (P. 5)

Goffman adds that an individual has an immediate emotional response to that face which he is permitted or allowed in his contact with others. If the claims an individual makes are consensually supported and have long been sustained then the interaction will be of little emotional consequence. If the situation sustains a face that is better than he is used to or might have expected then there will be positive emotional consequences, such as feeling flattered, or congratulated. When

information of an expressive nature is introduced which suggests that the image one is claiming for one's self is not or cannot be supported by other participants in the interaction then the person is said to be out of face or in wrong face. The emotional consequences in this situation are embarrassment and shame.

The Requirement of Involvement

The major obligation that one incurs by entering into a social interaction is that of being spontaneously involved in the conversation, turning attention to the main topic at hand without conveying any sense of involvement for the sake of satisfying social conventions. As Goffman (1957) expresses it:

> The individual's action must happen to satisfy his involvement obligations, but in a certain sense he cannot act in order to satisfy these obligations, for such an effort would require him to shift his attention from the topic of conversation to the problem of being spontaneously involved in it. (P. 48)

Anything less than total involvement and attention runs the risk of offending those the individual apparently does not find engaging.

The participant is further obliged to be able to take the role of others in the interaction and sense the range of things that are proper content for discussion. He must tailor his attitudes and expressions according to the company that he is keeping at the moment. Each participant in a face-to-face encounter eventually if not immediately, becomes aware of the face that is being maintained by each of the participants. Each person must test the meaning of his own actions in terms of the degree to which they are not inconsistent with that face which

every other participant is attempting to sustain. Goffman (1955) points out that in addition to maintaining his own self-respect each member of an interaction group is expected to behave in a way which allows every other member to maintain his self-respect. He is expected to show a degree of considerateness and concern for the feelings of others present regardless of his own true feelings for the other participants in the encounter.

> The combined effect of the rule of self-respect and the rule of considerateness is that the person tends to conduct himself during an encounter so as to maintain both his own face and the face of the other participants. This means that the line taken by each participant is usually allowed to prevail, and each participant is allowed to carry off the role he appears to have chosen for himself. A state where everyone temporarily accepts everyone else's line is established. This kind of mutual acceptance seems to be a basic structural feature of interaction, especially the interaction of face-to-face talk. It is typically a "working" acceptance, not a "real" one, since it tends to be based not on agreement of candidly expressed heart-felt evaluations, but upon a willingness to give temporary lip service to judgements with which the participants do not really agree". (P. 11)

Misinvolvement

For any of a number of reasons an individual may become misinvolved or alienated from an interaction. The source of this alienation may come from within the interaction or from outside of it, but when the source of distraction is something a participant feels is conspicuously inappropriate either about himself or another participant, the prospects for an interaction flowing uninterruptedly are much dimmer. Goffman (1957) has proposed a number of basic forms of alienative misinvolvement. An individual may be externally preoccupied and the

focus of his attention may be something unconnected with the other participants present. Goffman suggests that the degree of offensiveness of external preoccupation will depend upon how voluntary the noninvolvement appears to be. Willful refusal to participate or boredom are examples of voluntary preoccupation which are usually deemed offensive. Anxiety over, or involvement in vital matters outside the interaction would be forms of noninvolvement which would probably not precipitate judgements of negligence by the other participants. When a person turns the focus of his attention from the topic of conversation to himself he is said to be self-conscious. Self-consciousness is argued by Goffman to take two forms. In the first form a person may be involved in seeing himself as performing well in an interaction, e.g., being witty and the source of attention of other participants. Depending on the degree to which an individual submits to this self-involvement he may be perceived as charming on one hand or as a crashing bore on the other. Self-consciousness in this form is said to be a way of rejoicing about one's elevated status in an encounter. A second form of self-consciousness, in which one perceives oneself as faring badly in an interaction, is a more common experience. Embarrassment or negative self-consciousness depends upon the impression one feels he is making on others present in the situation. Events which contradict, discredit or compromise the face that one makes claim to in an interaction will tend to submerge him in the sustained uneasiness of self-consciousness.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, an individual may, during the course of an interaction, become otherconscious. Otherconsciousness

is a state of distraction occurring when another participant becomes an object of attention. Goffman's examples of otherconsciousness centered around the concepts of affectation and insincerity. When an individual finds himself in the presence of another whose gestures and expressive output suggest he is behaving in an over-controlled and contrived fashion, the perception one is likely to form is that of the participant in some sense being inappropriately involved. Goffman (1957) observes :

> ... while those who are felt to be self-conscious give the impression of being overly concerned with what will happen or has happened to them, those who are felt to be insincere or affected give the impression that they are overly concerned with what they can achieve in what is to follow and are willing to put on an act in order to achieve it. When the individual senses that others are insincere or affected he tends to feel they have taken unfair advantage of their communication position to promote their own interests; he feels they have broken the ground rules of interaction. His hostility to their unfair play leads him to focus his attention upon them and their misdemeanor at the price of his own involvement. (P. 52)

Misinvolvement and the Threat of Disability

The situation of a face-to-face encounter between the physically impaired and nonimpaired is particularly prone to the formation of otherconsciousness and its concomitant strain due to the tendency for awareness to be narrowly channeled on the single physical feature of disability. Yamamoto (1971) has pointed out that this effect is due in part to an incongruence in cognitive gestalt and in part to the fact of a lack of affective preparedness; social encounters with the physically impaired tax the social skills of the nonimpaired interactants. Goffman (1963) has commented:

> We feel that the stigmatized individual is either too aggressive or too shamefaced, and in either case too ready to read unintended meaning into our actions. We ourselves may feel that if we show direct sympathetic concern for his condition, we may be overstepping ourselves; and yet if we actually forget that he has a failing we are likely to make impossible demands of him or unthinkingly slight his fellow sufferers. Each potential source of discomfort for him when we are with him can become something we sense he is aware of, aware that we are aware of, and even aware of our state of awareness about his awareness; the stage is then set for the infinite regress of mutual considerations that Meadian social psychology tells us how to begin but not how to terminate. (P. 18)

Davis (1961) has described the process by which this awareness or otherconsciousness eventually leads to the disability becoming a threat to the nondisabled interactant. As was discussed above, the rules of social exchange dictate that attention to others during social encounters should be general and diffuse. There is a strong press to avoid expressing concern with any single attribute of the individual. Adherence to this rule is difficult when interacting with the physically handicapped because of strain which arises out of the discrepancy between felt and expressed interests in the stigmatized individual. Thus the nondisabled person is constantly faced with the threat that through his own behavior, the other's handicap may become a focal point of the interaction. The discrepancy between one's inner state and social expectation need not disturb social interaction, however the post hoc realization of a discrepancy between one's emotions or behavior and the emotions or behavior most appropriate for the situation can result in an inundation of profound embarrassment and a consequent shutdown of the expressiveness of the individual. This inundation potential can bring about a swift and sudden close to sociable interaction and thus it

is guarded against by both normals and the visibly stigmatized at a cost of foreshortening the expressive boundaries of the interaction.

Physical handicaps are quite often ambiguous predictors of social interaction. For the nonhandicapped there is quite often tremendous difficulty in anticipating the ability of the handicapped to participate in various activities. It is particularly difficult for the nonimpaired to determine the propriety of asking what the handicapped individual wants or is capable of doing. The nonimpaired person will feel on one hand compelled to convey the impression that the needs and limitations of the handicapped individual are being considered, while on the other hand he will be threatened by the fear of appearing to dwell upon those limitations.

At the root of the strain observed in the behavior of the nondisabled during face-to-face encounters with the physically disabled is the dilemma of wishing to express sympathy, while at the same time avoiding an acknowledgment that the disabled person is in need of such support. It should be recognized that the expression of sympathy particularly where such support is not requested explicitly, reflects more than an altruistic outpouring. The offering of sympathetic support by the nondisabled to the physically disabled serves to define the relationship between the two people as one of a sympathetic person in support of a pathetic other, with an implicit but clear status differential. It is an expression of a belief in the stereotype of the disabled person as one who has suffered a great misfortune, and whose life will never be quite normal or whole. The expression of sympathy provides the

nondisabled individual with the only socially sanctioned mode of expressing his negative attitudes toward the disabled person, and serves the function of distancing the person from the object of sympathy. It is an expression of an opinion that this person is somehow different, less than whole and in need of sympathy.

The Sick Role

Parson's (1951) concept of the sick role is directly relevant to the beliefs widely held about the disabled individual. Illness is not normally conceived of as something that is under the control of the person. The person is not responsible for his disease or difficulty and is not expected to manage or deal with it alone. Some sort of aid or process is expected to be given or applied by an outside agency. While the illness is always conceived as an exemption from role and task obligations the person who is ill is obliged to get well and his acceptance is a function of his co-operating to that end. As Parsons points out, acceptance is bought at the "price" of recognizing or admitting that illness is an undesirable state, thus reaffirming for the normal his valuations of health and beauty.

The Disabled Role

By defining the disabled person as sick and as needing help, it is possible to insulate the disabled person from the nondisabled by defining the appropriate domain of his activity as being outside of the range of "normal" social interaction. Conversely, any equal-status face-to-face encounter is defined as an inappropriate setting for him to be in.

Goffman (1963) describes how this process is applied to the physically disabled, who in a certain sense are thought to be ill:

> By definition, of course, we believe the person with a stigma is not quite human. On this assumption we exercise varieties of discrimination through which we effectively, if often unthinkingly reduce his life chances. We construct a stigma-theory, an ideology to explain his inferiority and account for the danger he represents, sometimes rationalizing an animosity based on other differences such as those of social class... We tend to impute a wide range of imperfections on the basis of the original one, and at the same time impute some desirable but undesired attributes, often of a supernatural cast, such as "sixth sense", or "understanding". (P. 5)

Goffman suggests that a central problem of the disabled individual's situation is one of acceptance. Those who interact with him tend to regard his disability or difference as the central aspect of his identity and fail to give him the respect he is entitled to on the basis of the uncontaminated aspects of his social identity.

The disabled individual can be seen as subject to two different, and at times conflicting, sets of expectations about his behavior. On one hand he is considered disabled or infirmed and is expected to display a degree of helplessness and dependence. On the other hand his own desire to be independent and the desire of those about him that he be unobtrusive and unencumbering may dictate that he act "normal", hiding his handicap and keeping up with the nonhandicapped. Goffman (1963) notes:

> The general formula is apparent. The stigmatized individual is asked to act so as to imply neither that his burden is heavy nor that bearing it has made him different from us; at the same time he must keep himself at that remove from us which ensures our painlessly being able to confirm this belief

> about him. Put differently, he is advised to reciprocate naturally with an acceptance of himself and us, an acceptance of him we have not quite extended him in the first place. (P. 122)

The possibility that the often observed discomfort of the nondisabled in face-to-face encounters with the disabled may represent inability or unwillingness to agree about appropriate role requirements is reflected in the fact that the disabled also experience discomfort in these face-to-face encounters. Comer and Piliavin (1972) performed conceptual replications of the Kleck (1968) and Kleck, Ono and Hastorf (1966) studies. In these replications subjects were physically disabled and the confederate interviewer was portrayed as either handicapped or nonhandicapped. Subjects answered a series of questions including several "sensitive" questions about the importance of athletics, relationships with females and physical appearance. The results showed that physically handicapped subjects interacting with a nondisabled interviewer as opposed to a physically disabled interviewer terminated the interaction sooner, showed greater motoric inhibitions, exhibited less smiling and less eye contact and expressed more discomfort over being in the interaction.

Playing the Sick Role

Turner (1971) has discussed the implications of "deviance avowal" or as in the case of disability, acting out the sick role. By acknowledging his disability, either through requests for aid or by verbally focusing on it, the disabled person is affirming those beliefs held by the nondisabled about his condition. In a similar sense he is

reaffirming the nondisabled person's high regard for his own health and distancing himself from the nondisabled individual. He is on some level expressing the opinion that he is unqualified to meet the nonimpaired person on an equal footing. Deviance avowal or playing the sick role, in effect, expresses a willingness on the part of the disabled person to abandon any claims he might have made for being treated as an equal in the interaction and also expresses a lack of expectation of any future interpersonal commitments by the nondisabled interactant. He is, by virtue of his avowal, willing to accept expressions of sympathy which, in fact, are expressions of distancing.

It can be argued then that a critical element in determining the quality of the social encounter between the physically disabled and the nondisabled is the degree to which the disabled individual's behavior "cues" the nondisabled individual about the appropriateness and acceptability of certain dominant, stereotyped behaviors on the part of the nondisabled, in the current social exchange. If the disabled person does not,in some way, avow or acknowledge his disability he is stating that the nondisabled will not be allowed to express sympathy or attend to the disability, forcing the nondisabled interactant to act as if nothing were awry, a situation which is most likely inconsistent with his true feelings. If the disabled individual rejects the "handicapped" label, with its implications of lower status, the nondisabled participant in the social exchange must then suppress his true feelings and behave in a way which fulfills his obligation of spontaneous involvement in the interaction. Thus, the experience the nondisabled participant

has of a face-to-face interaction with a disabled other is a function not only of the attitudes and beliefs he may hold about the meaning of the disability and the degree of intimacy of the exchange, but also it is a function of the apparent receptiveness of the disabled individual to behaviors or expressions which reflect those attitudes and beliefs.

The often observed uneasiness of the nondisabled in the presence of the disabled in not a constant state and should be mitigated by behaviors and expressions on the part of the disabled which are consistent with the nondisabled person's stereotype of the disabled. Conversely, behaviors or expressions which serve notice that the disability stereotype is not consistent with the disabled individual's own view of himself should increase the nondisabled person's uneasiness and have an unfavorable effect on the latter's perception of and reaction to the disabled participant.

While little experimental evidence bears directly on the above, a study by Katz, Farber, Glass, Lucido and Emswiller (1978), is highly suggestive. The investigators manipulated the personal qualities of a confederate/experimenter: she was either warm, friendly and generally positive in outlook or caustic, rude and apathetic. Crossed with this, the confederate was either wheelchair-bound or apparently normal. She administered a series of verbal tests to the subjects who were later asked to do her a personal favor. The investigators found that the subjects offered more help to the normal than to the handicapped confederate in the positive condition and showed the reverse pattern in the negative condition. A second experiment used the same independent

variables but instead of measuring willingness to help the confederate, assessed covert anger arousal and perception of the confederate as happy or unhappy. The investigators found greater covert anger arousal in the wheelchair/positive presentation condition than in the normal/positive condition and greater anger arousal in the normal/negative condition than in the wheelchair/negative condition. Independent of the confederate's physical status, the confederate's negative self-presentation was regarded by subjects as an indication of unhappiness.

The investigators interpreted the results as reflecting an annoyance on the part of subjects in the positive presentation condition with the disabled confederate's display of "normal" characteristics, while in the negative presentation condition subjects were sympathetic to the disabled individual, whose negative behavior was viewed as consonant with having suffered the misfortune of disability.

This interpretation, while plausible, relies on the assumption that behavior on the part of others which is consistent with expectations is viewed more positively than behavior which is inconsistent with expectations. Rather than speculate on the validity of this assumption, we would interpret these findings in terms of the degree to which the confederate's behavior, positive or negative, is informative to the nondisabled subject about the confederate's self-identity. For the disabled confederate a negative self-presentation suggests that he perceives himself as victimized by his disability and probably shares the evaluation of him that is held by the nondisabled subject. The positive self-presentation condition of the disabled confederate, on the other

hand, would present a threat to the subjects because the confederate's behavior suggests a rejection of the disabled role-identity and forces the subject to guard against any expression or behavior which indicates that he does not concur with the confederate's self-presentation.

A series of experiments by Hastorf, Wildfogel and Cassman (1979) also bears upon this interpretation of the social dynamics of the handicapped/nonhandicapped interaction. The investigators were testing the hypothesis that nonhandicapped individuals would prefer to interact face-to-face with a handicapped person who acknowledges his disability over one who does not acknowledge it, if the acknowledgment also conveys that he is not overly sensitive about his disability. In each of three experiments subjects viewed two videotaped interviews of handicapped confederates. Subjects were told that the purpose of the study was to examine the effects of seeing and hearing a paraplegic individual, as compared with only reading about him, on future interactions with him. Subjects were then led to believe that they would be returning at a later date to perform some simple task with one of the interviewees. The two interviews were essentially identical in content with the exception that in response to the question "How do you feel about yourself and your college experiences up to this point?" one confederate openly discussed his disability and acknowledged the problems he had with being confined to a wheelchair while the other confederate made no mention of his disability. In the acknowledgment interview the confederate described having learned to cope with the problem and having encouraged questions about his disability because he realized people were afraid to

talk about his handicap. Following the viewing of each videotape subjects were asked to rate the confederates on a series of polar adjective pairs and asked a series of four questions about how they felt the confederate would act in certain situations and how they themselves would act in certain situations with the confederate. Following the viewing of the second videotape subjects were asked to indicate which of the two handicapped confederates they would prefer to work with in a later session.

The results showed that significantly more subjects preferred to work with the confederate who acknowledged his disability than with the one who did not. In addition the acknowledging confederate was evaluated more positively and was viewed as significantly better adjusted.

These results were viewed as supportive of the hypothesis that acknowledgment is an effective strategy in handicapped /nonhandicapped interactions because it reduces the discomfort of the nonhandicapped interactant. However, it was felt that the findings were also consistent with an alternative hypothesis that the effectiveness of the acknowledgment was due to the fact that it reveals personal information and thus increases intimacy and liking. In order to control for the effects of self-disclosure a second experiment was conducted which was identical to the first but in the non-acknowledgment interview the confederate made a personal disclosure unrelated to his disability. The results of the second experiment were consistent with those of the first. Significantly more subjects preferred to work with the

disability-acknowledging confederate. Again the acknowledging confederate was evaluated more favorably and perceived as psychologically better adjusted.

A final experiment was conducted to test the limits of the acknowledgment tactic. This third experiment was identical in all respects to the previous two but the acknowledging confederate appeared to be nervous and tense when talking about his disability. It was felt that this manipulation would reverse the findings of the previous two experiments because subjects were expected to recognize the confederate's nonverbal behavior as being at odds with his verbal self-descriptions and perceive this as reflecting a hyper-sensitivity to his own disability on the part of the confederate. Contrary to the predictions, subjects again preferred to work with the acknowledging confederate over the confederate who made a personal self-disclosure even though the acknowledgment was made with nervous difficulty. None of the differences in impression ratings, however, reached an acceptable level of significance, although on 10 of the 12 adjective scales the acknowledging confederate received a more favorable evaluation.

Belgrave and Mills (1981) also examined the effect of mentioning one's disability on acceptance of the physically disabled. This study investigated the effect of five different experimental conditions on subjects' willingness to interact socially with a confederate. In a control condition the confederate was not physically disabled, while in the other four conditions he was apparently confined to a wheelchair. Each of the four handicapped-confederate treatment conditions differed

in whether the disabled confederate mentioned his disability and if so in what context it was mentioned.

Subjects were told that the study was an investigation of the effects of prior social interaction on task performance. They were also told that they were part of a group that would indicate whether or not they would have further social interaction with their partner. Subjects found themselves filling out a questionnaire along with the confederate after the experimenter had left the room. In three of the four conditions in which the subject was paired with a handicapped confederate, the confederate mentioned his disability. In a Request-Mention condition the confederate broke his pencil lead while filling out the questionnaire and asked the subject if he would sharpen it for him saying "There's just some things you can't do from a wheelchair". In a Miscue-Mention condition the confederate first tried to sharpen the pencil by himself but then dropped it to the floor. He then asked for the subject's help saying "I forget, there's just some things you can't do from a wheelchair". In the final Mention condition the confederate said to the subject while filling out his questionnaire "I hope this experiment doesn't involve anything physical. There's just some things you can't do from a wheelchair". In the No Mention and Nondisabled conditions the confederate did not make any comment to the subject. The results showed that subjects expressed a greater preference to interact with the disabled confederate in the Request-Mention and Miscue-Mention conditions than in any other. Analysis of the impression ratings showed a difference only between the nondisabled condition and the four dis-

abled conditions. There was no effect of merely mentioning the disability on subjects' ratings of the confederate's personality.

It would appear from the results of these two studies that the acknowledgement strategy is an effective tactic in some situations for reducing the usual discomfort felt by the nondisabled in the presence of the disabled. Yet, there is considerable ambiguity about the generalizability of these results to all social interactions between disabled and nondisabled individuals. The studies by Hastorf et al. and Belgrave and Mills assume that acknowledgement of a disability by a handicapped individual increases liking and acceptance because of a reduction of anticipated discomfort and uncertainty in the interaction. Because neither study manipulated subjects' expectations of the type of interaction they would be having with the confederate, one must assume either that the nondisabled expect all interactions with the disabled to be uncomfortable or that the explanation given to subjects about the interaction they would have with the disabled confederate at a later point in time led them to believe that they would probably be uncomfortable to a significant extent. The resolution of this ambiguity about the degree of discomfort that subjects anticipated having in these two studies is critical to understanding the limits of the acknowledgment strategy in interactions between the disabled and nondisabled. Hastorf et al. and Belgrave and Mills did not explicitly manipulate the discomfort which their subjects anticipated having when interacting with the disabled confederates. They assumed some moderate level of discomfort on the part of subjects in all of the experiments that they report on. It is

unclear from their paradigms whether the effect of acknowledgment is dependent upon the level of discomfort that subjects felt about interacting with a disabled individual or incidental to it. The results of at least one study (Katz, Glass, Lucido and Farber 1977) suggest that arousal or discomfort about one's behavior vis a vis the disabled, independent of whether the individual acknowledged his disability, could produce quite the opposite results, i.e. decreases in liking or denigration.

A second question not adequately addressed by these studies is what are the sources of the discomfort experienced by subjects when anticipating interaction with the disabled confederates. Hastorf et al. point out that a major source of discomfort for the nondisabled when interacting with the disabled is the uncertainty over what kinds of behavior are appropriate and acceptable. This uncertainty arises from a conflict between societal norms which dictate that one should behave kindly and supportively toward the disabled but at the same time not in a way which calls attention to their disability. The uncertainty that arises in these situations typically manifests itself as self-consciousness about how one's own behavior is being received. The discomfort an individual might experience in a face-to-face encounter with a disabled person is probably proportional to the degree to which he is self-conscious about his performance in that encounter.

Self-consciousness may be viewed as a normal response to certain transient, situational variables, but it may also be viewed as a reliable tendency or trait. Fenigstein, Schier and Buss (1975) have

developed an objective measurement scale to assess self-consciousness. According to the authors of the scale, the trait of self-consciousness is made up of three dimensions: public self-consciousness, private self-consciousness and social anxiety. Public self-consciousness represents concerns over the self as a social object and focuses on the reactions of others to the self. Private self-consciousness is viewed as similar to the concept of introversion but is more narrowly defined as reflecting thoughts that deal solely with the self rather than just being internally oriented. Social anxiety is argued to represent a reaction to the processes of self-focused attention represented by public and private self-consciousness.

Evidence in support of the Fenigstein et al. conception of the personality dimension of Self-consciousness is found in the reliability of the subscales they have developed. Correlations between the three subscales were small but consistent across different subsamples indicating that the three subscales are relatively independent of one another and stable[2]. The test-retest correlations of the three subscales were high indicating that they are reliable.[3]

The work by Fenigstein et al. suggests that individuals high in trait self-consciousness would tend to suffer from social evaluation

---

2. The subscale correlations ranged from .26 to -.06 .

3. The authors report test-retest correlations for the subscales as : public self-consciousness, .84; private self-consciousness, .79; social anxiety, .73; and total score, .80.

anxiety independently of any situational determinants conducive of self-consciousness. Additionally, trait self-consciousness should serve to amplify the effects of any situational factors which would also produce self-consciousness.

One major assumption of both the Hastorf et al. and Belgrave and Mills studies is that reactions toward the disabled are mediated by discomfort on the part of the nondisabled about not knowing how to behave toward them. This discomfort is best described as self-consciousness. The question that is raised by the work of Fenigstein et al. is to what extent the results of the investigations by Hastorf et al. and Belgrave and Mills can be explained in terms of individual differences in the personality trait of self-consciousness.

In order to better test the limits of the acknowledgment strategy as well as evaluate it in the context of the model of the social dynamics between the disabled and nondisabled that we have developed here, it would be necessary to explicitly manipulate the discomfort that subjects would anticipate having with the disabled confederate. Subjects' expectations about how uneasy they would feel in the anticipated interaction were manipulated by varying the degree of relevance of the assigned discussion topic to the issue of physical disability. In the groups in which subjects expected to discuss the topic "How important is physical beauty in getting ahead ?", it was anticipated that that subjects would perceive a strong possibility that their beliefs and values would be exposed as unsupportive of the disabled or insensitive to their problems. Subjects would thus be faced with the possibility that that their

intimate or personal and private feelings would be exposed to an audience that may not be receptive to them. We have chosen to describe this as a manipulation of intimacy recognizing that, operationally, the topics chosen varied along a dimension of disability relevance and that we must infer that subjects would experience the setting as one in which their intimate feelings may or may not be revealed.

The present study attempted to resolve the ambiguity in previous studies involving disability acknowledgment or avowal by independently manipulating both the acknowledgment of disability by a confederate and subjects' expectations about the degree of tension that they might have in interacting with that confederate.

If the acknowledgment strategy is effective because it reduces a ubiquitous sense of social threat represented by physical disabilities then one would have to conclude that situational variables, such as the context in which an interaction takes place, are relatively unimportant when compared to the beliefs and attitudes held by subjects about the disabled. If, on the other hand, the acknowledgment tactic is effective only in those situations in which disability can clearly and obviously be identified as a source of tension or discomfort then a much more restricted conclusion is warranted about the usefulness of the acknowledgment strategy.

These different outcomes can now be more formally stated in terms of subjects' reactions to a disabled confederate in the experimental context which we will now define. The major hypotheses refer to a

situation in which a nondisabled person observes a disabled stimulus person with whom he expects to interact at a later time.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. Open avowal or acknowledgment of a disability by a disabled other will lead to greater liking, more favorable personality evaluations and less social and physical distancing on the part of subjects when the content of the interaction is expected to be relatively intimate, but will not have these effects when a relatively neutral or nonintimate interaction is anticipated.

The first hypothesis predicts that there will be significant interaction effects between the two variables, avowal vs. disavowal of disability and high vs. low intimacy of anticipated topic to be discussed, on the following measures: (a) subjects' overall ratings of the stimulus person, (b) subjects' ratings of the latter on five component subscales: intelligence, warmth, conceit, psychological adjustment and likeableness, (c) subjects' expressions of social distancing from the stimulus person and (d) the physical distance from the stimulus person subjects choose to sit. It is further predicted that contrasts within intimacy levels will show significantly favorable effects of avowal for high intimacy but an absence of, or opposite effects for low intimacy.

Hypothesis 2. Open avowal of the disability by the disabled other will favorably affect subject's mood state when the content of the interaction is expected to to be relatively intimate, but will not affect mood states when a relatively nonintimate encounter is expected

to occur.

The second hypothesis also predicts significant interaction effects for the variables of avowal vs. disavowal of disability and high vs. low intimacy of anticipated discussion topic but for four measures of subjects' mood state: (a) anxiety, (b) depression, (c) aggression and (d) social affection. Contrasts within intimacy levels should indicate that when expecting to interact with an avowing stimulus person, as opposed to a disavowing stimulus person, subjects mood ratings will show significantly lower anxiety, depression and aggression scores and sigificantly higher social affection scores under high intimacy but no difference or the opposite effect for low intimacy.

Hypothesis 3. Subjects who are predisposed toward self-consciousness in social encounters will be especially susceptible to the combined effects of avowal and intimacy, as described in Hypotheses 1 and 2.

Three-way interactions (avowal X intimacy X self-consciousness) are predicted on (a) subjects' overall impression ratings of the stimulus person (b) subjects' ratings of the stimulus person on the five component subscales: intelligence, warmth, conceit, emotional adjustment and likeableness (c) subjects' expressions of social distancing from the stimulus person, (d) The physical distance subjects choose to sit away from the stimulus person, and (e) subjects' self-ratings on four mood measures: anxiety, depression, aggression and social affection. The predictions of this hypothesis are parallel to those of Hypotheses 1 and

2. These three-way interactions should be reflected in greater differences between the two avowal groups under high intimacy for those high in self-consciousness than those low in self-consciousness. An ancillary hypothesis is that the predictions of Hypotheses 1 and 2 will be the results of two-way interactions between avowal and intimacy for subjects high in self-consciousness but not for subjects low in self-consciousness.

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Research Design

The overall plan of the study was a factorial design. Subjects were randomly assigned to one of four treatment groups formed from the four possible combinations of the two major independent factors. There were 20 subjects in each cell of the basic design. All subjects viewed a videotaped interview of a handicapped confederate who either acknowledged or did not acknowledge his disability (Factor 1) and were told that they would meet the confederate at a later point in the experiment to have an open-ended discussion. The topic for the discussion was described to subjects as either being neutral and potentially unrelated to disability or the topic given was directly relevant to the issue of physical disability (Factor 2). For purposes of a secondary analysis a third factor was derived by dividing each of the four treatment groups into two separate groups based upon a median split of scores on a personality measure of self-consciousness.

The procedure was administered to subjects individually. Upon entering the experimental setting the subject was asked to be seated and the experimenter recorded subjects' demographic data including age, sex, and race. Before explaining any of the requirements of the study the experimenter asked subjects to respond to a questionnaire designed to

assess public and private self-consciousness as well as social anxiety (Fenigstein, Scheier and Buss, 1975). The subjects was then given the following explanation about the purpose of the experiment:

> "This experiment is designed to assess the effects of two (2) different factors related to interpersonal relations. The first factor is first impressions and in particular the medium through which the impression is made. The first question we are asking is : Does the audio or visual medium through which we first learn about someone affect the impression we first make of that person. For example, in our experiment we want to find out if 'meeting' someone in person as opposed to first seeing and hearing him on videotape makes any difference in the impression we make of him. The second factor we are interested in is whether the first impression we form of an individual affects any communication we might later have with that individual. So, we basically have two groups in the study. In the first group, the group of which you are a member, the people will view a short videotaped interview of another person in the experiment who is being interviewed at this time by a colleague of mine. And so, your first impression of the other participant in the study will be entirely formed through your viewing of him or her on the videotape. In the other group the two people will meet face-to-face.
>
> Regardless of which group you are in, we will have you answer on a questionnaire, a number of questions about your impressions of the person you just 'met' - or as in your case saw on the tape. By the way, your impressions of the other person will never be revealed to him or her and so you can feel free to be as frank as you wish in your rating of the other participant.
>
> After you have given us your impression of the other participant, we will bring the two of you together to discuss a topic we've picked at random from a number of possibilities. Your discussion will be completely unstructured and the two of you can talk for 10 minutes about your feelings and opinions related to the topic in any way you wish. After your discussion we'll ask you to give us your final feelings and opinions about the questions related to the topic on a questionnaire."

Half of the sample of subjects was then told that the topic chosen at random was 'Do we need more police or tougher courts ?'. The other half of the sample of subjects was told that the topic chosen was 'How

important is physical attractiveness in getting ahead?'. In either case the subject was given a 3x5 card with the appropriate question typed upon it to insure the subject's understanding of the topic.

The first topic, 'Do we need more police or tougher courts ?' was chosen to have low relevance to the issue of physical disability and thus would be thought of by subjects as not being potentially self-revelatory or intimate. The second topic, 'How important is physical attractiveness in getting ahead ?' was chosen to be highly relevant to the issue of physical disability so that its discussion would create a situation with a high potential for intimate self-disclosure.

As was previously explained by the experimenter, subjects were then shown one of two videotaped interviews in which the interviewee spontaneously identifies himself as handicapped (Avowal) or apparently refuses to view himself as handicapped (Disavowal) (See Appendix A). The subject was then told the name of the interviewee and that he was physically disabled. The procedure was then briefly explained a second time to the subject and at the point of mentioning the discussion the subject was to have with the person he had just viewed on videotape the experimenter asked the subject what topic he had been given previously on the 3x5 card handed to him during the first explanation of the procedure. This was done to reinforce the subject's awareness of the topic which was to be discussed.

Before asking the subject to give his impressions of the stimulus person he had just viewed on the videotape, it was explained to him that

'to get an accurate estimate of your impression of the other individual we really should have a measure of how you are feeling at the present moment'. The Mood Adjective Check List (Nowlis, 1970) was then administered to the subject.

The subject was then asked to indicate his impression of the stimulus person using a 20 item interpersonal perception scale (Davis and Jones, 1960) as well as a six item social distance scale adapted from Triandis (Triandis, 1964). The items in the interpersonal perception and social distance scales were intermixed at random in a single instrument and all items had a common response format.

The subject was then told that he and the other participant (stimulus person) would have their discussion in a nearby room. The subject was brought into an 8 x 12 foot room identical to and adjoining the room in which the subject had viewed the videotape and had filled out the instruments previously mentioned. The second room contained a stack of chairs but was otherwise empty. The experimenter then explained that he would bring the stimulus person into the room to meet the subject. The experimenter indicated where he would have the stimulus person sit since he was in a wheelchair. He then asked the subject to take a chair off the stack and to place it anywhere else in the room. An unobtrusive reference mark had been previously placed on the floor at the point where it was indicated the stimulus person would be sitting when he was brought into the room. The position where the subject placed his chair was recorded relative to the reference mark and was used in computing four indices of physical distancing from the

stimulus person.

The major independent variables were the version of the videotape the subject viewed (Avowal vs. Disavowal of Disability), the topic the subject anticipated discussing with the stimulus person (Relevant to physical disability and thus potentially self-revealing and intimate or Non-relevant to physical disability and non-intimate) and the subject's score for self-consciousness which was scored as either below or above the median score for the total sample.

The dependent variables were Physical Distancing (Lateral, Horizontal and Absolute distance of the subject's chair placement from stimulus person's position and the angle off of face-to-face conversation of the subjects' position), the reaction of the subject to the stimulus person (scores on six interpersonal perception scales and a measure of social distance) and the reaction of the subject to the experimental situation (scores on four measures of mood).

Subjects. The subjects for the study were 80 male college students attending Brooklyn College during the Spring semester of 1981. Their ages ranged from 16 to 38 years with an average age of 21 years. The subjects participated in the experiment to fulfill requirements for an introductory psychology course and they were recruited from a pool of potential subjects through sign-up sheets.

The subject population was restricted to males in order to eliminate the confounding of experimental results with gender based behavior related to experimenter-subject sex differences. One subject who signed

up to participate in the experiment and who kept his appointment had to be excluded from participation due to an inability to understand the experimenter's explanation of the procedure owing to a limited command of the English language. Of the sample of 80 subjects, 18 were Black (22.5%), 3 were Oriental (3.75%) 1 was Hispanic (1.25%) and 58 were White (72.5%).

Independent Variables

Avowal-Disavowal of Disability. The stimulus person's identification with (Avowal) or rejection of a handicapped role identity (Disavowal) was manipulated in the content of his verbal self-disclosures viewed by subjects on videotape. The subject viewed one of two videotaped interviews with a stimulus person, a white male, 21 years of age. The two videotapes were identical in all but the first two responses to questions given by the interviewee. In the avowal condition the stimulus person acknowledged his physical disability and the problems associated with it but at the same time asserted mastery over those problems. In the disavowing condition the stimulus person asserted that 'I guess I'm pretty average', and avoided any mention of his disability. (See Appendix A, pages 78 and 81)

Intimacy-Nonintimacy of Encounter. The intimacy of the encounter subjects expected to have with the stimulus person was manipulated through the topic they anticipated discussing with him. Previous research has shown subjects interacting with a disabled confederate tended to distort previously stated opinions away from valuing athletic

ability and physical prowess and towards academic achievement. Expressing a high regard for athletic ability was avoided by subjects to minimize the potential for embarrassing self-disclosures during interactions. For the present study subjects were told that they would have to discuss one of two topics. In the High Intimacy conditions the topic they expected to discuss was "How important is physical beauty in getting ahead ?". In the Low Intimacy conditions the topic subjects were led to believe they would be discussing was "Do we need more police or tougher courts ?". In the former case the topic was chosen so as to maximize subjects' concern and uneasiness about making indiscreet self-disclosures while the setting, an open-ended discussion, minimized their ability to deal with these concerns.

Self-consciousness. A trait measure of Self-consciousness was obtained from a scale designed for that purpose (Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss, 1975) (see Appendix C). The instrument measures three components of self-consciousness: public and private self-consciousness and social anxiety. For purposes of this study, each subject's score for self-consciousness was taken from the sum of his subscale scores for Public Self-consciousness and Social Anxiety[4]. The subscale score for Private Self-consciousness was not used because it was not appropriate to the understanding of self-consciousness which we have developed here,

---

4. The scoring of the self-conscious items differed from that of the authors in that each item was rated on a scale of -3 (extremely uncharacteristic) to +3 (extremely characteristic) while the authors' scale ranged from 0 to 4.

namely that of the self as a social object and stimulus. Rather, Private Self-consciousness seems to deal with introverted cognitions and concerns[5]. For purposes of the analysis of data, each subject's raw score for Self-consciousness was converted to a dichotomous value being either below or above the Median score for Self-consciousness for the entire sample of 80 subjects[6].

Dependent Variables

Interpersonal Perception Scales. Six types of impression rating scores were obtained from subjects, using an instrument developed by Davis and Jones (1960): perceptions of the stimulus person's traits of intelligence, conceit, psychological adjustment warmth and likability as well as a total evaluative score for the five subscales combined.[7] The total evaluative score from the scale had been previously found to be sensitive to experimental manipulations (Katz, Glass and Cohen, 1973;

---

5. It could be argued that because Private Self-consciousness reflects a heightened awareness of inner feelings and attitudes, subjects high in Private Self-consciousness would be more prone to experience anxiety over the possibility that attitudes which may be embarassing to them might be revealed. An analysis of the dependent variables of the study which used a dichotomous score based on a median split of the Private Self-consciousness measure, however, was not substantially different from that using a dichotomous score based on the sum of the Public Self-consciousness and Social Anxiety measures.

6. The Median value for the Self-consciousness score based on the sum of Public Self-consciousness and Social Anxiety was 14.00.

7. The authors report a split-half reliability score of .91 (Spearman-Brown) and an overall reliability score of .90 (Kuder-Richardson) for the total scale score.

Katz, Glass Lucido and Farber, 1977). For this study, each of the 5 trait scores was analyzed separately in order to control for any tendency on the part of subjects to respond differentially to the trait dimensions (e.g. viewing the stimulus person as intelligent but not likable). The total scale was made up of twenty items, with each subscale containing four items. For each item the subjects was asked to indicate Agreement or Disagreement and the strength of that judgement (Very much, Pretty Much, A Little) as it related to his perception of the stimulus person. The judgements were converted to numeric values ranging from -3 to +3. The subscale score for each trait was the sum of the numeric scores of the four items making up the subscale. Subscale scores could thus range between +12 and -12 with a neutral point at 0. All negatively keyed items were arithmetically adjusted so that scores on the interpersonal perception subscales reflected positive or negative valence rather than the degree of presence of the trait (i.e. a high Conceit subscale score reflects an absence of Conceit). (see Appendix C).

Social Distance Scale. A measure of Social Distance was derived from six items adapted from Triandis (Triandis, 1964). The Social Distance scale items were intermixed at random with the interpersonal perception scale items and were presented with the same response format. A Guttman Scalogram Analysis was performed on the six items over the entire experimental sample using an a priori order of domination following that of Triandis. The analysis showed a coefficient of reproducibility of .90, well above that necessary to indicate a valid Guttman

Scale (Torgerson, 1958). The coefficient of scalability was .24 which indicates that for the sample as a whole, the scale was not unidimensional. For purposes of the analysis each item response was converted to a numeric value from -3 to +3 and it was weighted by its rank in the order of domination. The most extreme item, "I would accept this person as a member of my family through marriage", was weighted 6 and the least extreme item, "I would permit this person to do me a favor" was weighted 1. The weighting of the degree of agreement for each item by its ranking was used to control for the possibility of weak agreement with more extreme items disproportionately inflating the total scale score. High scores on the Social Distance Scale indicate greater acceptance of the stimulus person by the subjects and less attitudinal distancing.

Mood Scales. Four measures of mood were obtained from administration of the short form of the Mood Adjective Check List (MACL) (Nowlis, 1970). This instrument consists of 33 mood adjectives, each having a four point response scale ranging from 'definitely applies' to feelings at the moment to 'definitely does not apply'. The check list has been factor analyzed into 12 mood factors by Nowlis and those dimensions were used for scoring in the present study. The score for each mood factor was computed by summing the agreement scores for the individual adjectives which load on the factor. For the analysis four mood measures were scored: Aggression, Anxiety, Social Affection and Depression. Each of the four basic mood factors was made up of agreement scores from three adjectives. The degree of agreement for each adjective was converted to a numeric value ranging from 0 to 3, so the range of values

for each of the five basic mood factors was 0 to 9.

Physical Distance. At the point the subject expected to meet the stimulus person he was brought into a room adjoining the one in which the experimental manipulations were performed. The room was empty except for a stack of chairs near the door. The experimenter then said 'Now I'm going to bring the other fellow in so that we can have you discuss the topic we've chosen. Since he is in a wheelchair I'll have him sit right over here (E points to a position near the wall to the right of the door). Why don't you take a chair off the stack and have a seat. I'll go get him now (E leaves room)'. After waiting 1 minute the experimenter returned to the room in which the subject was waiting and said 'There has been a change of plans. You are not going to be meeting with the other fellow to have the discussion. I need to ask you a few questions though, so just leave your chair where it is and come with me'. At that point the subject was brought back to the first room and was then asked a series of questions to check the effectiveness of the experimental manipulations and to determine if the subject had seen through the procedural deception. A second experimenter then entered the room and measured the location of the subjects chair relative to the reference mark indicating the location of point where the stimulus person was to sit.

The floor plan of the room was conceived of as representing the 2 dimensional surface of a Cartesian plane. Two adjacent walls were arbitrarily selected as ordinate and abscissa and their point of meeting, the corner of the room, represented the origin of a graph superimposed

over the floor plan. The coordinates of the reference mark located where the stimulus person was to have been seated had been previously recorded. By subtracting the coordinates of the reference mark from the corresponding coordinates of the subject's chair placement it is possible to derive 3 physical measures of distancing between the subject and where he anticipated the stimulus person would sit.

The first difference measure represents a degree of lateral displacement from the position of the stimulus person. The second difference measure represents a degree of anterior displacement or relative distance from the stimulus person. Using these first two measures as representing the lengths of the adjacent and opposite sides of a right triangle it is possible to algebraically align the distance from the subject's chair to the reference mark along the hypotenuse of the same triangle. Using the Pythagorean Theorem it is possible to calculate the length of that hypotenuse or the absolute distance from the subject to the stimulus person.

Angle of Deviation from Face-to-Face. Eye-contact has been argued to be the primary nonverbal mode with which individuals interact socially. A large body of research has developed around the basic premise that reactions to both internal and external cues can be measured in changes in eye-contact or visual behavior. Argyle and Dean (1965) have suggested that eye-contact reflects a positive, affiliative or approach tendency while avoidance of eye-contact is indicative of not wanting to be seen or of not wanting to reveal inner feelings. Argyle and Dean have also suggested that in interpersonal encounters participants will

attempt to maintain a personal equilibrium level of intimacy by altering their own eye-contact behavior when the behavior of co-participants or other constraints of the setting serve to disturb that equilibrium.

The major prediction of the equilibrium model is that there will be a direct relationship between changes in eye-contact and changes in other behaviors which also reflect affiliative tendencies. Argyle and Dean found that as the physical distance increased between subjects and a confederate who was trained to stare, the amount of eye-contact maintained by subjects also increased. This effect was also demonstrated for pairs of subjects (Argyle and Ingham, 1971).

In the present study since the subject was able to anticipate the location where the stimulus person would sit, he was able to to place his chair in a position which would put himself in a direct face-to-face orientation with the stimulus person or in a position which deviated some amount from face-to-face[8]. The amount of that deviation or angle off of face-to-face was also calculated from knowledge of the coordinates of the subjects chair placement and those of the reference mark[9]. This angle can be interpreted as a measure of gaze avoidance since an

---

8. At least one previous study (Clore, 1969 (cited in Harper, Wiens and Matarazzo, 1978)) has demonstrated that mere knowledge of where another individual will be sitting without actually viewing him is sufficient to produce effects in interpersonal distancing behaviors consistent with the equilibrium model.

9. The angle of deviation in degrees is given by : arctangent of (absolute value of (lateral/anterior))

increase in the angle of deviation from face-to-face interaction would most likely also lead to a decrease in eye contact. It is recognized that this measure of gaze-avoidance is somewhat confounded by the fact that it was not possible to determine the angle of orientation of the subject's chair with respect to the position of the confederate but rather only the degree to which the subject avoided a direct face-to-face orientation with the stimulus person. However, an analysis of the relationship between the measure of physical distancing of the subjects and their measure of deviation from a face-to-face orientation showed a strong negative correlation ($r = -.47$, $p = .0001$) between these two measures. This is consistent with the equilibrium model of Argyle and Dean and suggests that the measure of angle of deviation from face-to-face does contain a large component of gaze-avoidance.

Debriefing/Manipulation Check

After being told that there had been a change in the plans for the experiment and that he would not be meeting the confederate, the subject was taken back to the experimental cubicle where he had viewed the videotaped interview. Before informing him of the experimental deception the subject was asked to respond to a series of questions.

First, the subject was asked to indicate, on a ten-point scale, how much he looked forward to meeting the person he viewed in the videotaped interview. Secondly, he was asked how comfortable he felt about discussing the assigned topic with the confederate. The subject was then asked if he felt that there was another, hidden, purpose to the experi-

ment. If he indicated that he felt there was another purpose to the experiment apart from the one he was given, he was asked to indicate what he thought the purpose actually was. Four subjects stated they felt that the explanation given given to them was not the true one but none indicated that they felt the confederate was not handicapped or that he was part of the experiment.

The subject was then informed of the deception and was given the opportunity to ask questions about the procedure. During this discussion the experimenter explained the necessity of the deception and again indicated to the subjects that all of his responses to the questions he had been asked about himself and about his reactions to the confederate would be be kept in strict confidence.

Before leaving the subject was asked if he had any personal experience with knowing a disabled individual, either socially or as a member of his family. Only one subject volunteered that he had a disabled friend (the friend apparently had a congenitally malformed arm). Because the subject did not indicate that he associated the confederate's disability with the purpose of the study, his data was included in the analysis.

Data Analysis

Two models were used to examine the effects of the independent variables. The first model was a 2-way factorial ANOVA design which examined the effects of Role Behavior (Avowal vs. Disavowal) and Discussion Topic (Intimate vs. Non-intimate) on each of the dependent

variables. The second model, a 3-way factorial ANOVA, involved Self-consciousness (Low vs. High) in addition to Role Behavior and Discussion Topic.

All of the major hypotheses of this study were cast in terms of tests of simple main effects of one factor (e.g. Role Behavior) holding levels of the second factor (e.g. Discussion Topic) constant. These a priori hypotheses were tested whether or not the overall 2-way interaction effect, which contained the simple main effects, was found to be significant (Winer, 1971 p. 347). In the absence of interaction effects, main effect F-values were examined to compare marginal cell means.

RESULTS

Manipulation Check

A check on the effectiveness of the independent manipulations was made only for the factor of Intimacy (Topic). The topics that the subjects were led to believe they would be discussing with the confederate were chosen so as to produce differential levels of uneasiness. A check on the effectiveness of this manipulation indicated that the topics chosen did produce this result. In response to the question of how comfortable they felt discussing the topic which was chosen with the confederate, there was a significant difference between Intimacy (Topic) conditions in how comfortable subjects felt ($F=3.87$, 1/76 df, $p=.05$) with subjects in the High Intimacy conditions feeling more uncomfortable. Whether the Avowal or Disavowal of disability actually registered with the subject was not explicitly checked because previous investigations had demonstrated that a confederate's mentioning or not mentioning of his disability was reliably perceived by subjects.

Hypothesis 1

Open avowal or acknowledgment of a disability by a disabled other will lead to greater liking, more favorable personality evaluations and less social and physical distancing on the part of subjects when the

content of the interaction is expected to be relatively intimate, but will not have these effects when a relatively neutral or nonintimate interaction is anticipated.

The first hypothesis was expressed in terms of 2-way interaction effects between the avowal variable and the anticipated level of intimacy on subjects' judgements of the stimulus person's personality as well as social and physical distancing. Hypothesis 1 predicted that subjects would respond differentially to the stimulus person in Low Intimacy and High Intimacy treatment conditions as a function of the avowal variable. The results for the interpersonal perception measures strongly support this hypothesis. While the tests of the overall interaction effects for each of the interpersonal perception measures did not reach the .05 level of statistical significance, the a priori nature of the hypotheses permitted the analysis of specific contrasts. The contrasts of interest for most of the interpersonal perception measures did achieve statistical significance and are reported here. Subjects in the Intimate/Avowal treatment condition saw the stimulus person as significantly more intelligent ($F=6.08$, 1/76 df, $p=.01$), significantly warmer ($F=5.30$, 1/76 df, $p=.02$) significantly more likeable ($F=4.24$, 1/76 df, $p=.04$) and marginally less conceited ($F=2.78$, 1/76 df, $p=.09$) than their counterparts in the Intimate/Disavowal treatment condition. This pattern held for the Interpersonal perception scale as a whole ($F=4.34$, 1/76 df, $p=.04$). The prediction was not supported in the findings for perceived psychological adjustment which were nonsignificant. (see Tables 1a-1f)

TABLE 1a. Mean Perceived Intelligence

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	6.45* (20)	5.90 (20)	6.17
Disavowal	4.55* (20)	5.75 (20)	5.15
Combined	5.50	5.83	

Note. Means marked by * are significantly different at p=.01
Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

TABLE 1b. Mean Perceived Warmth

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	6.95* (20)	5.55 (20)	6.25
Disavowal	5.30* (20)	5.65 (20)	5.47
Combined	6.12	5.60	

Note. Means marked by * are significantly different at p=.02
Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

TABLE 1c. Mean Perceived Likeableness

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	6.30* (20)	4.20 (20)	5.25
Disavowal	4.50* (20)	4.60 (20)	4.55
Combined	5.40	4.40	

Note. Means marked by * are significantly different at p=.04
Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

TABLE 1d. Mean Perceived Conceit

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	4.80* (20)	4.45 (20)	4.63
Disavowal	3.30* (20)	3.80 (20)	3.55
Combined	4.05	4.13	

Note. Means marked by * are significantly different at p=.09
Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

TABLE 1e. Mean Total Impression Score

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	24.75* (20)	19.00 (20)	21.88
Disavowal	19.15* (20)	20.65 (20)	19.90
Combined	21.95	19.83	

Note. Means marked by * are significantly different at p=.04
Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

TABLE 1f. Mean Perceived Psychological Adjustment

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	5.05 (20)	3.35 (20)	4.20
Disavowal	4.80 (20)	4.65 (20)	4.72
Combined	4.92	4.00	

Note. Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

Hypothesis 1 also predicted that when anticipating an intimate interaction, subjects would express greater acceptance for the avowing stimulus person measured in terms of the Social Distance Scale. The results for this a priori contrast showed that this was not true for the Social Distance Scale as a whole (F=.51, 1/76 df, p=.47). (see table 1g.)

A secondary analysis of the individual items within the six item scale showed a marginally significant avowal by intimacy interaction for the item highest in the order of domination, "I would accept this person as a member of my family through marriage" ($F=3.43$, 1/76 df, $p=.06$). Inspection of the cell means revealed greater acceptance of the avowing stimulus person in the high intimacy treatment groups while the opposite was true in the low intimacy treatment groups. (see table 1h.)

TABLE 1g. Means for Social Distance Scale

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	18.70 (20)	12.55 (20)	15.63
Disavowal	14.70 (20)	18.35 (20)	16.38
Combined	16.7	15.45	

Note. Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

TABLE 1h. Means for Social Distance Item 1

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	8.40 (20)	3.90 (20)	6.15
Disavowal	5.40 (20)	9.00 (20)	7.20
Combined	5.50	5.83	

Note. Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

An item-analysis of the six items making up the Social Distance scale revealed a clear lack of linearity in subjects' responses to the items. Table 1i shows the Item-total score correlations and stepwise item alphas for the items arranged in their order of domination from most extreme to least extreme. The values indicate that the scale alphas remain reasonably constant with the removal of any item. The

discontinuity in the item-total score correlations at item 4, "I would not mind having this person live in my neighborhood", indicates that the underlying response scale is not linear and suggests that the total scale score may not be unidimensional.

TABLE 11. Social Distance Item Analysis

	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha If Item Deleted
I could accept this person as a member of my family through marriage.	0.42237	0.47998
I would not have difficulty being intimate friends with this person.	0.38530	0.48249
I would not invite this person to a party at my home.	0.37798	0.48593
I would not mind having this person live in my neighborhood.	0.13482	0.57292
I could work with this person if we were employed at the same place.	0.64576	0.49678
I would permit this person to do me a favor.	0.51204	0.54729

The third part of Hypothesis 1 predicted an interaction between the avowal variable and the level of anticipated intimacy on a number of measures of physical distancing by the subject from the stimulus person. The results did not support the predictions for any of the physical distancing measures. Neither the overall interaction effects nor any of

the a priori comparisons reached an acceptable level of significance. (see tables 1j-1m.)

TABLE 1j. Means for Lateral Distance of Chair Placement

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	7.90 (20)	13.95 (20)	10.92
Disavowal	16.75 (20)	12.60 (20)	14.67
Combined	12.32	13.27	

Note. Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

TABLE 1k. Means for Horizontal Distance of Chair Placement

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	51.30 (20)	57.50 (20)	54.25
Disavowal	52.35 (20)	54.80 (20)	53.57
Combined	51.82	56.15	

Note. Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

TABLE 11. Means for Absolute Physical Distance of Chair Placement

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	60.39 (20)	63.75 (20)	62.07
Disavowal	60.03 (20)	60.87 (20)	60.45
Combined	60.21	62.31	

Note. Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

TABLE 1m. Means for Angle Off of Face-to-Face of Chair Placement

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	24.52 (20)	21.01 (20)	22.76
Disavowal	24.62 (20)	22.68 (20)	23.65
Combined	24.57	21.84	

Note. Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

Hypothesis 2

Open avowal of the disability by the disabled other will favorably affect subjects' mood states when the content of the interaction is expected to be relatively intimate, but will not affect mood states when a relatively nonintimate encounter is expected to occur.

The second hypothesis predicted interaction effects for the manipulations of avowal/disavowal and anticipated level of intimacy on four measures of subjects' moods: anxiety, depression, aggression and social affection. It was anticipated that within the high intimacy treatments, subjects would express lower anxiety, depression, and aggression as well as higher social affection scores when expecting to interact with an avowing stimulus person. The results did not support the predicted interaction effects.

Analysis of the four mood scores showed a significant avowal main effect for the mood score for aggression with subjects in the avowal treatment groups expressing a significantly higher score for aggression than the disavowal treatment groups across intimacy levels ($F=4.76$, 1/76 df, $p=.03$) (see table 2a). A marginally significant avowal main effect was also found for the mood score for depression with subjects in the two avowal treatment groups expressing greater depression scores than the two disavowal treatment groups ($F=3.30$, 1/76 df, $p=.07$). Further examination showed this to be the result of a significant avowal/disavowal simple Main Effect between the Low Intimacy treatment groups ($F=3.72$, 1/76 df, $p=.05$) with the avowal treatment group showing significantly higher depression scores than the disavowal treatment groups. (see Table 2b).

TABLE 2a. Mean Mood Score for Aggression

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	1.40 (20)	1.55 (20)	1.48*
Disavowal	0.70 (20)	0.75 (20)	0.73*
Combined	1.05	1.15	

Note. Means marked by * are significantly different at p=.03 .
Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

TABLE 2b. Mean Mood Score for Depression

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	1.20 (20)	1.60* (20)	1.40
Disavowal	0.85 (20)	0.55* (20)	0.70
Combined	5.50	5.83	

Note. Means marked by * are significantly different at p=.05 .
Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

Analysis of the mood scores for anxiety and social affection showed no significant main effects or interactions of the avowal and intimacy variables (see tables 2c-2d).

TABLE 2c. Mean Mood Score for Anxiety

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	2.85 (20)	2.30 (20)	2.58
Disavowal	2.50 (20)	1.90 (20)	2.20
Combined	2.68	2.1	

Note. Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

TABLE 2d. Mean Mood Score for Social Affection

ROLE IDENTITY	INTIMACY		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	4.00 (20)	4.45 (20)	4.23
Disavowal	3.30 (20)	3.85 (20)	3.58
Combined	3.65	4.15	

Note. Numbers in parentheses are cell Ns.

Hypothesis 3

Subjects who are predisposed toward self-consciousness in social encounters will be especially susceptible to the combined effects of avowal and intimacy, as described in Hypotheses 1 and 2.

No differential predictions were made for the degree of subjects' self-consciousness although it was expected that the effects of self-consciousness would be to amplify those of Avowal/Disavowal and Topic Intimacy/Non-intimacy. Three-way interactions (avowal X intimacy X self-consciousness) were predicted on (a) subjects impression ratings of the stimulus person, (b) subjects' expressions of social distancing from the stimulus person, (c) subjects' self-ratings of anxiety, depression, aggression and social affection and (d) several measures of physical distancing of the subject from the stimulus person.

The predicted three-way interactions of self-consciousness with avowal and intimacy were not supported. The results showed that the effect for self-consciousness was independent of that of interaction intimacy. Effects for self-consciousness were found only on two of the measures of Physical Distancing of subjects from the stimulus person but varied with the role-identity the stimulus person took. A significant avowal by self-consciousness two-way interaction was found in the analysis of the anterior or relative distance subjects sat away from the stimulus person ($F=3.51$, 1/72 df, $p=.06$). Inspection of cell means showed that subjects higher in self-consciousness sat further from the disavowing stimulus person than the avowing stimulus person while the opposite was true for subjects lower in self-consciousness. (see Table 3a)

TABLE 3a. Mean Relative Physical Distance in Inches

ROLE IDENTITY	SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	49.81 (20)	57.97 (20)	53.89
Disavowal	57.04 (21)	49.17 (19)	53.11
Combined	53.43	53.57	

A significant two-way avowal by self-consciousness interaction was also found in the analysis of the angle off of face-to-face that subjects chose to sit relative to the stimulus person ($F=3.69$, 1/72 df, $p=.05$). An examination of the cell means showed the pattern to be just the opposite of that for relative distance. That is, subjects higher in self-consciousness sat at a wider angle off of face-to-face when expecting to interact with the avowing stimulus person than when expecting to interact with a disavowing stimulus person. The opposite pattern was found for subjects lower in self-consciousness. (see Table 3b)

TABLE 3b. Mean Angle Off of Face-to-Face in Degrees

ROLE IDENTITY	SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS		
	High	Low	Combined
Avowal	27.54 (20)	19.16 (20)	23.35
Disavowal	20.02 (21)	27.82 (19)	23.92
Combined	23.77	23.48	

Summary

The results of this study confirmed that subjects would show more favorable evaluations of a disabled stimulus person when he acknowledged his disability but indicated that the effects of that acknowledgment would be limited to situations in which subjects perceived a significant potential for embarrassing self-disclosures. The predicted interaction effects of disability acknowledgement and situation intimacy were strongly supported for subjects' perceptions of the stimulus person but were only weakly supported for their expressions of social distancing from him. The predicted interaction effects of disability acknowledgement and situation intimacy were not supported for any measures of physical distancing or avoidance of eye contact.

The impact of the stimulus person's self-description on subjects' moods was found to be independent of whether subjects expected to interact with him in an intimate or nonintimate setting. Subjects expressed greater aggression and depression when expecting to interact with a stimulus person who acknowledged his disability than when expecting to interact with a stimulus person who made no acknowledgment.

Finally, subjects' own self-consciousness was found to interact with the role-identity which the stimulus person assumed but was found to be independent of situation intimacy. Subjects high in self-consciousness positioned themselves physically closer to a stimulus person who acknowledged his disability than to a stimulus person who did not acknowledge it, but positioned themselves in such a way as to main-

tain significantly less eye contact.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study strongly supported the predictions of the major hypotheses relating to impressions formed of a handicapped stimulus person by subjects, but they were generally inconclusive in regards to the other dependent variables. Hypothesis 1 predicted that in an intimate situation only, subjects would perceive a handicapped stimulus person more favorably when he acknowledged his disability than when he did not acknowledge it. In addition, it was anticipated that in an intimate situation only, subjects would maintain less social and physical distance from the avowing stimulus person than from the nonavowing person.

As was predicted, subjects in the Intimate/Avowal treatment group perceived the stimulus person as significantly more intelligent, warmer and more likeable than his counterpart in the Intimate/Disavowal treatment condition. The prediction was not supported for perceived psychological adjustment. The prediction was supported for one social distance item but not for the scale as a whole. Only the most extremely acceptant item produced the anticipated interaction of intimacy and avowal of disability for social distance. The predictions of Hypothesis 1 for physical distancing were not supported.

The predictions of Hypothesis 2 were that acknowledgment or avowal of a disability by a handicapped stimulus person would favorably affect subjects' mood states but only when subjects expected to interact with the stimulus person in a relatively intimate or self-disclosing encounter. The results of the study did not support the predicted interaction of avowal and intimacy on subjects' self-reports of mood states. Subjects expressed significantly more aggression and depression in the presence of the avowing stimulus person across intimacy conditions.

The predictions of Hypothesis 3 were that the anticipated interaction effects of avowal and intimacy of Hypotheses 1 and 2 would be seen to be significantly related to subjects' own self-consciousness about being in social interactions. It was predicted that the 2-way interactions of avowal and intimacy on subjects impressions of, and distancing from a handicapped stimulus person as well as the effects on subjects' moods would be most pronounced in those subjects high in the personality trait of self-consciousness. The results did not support these predictions of 3-way interaction effects for any of the dependent variables. The effects of self-consciousness were independent of whether the subjects expected to discuss an intimate or nonintimate topic with the handicapped stimulus person. Subject self-consciousness was not consistently related to the third factor, namely whether the stimulus person acknowledged or did not acknowledge his disability.

Hypotheses 2 and 3 were formulated in order to answer some questions not addressed by previous studies of the reactions of individuals

to the physically handicapped in social interactions. Our failure to obtain support for these hypotheses only reinforces the need for further research to be done in this area. Hypothesis 1, however, was proposed to address some issues raised by ambiguities in the findings of previous studies concerning the efficacy of acknowledgment of disability by the physically handicapped in facilitating social interaction with the nondisabled. The findings of this study relating to Hypothesis 1 represent a significant qualification to the findings and conclusions of other investigators who have used similar methodologies.

The major conclusion drawn from previous research is that, for a disabled individual, acknowledging ones' handicap can serve as an effective tactic for reducing the tension often observed in social interaction with nondisabled individuals. It would appear from the results of our study, however, that a much more restricted conclusion is justified. The salutary effects of disability acknowledgment appear to be limited to those situations in which the nondisabled participant perceives a significant likelihood that his own self-disclosures may serve as a source of embarrassment to himself and/or to the disabled individual.

Before accepting the conclusion we have drawn as valid it is necessary to explain the obvious differences in the generalizability of the acknowledgement strategy found in this investigation which were not indicated by previous studies. Other possible factors could have served to produce the differences in results between this study and previous investigations. Those factors include differences in the makeup of the subject samples and differences in possible interpretation by subjects

of the implications of continued interaction with the handicapped confederate.

The studies which previously demonstrated generalizable, positive effects of disability acknowledgement used approximately equal numbers of male and female subjects (Hastorf et al., 1979), or an all female sample (Belgrave and Mill, 1981). The subject sample in this investigation was made up entirely of males. At least one other study (Farina, Sherman and Allen, 1968) which evaluated the effectiveness of the acknowledgement strategy used an all male sample. In that investigation no differences in response to a disabled confederate were found as a function of the acknowledgement strategy. Little experimental evidence bears directly upon the question of gender differences in response to the disabled, but a number of survey studies have found female respondents to express significantly more favorable attitudes toward various disability groups than males (Yuker, Block and Younng, 1970). For the gender-confound explanation to be plausible it would be necessary to assume a significant degree of confounding between subject gender and the the manipulation of the disability acknowledgment in previous research. In the studies involving homogeneous gender samples (Belgrave and Mills,1981; Farina, Sherman and Allen, 1968) the effectiveness of the disability acknowledgment tactic is equivocal. In the Hastorf et al. study, which used heterogeneous samples, there is no indication of an over-representation of female subjects in the acknowledgment treatment conditions. At the same time however it should be noted that the investigation did not address the possibility of differential responding

of males and females in the treatment conditions. In summary it would appear that a subject gender by acknowledgment condition interaction could not have contributed systematically to producing the differences between this study and previous investigations although it most likely does represent a significant source of error variation.

The remaining interpretation of the differences between this and other studies of the disability acknowledgment strategy focuses on the expectations subjects held for their anticipated interaction with the handicapped confederate. In the present study, subjects' expectations about their interactions with the handicapped confederate were explicitly manipulated. Subjects anticipated either a neutral topic of discussion in their conversation with the disabled confederate or they expected there to be a high probability that their conversation could lead to embarrassing self-disclosures. The utility of the disability acknowledgment was limited to the treatment condition in which subjects supposed to anticipate a high degree of uneasiness about the discussion topic.

In order to reconcile the findings of the present study with those of prior investigations, one must assume that subjects felt at least a moderate level of anxiety or uneasiness about the possibility of embarrassing self-disclosure in their subsequent interaction with the confederate. This is not an unreasonable assumption given that there was considerable ambiguity about the context of the future interaction with the confederate in the two studies in which subjects actually anticipated interaction (Hastorf et al., 1979; Belgrave and Mills, 1981). In

both cases the subjects anticipated working with the confederate on some cooperative task but no information was given about the nature of that work. In the present study there was no such ambiguity. For subjects in the low intimacy conditions there was little reason to expect there would be any embarrassing self-disclosure in their discussion with the confederate of the "police/courts" issue. Subjects in the high intimacy conditions, on the other hand, could be sure that unless they were able to monitor their verbal output carefully the interaction could have an embarrassing outcome.

Current theory regarding handicapped and nonhandicapped interactions has suggested that much of the difficulty that the nondisabled experience in the presence of the disabled arises out of an inability to evaluate the potential social implications of physical disabilities in the ongoing interaction. Either because of a lack of knowledge or experience with the disabled or perhaps because of more deep-seated prejudices the nondisabled tend to respond to the disabled in an undifferentiated fashion. The disabled individual is evaluated, primarily, on the basis of his membership in a group and not on the basis of any other salient personal attributes. One important consequence of this is that the degree of uneasiness experienced by the nondisabled participant in the interaction is, to a significant extent, under the control of the disabled participant. To the extent that the disabled individual's own behavior and self-description reaffirms that evaluation and suggests that he is willing to be regarded as "handicapped", the nondisabled individual's beliefs and response set will go unchallenged. To the

extent that the disabled individual apparently rejects the label of "handicapped" he is challenging the nondisabled individual to put aside his prejudices and respond to him in a spontaneous and differentiated manner. The act of acknowledging a disability can be seen to be a case of such behavior which diffuses the potential threat to the social interaction by allowing the nondisabled participant to psychologically minimize his interpersonal involvement.

The conclusion drawn from previous research is that increases in liking and acceptance of the physically disabled are associated with reductions in tension and discomfort in social interactions with them. The model underlying the acknowledgment strategy assumes that rejection of the disabled is associated with discomfort in their presence and that a reduction or elimination of that discomfort should be associated with greater acceptance of them. The major findings of this study would qualify that conclusion significantly by specifying one of the boundary conditions, namely the degree of intimacy of the interaction.

Another point of interest is that the absence of a main effect for the intimacy variable suggests that level of threat by itself does not affect liking for the disabled person. Nor does avowal alone affect liking. Rather it is the reduction of threat (i.e., the combination of high intimacy and avowal) that enhances liking. Thus, acknowledgment as a tactic for increasing the acceptance of the disabled only makes sense in the context of high arousal over uncertainty about the acceptability of one's behavior, including one's self-disclosures. The absence of main effects also indicates that the level of threat present in the

interaction is not critical, but rather the level of threat reduction brought about by the the confederate's acknowledgment determined the degree of differences in liking between treatment conditions.

Even in the context of high uncertainty about an interaction, the utility of the acknowledgment strategy is suspect. The results of this study and others suggest that liking is produced by relieving subjects of the threat that their own self-disclosures may prove to be embarrassing and not by any additional information that the observer may acquire about the disabled confederate in the interaction. The long-term effects of the acknowledgment strategy are not known and it may be the case that the increased acceptance of the handicapped individual who openly discusses his disability may not carry over beyond the immediate interaction.

The level of disability represented in this and several previous studies, that of being confined to a wheelchair, probably has relatively little immediate emotional impact. A more visually compelling disability such as a grotesque facial deformity or a bizarre motoric disturbance would probably produce a stronger emotional response, one which perhaps could not be mitigated by the acknowledgment strategy.

The lack of findings of this study with regard to the affective response of subjects suggests that two different mechanisms may operate to determine subjects' reactions to the disabled confederate. While subjects consistently evaluated the acknowledging confederate more positively than the nonacknowledging one within the high intimacy condi-

tions, their self-reports of mood showed significantly greater aggressive and depressive feelings in anticipation of being in his presence. This suggests that mood self-ratings may reflect a relatively deep-seated level of reaction while impression ratings represent a more cognitive response. One interpretation of this disparity is that while acknowledgment does serve to reduce interactional strain for the nondisabled, at the same time it serves to accentuate inherent differences between the two. This accentuation of differences may thus serve to tap into more deep-seated prejudices against the outsider. A second interpretation of this finding follows a purely cognitive model. If heightened arousal of subjects in the high intimacy conditions caused them to more closely attend to what the confederate was saying about himself in the videotaped interview and if the Avowal transcript were, in fact, objectively a more positive self-presentation than the Disavowal transcript, then one would predict the pattern of findings obtained for the interpersonal perception measures as well as the lack of findings for the mood and physical distancing measures. The results of the analysis do not support this interpretation. The most appropriate test of this interpretation is found in examining the contrasts between the Avowal and Disavowal conditions for the Low Intimacy treatment groups. If the Avowal transcript was an objectively more positive self-presentation then these contrasts should reflect that. None of the contrasts were statistically significant and so the evidence does not support this interpretation.

The disjunction between feelings and perceptions as it relates to

physical disability can be seen to operate beyond the level of the individual. Dejong and Lifchez (1983) reported that while legislation has existed since the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 which bars discrimination on the basis of handicap from any program or activity benefiting from federal funding, the laws have remained largely unenforced. This is true in spite of the fact that the incidence of severe disability has increased by more than 70 percent since 1966. The inconsistency between the attitudes and behavior of the nondisabled toward the disabled may represent the largest problem facing disabled individuals.

The findings of this study have suggested that that there may be some limits on the usefulness of the acknowledgment strategy for increasing acceptance of the disabled in various types of social settings. However, the results of this study validate the findings of previous investigators that strategies do exist which may be used to reduce the often observed rejection of the physically disabled in social interaction. Further studies must be performed to address the question of whether the acknowledgment strategy, or any other, produces only short-term effects or whether these effects represent meaningful, long-term gains. Future research will also have to focus on long-term behavior and attitudinal change through desensitization of individuals to the concept of physical disability. This could be through educational programs for adults or early on in the social development of children through the main-streaming of disabled children into the school systems.

Summary

The results of this study have indicated that the utility of acknowledging a disability by a disabled person in order to facilitate social interaction with a nondisabled person may have less general applicability than previous studies have suggested. While disability acknowledgement did lead to more positive interpersonal evaluations of a disabled individual by a nondisabled one, the effects were limited to contexts in which a significant possibility existed that the nondisabled individual would embarrass himself in the interaction by not monitoring his own self-disclosures carefully enough. The failure of the findings regarding measures of moods taken from subjects to parallel those of the interpersonal evaluations suggests that responses toward the physically disabled may be determined by processes in the cognitive and emotional domains which are somewhat independent of each other.

APPENDIX A -- Video Tape Script

Disavowal of Disability Condition

Interviewer: Lets see ... my notes indicate that your name is _____ and you're 19 years old. Is that right ?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Why don't we start out by having you describe yourself, briefly.

Respondent: There's not too much I can say about myself that stands out from the ordinary. I'm just like most of the people I know. I have my usual ups and downs, but all in all I go along on a pretty even keel. I guess I'm pretty average (laughs). I guess that doesn't tell you much but is there anything more specific you want to ask ?

Interviewer: Well, more specifically are you happy with the way things are for you now. Would you say you had more problems, fewer problems or about as many as your friends.

Respondent: I'd say about the same number of problems. All in all I guess I don't have too much to complain about. Life is pretty good.

Interviewer: What are you doing right now. Are you in school ?

Respondent: Yes, I'm an undergraduate at N.Y.U. . Right now I'm majoring in Accounting but I'm not sure I'm going to stay in Accounting, it's king of dry.

Interviewer: Do you have an idea of what else you might like to study ?

Respondent: Well, I just finished an introductory course in computer science. We learned the basic stuff, how computers work, some of the features of the various programming languages and a little bit about how the computers from the major companies compare. I really enjoyed the course. I'm definitely going to take some more computer science courses and maybe I'll change my major to computer science.

Interviewer: Outside of school, what are your interests ?

Respondent: Well, I enjoy music quite a bit and I have a large collection of records; mostly classical, jazz and old rock and roll. I find myself buying more and more classical records because I don't like much of the new, popular stuff, like Disco. Apart from music, I really enjoy watching old movies. If you like old films, you know Bogart, Cagney, Wallace Beery, I guess New York City is the best place to live. There must be a dozen little theaters that specialize in revival film festivals. Lets see ... as far as my other interests go, I like to read and I'm a big sports fan. I follow all of the local teams-when they do well.

Interviewer: What do you do to support yourself. Do you have a job ?

Respondent: Yes, through the accounting department at _____ I got a job as an assistant book keeper. There aren't too many people who are qualified to do the work and so the pay is pretty good. I havn't had to borrow money to go to school on.

Interviewer: Well, I think that just about raps up the questions that I have.

Avowal of Disability Condition

Interviewer: Lets see ... my notes indicate that your name is _____ and you're 19 years old. Is that right ?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Why don't we start out by having you describe yourself, briefly.

Respondent: I guess the most obvious thing about me is that I'm physically handicapped. I've been this way since I was born. It has created a lot of problems for me, you know like getting around; using public transportation; going to school; finding a job. I think I have been reasonably successful in getting around them though. Things are difficult the first time around. After I've done something once its much easier for me. I guess that doesn't tell you much but is there anything more specific you want to ask ?

Interviewer: Well, more specifically, are you happy with the way things are for you now. Would you say you had more problems, fewer problems or about as many as your friends.

Respondent: Apart from this wheelchair, which is sort of part of me by now, I'd say I had about the same number of problems. All in all I guess I don't have too much to complain about.

Interviewer: What are you doing right now. Are you in school ?

Respondent: Yes, I'm an undergraduate at N.Y.U. . Right now I'm majoring in Accounting but I'm not sure I'm going to stay in Accounting, it's king of dry.

Interviewer: Do you have an idea of what else you might like to study ?

Respondent: Well, I just finished an introductory course in computer science. We learned the basic stuff, how computers work, some of the features of the various programming languages and a little bit about how the computers from the major companies compare. I really enjoyed the course. I'm definitely going to take some more computer science courses and maybe I'll change my major to computer science.

Interviewer: Outside of school, what are your interests ?

Respondent: Well, I enjoy music quite a bit and I have a large collection of records; mostly classical, jazz and old rock and roll. I find myself buying more and more classical records because I don't like much of the new, popular stuff, like Disco. Apart from music, I really enjoy watching old movies. If you like old films, you know Bogart, Cagney, Wallace Beery, I guess New York City is the best place to live. There must be a dozen little theaters that specialize in revival film festivals. Lets see ... as far as my other interests go, I like to read and I'm a big sports fan. I follow all of the local teams-when they do well.

Interviewer: What do you do to support yourself. Do you have a job ?

Respondent: Yes, through the accounting department at _____ I got a job as an assistant book keeper. There aren't too many people who are qualified to do the work and so the pay is pretty good. I havn't had to borrow money to go to school on.

Interviewer: Well, I think that just about raps up the questions that I have.

APPENDIX B -- Summaries of Analyses of Variance and Contrasts

Total Of All Impression Scales Combined

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	78.01250000	1.08	0.3021
Intimacy (B)	1	90.31250000	1.25	0.2672
AxB	1	262.81250000	3.64	0.0603
Error	76	5492.85000000		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	27.22500000	0.38	0.5412
Avowal (High)	1	313.60000000	4.34	0.0406

Impression Score For Intelligence

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	21.01250000	3.54	0.0638
Intimacy (B)	1	2.11250000	0.36	0.5527
AxB	1	15.31250000	2.58	0.1125
Error	76	451.45000000		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	0.22500000	0.04	0.8462
Avowal (High)	1	36.10000000	6.08	0.0159

Impression Score For Conceit

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	23.11250000	2.85	0.0953
Intimacy (B)	1	0.11250000	0.01	0.9065
AxB	1	3.61250000	0.45	0.5063
Error	76	615.55000000		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	4.22500000	0.52	0.4724
Avowal (High)	1	22.50000000	2.78	0.0997

Impression Score For Psychological Adjustment

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	5.51250000	0.47	0.4970
Intimacy (B)	1	17.11250000	1.45	0.2329
AxB	1	12.01250000	1.02	0.3168
Error	76	899.25000000		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	16.90000000	1.43	0.2358
Avowal (High)	1	0.62500000	0.05	0.8188

Impression Score For Warmth

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	12.01250000	2.34	0.1305
Intimacy (B)	1	5.51250000	1.07	0.3037
AxB	1	15.31250000	2.98	0.0884
Error	76	390.65000000		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	0.10000000	0.02	0.8894
Avowal (High)	1	27.22500000	5.30	0.0241

Impression Score For Likeableness

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	9.80000000	1.28	0.2612
Intimacy (B)	1	20.00000000	2.62	0.1100
AxB	1	24.20000000	3.16	0.0793
Error	76	581.20000000		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	1.60000000	0.21	0.6487
Avowal (High)	1	32.40000000	4.24	0.0430

Mood Scale For Aggression

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	11.25000000	4.76	0.0323
Intimacy (B)	1	0.20000000	0.08	0.7720
AxB	1	0.05000000	0.02	0.8848
Error	76	179.70000000		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	6.40000000	2.71	0.1041
Avowal (High)	1	4.90000000	2.07	0.1541

Mood Scale For Social Affection

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	8.45000000	1.59	0.2111
Intimacy (B)	1	5.00000000	0.94	0.3350
AxB	1	0.05000000	0.01	0.9230
Error	76	403.70000000		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	3.60000000	0.68	0.4129
Avowal (High)	1	4.90000000	0.92	0.3399

Mood Scale For Anxiety

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	2.81250000	0.53	0.4668
Intimacy (B)	1	6.61250000	1.26	0.2656
AxB	1	0.01250000	0.00	0.9612
Error	76	399.55000000		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	1.60000000	0.30	0.5828
Avowal (High)	1	1.22500000	0.23	0.6307

Mood Scale For Depression

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	9.80000000	3.30	0.0731
Intimacy (B)	1	0.05000000	0.02	0.8971
AxB	1	2.45000000	0.83	0.3664
Error	76	225.50000000		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	11.02500000	3.72	0.0576
Avowal (High)	1	1.22500000	0.41	0.5225

Attitude Scale For Social Distance

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	1.80000000	0.01	0.9399
Intimacy (B)	1	18.05000000	0.06	0.8114
AxB	1	369.80000000	1.17	0.2819
Error	76	21211.90000000		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	211.60000000	0.67	0.4149
Avowal (High)	1	160.00000000	0.51	0.4781

Angle Off of Face to Face In Degrees

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	15.67318991	0.05	0.8302
Intimacy (B)	1	148.23068122	0.44	0.5102
AxB	1	12.48757315	0.04	0.8482
Error	76	25738.07112777		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	28.07038173	0.08	0.7742
Avowal (high)	1	0.09038133	0.00	0.9870

Physical Distance In Inches

Source	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (A)	1	52.34273313	0.37	0.5426
Intimacy (B)	1	88.09758234	0.63	0.4300
AxB	1	31.70437192	0.23	0.6355
Error	76	10636.08175092		

Contrast	DF	SS	F VALUE	PR > F
Avowal (Low)	1	82.76043359	0.59	0.4443
Avowal (High)	1	1.28667146	0.01	0.9239

APPENDIX C -- Dependent Measures Instruments

Self-Consciousness Scales

Private self-consciousness was measured by the sum of items 1-10, Public self-consciousness by the sum of items 11-17 and Social Anxiety by the sum of items 18-23.

Items 2, 5 and 21 were reversed for scoring purposes.

Code Number _____

Self-Impressions

In answering the following questions indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement as it applies to yourself. Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a check mark (X) in the box which comes closest to describing your true feelings. Remember, under no circumstances will these answers be shown to anyone.

	AGREE			DISAGREE		
	Very Much	Pretty Much	A Little	A Little	Pretty Much	Very Much
1. I'm always trying to figure myself out.						
2. Generally, I'm not very aware of myself.						
3. I reflect about myself a lot.						
4. I'm often the subject of my own fantasies.						
5. I never scrutinize myself.						
6. I'm generally attentive to my inner feelings.						
7. I'm constantly examining my motives.						
8. I sometimes have the feeling that I'm off somewhere watching myself.						
9. I'm alert to changes in my mood.						
10. I'm aware of the way my mind works when I work through a problem.						
11. I'm concerned about my style of doing things.						
12. I'm concerned about the way I present myself.						

2.

	AGREE			DISAGREE		
	Very Much	Pretty Much	A Little	A Little	Pretty Much	Very Much
13. I'm self-conscious about the way I look.						
14. I usually worry about making a good impression.						
15. One of the last things I do before I leave my house is look in the mirror.						
16. I'm concerned about what other people think of me.						
17. I'm usually aware of my appearance.						
18. It takes me time to overcome my shyness in new situations.						
19. I have trouble working when someone is watching me.						
20. I get embarrassed very easily.						
21. I don't find it hard to talk to strangers.						
22. I feel anxious when I speak in front of a group.						
23. Large groups make me nervous.						

Impression Ratings/Social Distance Scale

Intelligence was measured by the sum of items 1, 11, 14, and 16, Conceit by items 2, 9, 19, 24, Adjustment by items 3, 8, 13, and 20, Warmth by items 4, 7, 18, and 23, and Likeableness by items 6, 12, 21 and 25.

The measure of Social Distance was derived from the sum of items 5, 10, 15, 17, 22 and 26 weighted by their order of domination. The order of domination or rank from most extreme to least extreme was item 22, 15, 10, 17, 5, 26.

Items 1, 2, 3, 7, 10, 12, 13, 19, 23, and 25 were reversed for scoring.

Code Number of rater _____

Code number of person rated _____

Impression Ratings

Try to be as honest as you can in rating the person. You should be able to get your feelings about the person across by placing a check mark (X) in the box which comes closest to your current impression of the person being rated. Remember, under no circumstances will these ratings be shown to the person you have rated, and your ratings will be used for research purposes only. It is extremely important that you express your true feelings.

	AGREE			DISAGREE		
	Very Much	Pretty Much	A Little	A Little	Pretty Much	Very Much
1. He strikes me as a little muddle-headed and confused.						
2. He strikes me as somewhat arrogant and conceited.						
3. I feel that he may have some important personal problems.						
4. He seems to be a very warm and affectionate person.						
5. I could work with this person if we were employed at the same place.						
6. I would certainly enjoy having this person as a friend.						
7. He strikes me as a rather hostile & unsympathetic person.						
8. I feel that he is very secure and well adjusted.						
9. I think he is basically a modest, unpretentious person.						
10. I would not invite this person to a party at my home.						
11. He seems to be very bright and alert.						

2.

	AGREE			DISAGREE		
	Very Much	Pretty Much	A Little	A Little	Pretty Much	Very Much
12. I find it hard to like this person very much.						
13. I feel that he is quite troubled and personally insecure.						
14. I would say he has a clear thinking logical mind.						
15. I would not have difficulty being intimate friends with this person.						
16. I think perhaps he is dull and slow on the uptake.						
17. I would not mind having this person live in my neighborhood.						
18. To me he seems extremely kind and sympathetic as a person.						
19. This person seems somewhat distant and aloof.						
20. He strikes me as emotionally stable and well-balanced.						
21. I think he is extremely likeable as a person.						
22. I could accept this person as a member of my family through marriage.						
23. I think he may be an antagonistic person who is easily irritated.						
24. He seems very humble and self-effacing to me.						
25. It probably would be hard for me to feel a close friendship with him.						
26. I would permit this person to do me a favor.						

Mood Adjective Check List

Aggression was measured by items 1, 12, and 23, Anxiety was measured by items 2, 13, and 24, Sadness was measured by items 8, 19, and 30, Elation was measured by items 4, 15, and 26, and Social Affection was measured by items 7, 18, and 29.

Code number _____

Feelings Questions

Each of the following words describes feelings or mood. Please use the list to describe your feelings at the moment you read each word. If the word definitely describes how you feel at the moment you read it, circle the double check (vv) to the right of the word. For example, if the word is relaxed and you are definitely feeling relaxed at the moment, circle the vv as follows:

relaxed (vv) v ? no. (This means you definitely feel relaxed at the moment.)

If the word probably applies to your feelings at the moment, circle the single check v as follows:

relaxed vv (v) ? no. (This means you feel slightly relaxed at the moment.)

If the word is not clear to you or you cannot decide whether or not it applies to your feelings at the moment, circle the question mark as follows:

relaxed vv v (?) no. (This means you cannot decide whether you are relaxed or not.)

If you definitely decide the word does not apply to your feelings at the moment, circle the no as follows:

relaxed vv v ? (no.) (This means you are definitely not relaxed at the moment.)

Work rapidly. Your first reaction is best. Work down the first column, then to the next. Please mark all words. This should take only a few minutes. Please begin.

1.	angry	vv	v	?	no	18.	kindly	vv	v	?	no
2.	clutched up	vv	v	?	no	19.	sad	vv	v	?	no
3.	carefree	vv	v	?	no	20.	skeptical	vv	v	?	no
4.	elated	vv	v	?	no	21.	egotistic	vv	v	?	no
5.	concentrating	vv	v	?	no	22.	energetic	vv	v	?	no
6.	drowsy	vv	v	?	no	23.	rebellious	vv	v	?	no
7.	affectionate	vv	v	?	no	24.	jittery	vv	v	?	no
8.	regretful	vv	v	?	no	25.	witty	vv	v	?	no
9.	dubious	vv	v	?	no	26.	pleased	vv	v	?	no
10.	boastful	vv	v	?	no	27.	intent	vv	v	?	no
11.	active	vv	v	?	no	28.	tired	vv	v	?	no
12.	defiant	vv	v	?	no	29.	warmhearted	vv	v	?	no
13.	fearful	vv	v	?	no	30.	sorry	vv	v	?	no
14.	playful	vv	v	?	no	31.	suspicious	vv	v	?	no
15.	overjoyed	vv	v	?	no	32.	self-centered	vv	v	?	no
16.	engaged in thought	vv	v	?	no	33.	vigorous	vv	v	?	no
17.	sluggish	vv	v	?	no						

Debriefing Questions/Manipulation Check

Code number _____

Debriefing Questions

1. On a scale of 1 to 10 how much did you look forward to meeting the other person that you saw on the videotape?

1.	5.	10.
Did not look forward to it at all.		Looked forward to it very much.

Comments:

2. How comfortable did you feel about discussing the topic which was chosen with the other person. (E should represent topic.)

1.	5.	10.
Not at all comfortable.		Very comfortable.

Comments:

3. Did you feel at any time that there was another hidden purpose to the experiment?

Comments:

REFERENCES

Argyle, M. & Dean, J. Eye-contact distance and affiliation. Sociometry, 1965, 28, 289-304

Argyle, M. & Ingham, R. Gaze, mutual gaze and distance. Semiotica, 1972

Belgrave, F. Z. & Mills, J. Effect upon desire for social interaction with a physically disabled person of mentioning the disability in different contexts. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1981, 11, 44-57.

Carver, C. S., Glass, D. C., & Katz, I. Favorable evaluations of blacks and the handicapped. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1978, 8, 97-106.

Chesler, M. A. Ethnocentrism and attitudes toward the physically disabled. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 877-882

Comer, R. J. & Piliavin, J. A. The effects of physical deviance upon face to face interaction: The other side. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 23, 33-39.

Cowen, E. L., Bobgrove, P. H., Rockway, A. M. & Stevenson, J. Development and evaluation of an attitudes to deafness scale. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 183-191.

Cowen, E. L., Underberg, R. P. & Verrillo, R. T. The development and

testing of an attitude to blindness scale. Journal of Social Psychology, 1958, 48, 297-304.

Davis, F. Deviance disavowal: The management of strained interaction by the handicapped. Social Problems, 1964, 9, 120-132.

Davis, K. E. & Jones, E. E. Changes in interpersonal perception as a means of of reducing cognitive dissonance. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1960, 61, 402-410.

Dejong, G. & Lifchez, R. Physical Disability and Public Policy. Scientific American. 1983, 248, 40-49.

Doob, A. N. & Ecker, B. P. Stigma and compliance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 14, 302-304.

Evans, J. E. Changing attitudes toward disabled persons: An experimental study. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin. 1976, 19, 572-579.

Farina, A. & Felner, R. D. Employment interviewer reactions to former mental patients. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1973, 82, 268-272.

Farina, A., Holland, C. & Ring, K. Role of stigma and set in interpersonal interaction. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1966, 71, 421-428.

Farina, A & Ring, K. The influence of perceived mental illness on interpersonal relations. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 70, 47-51.

Farina, A., Sherman, M. & Allen, J.G. Role of physical abnormalities in

interpersonal perception and behavior. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 590-593.

Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F. & Buss, A. H. Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 522-527.

Gergen, K. J. & Jones, E. E. Mental illness, predictability, and affective consequences as stimulus factors in person perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 95-104.

Goffman, E. On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes, 1955, 18, 213-231.

Goffman, E. Alienation from interaction. Human Relations, 1957, 10, 47-49.

Goffman, E. Stigma. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1963.

Harper, R., Wiens, A. & Matarazzo, J. Nonverbal Communication: The State of the Art. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.

Hastorf, A.H., Wildfogel, J. & Cassman, T. Acknowledgement of handicap as a tactic in social interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1790-1797.

Katz, I. Stigma: A Social Psychological Analysis. New Jersey: Lawrence

Erlbaum Associates, 1981.

Katz, I. Some thoughts on the stigma notion. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1979, 5, 447-460.

Katz, I., Farber, J., Glass, D. C., Lucido, D. & Emswiller, T. When courtesy offends: Effects of positive and negative behavior by the physically disabled on altruism and anger in normals. Journal of Personality, 1978, 46, 505-518.

Katz, I. & Glass, D. C. An ambivalence-amplification theory of behavior toward the stigmatized. in W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.) The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Monterey, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1978.

Katz, I., Glass, D. C. & Cohen, S. Ambivalence, guilt, and the scapegoating of minority group victims. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1973, 9, 423-436.

Katz, I., Glass, D. C., Lucido, D. & Farber, J. Ambivalence, guilt and the denigration of a physically handicapped victim. Journal of Personality, 1977, 45, 419-429.

Katz, I., Glass, D. C., Lucido, D. & Farber, J. Harm-doing and victim's racial or orthopedic stigma as determinants of helping behavior. Journal of Personality, 1979, 47, 340-364.

Kleck, R. Physical stigma and nonverbal cues emitted in face-to-face interaction. Human Relations, 1968, 21, 19-28.

Kleck, R., Buck, P.L., Goller, W.L., London, R.S., Pfeiffer, J.R., & Vukcevic, D. P. Effect of stigmatizing conditions on the use of personal space. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 111-118.

Kleck, R., Ono, H. & Hastorf, A.H. The effects of physical deviancy on face-to-face interaction. Human Relations, 1966, 19, 425-436.

Kogan, N. Attitudes toward old people: The development of a scale and an examination of correlates. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961 62, 44-54.

Langer, E. J., Taylor, S., Fiske, S. & Chanowitz, B. Stigma, staring, and discomfort: A novel-stimulus hypothesis. Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology, 1976, 12, 451-463.

Nowlis, V. Mood: Behavior and experience. in Arnold, M. (Ed.) Feelings and Emotions. New York, N.Y. : Academic Press, 1970.

Parsons, T. Illness and the role of the physician: A sociological perspective. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1951, 21, 452-460.

Piliavin, J. A. & Piliavin, I. M. The effect of blood on reactions to a victim. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 23, 253-261.

Piliavin, I. M., Piliavin, J. A. & Rodin, J. Costs, diffusion and the stigmatized victim. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 429-438.

Sagarin, E.

Deviants and Deviance: an introduction to the study of disvalued people and behavior. New York: Praeger, 1975.

Schroedel, J. G & Jacobsen, R. J. Employer Attitudes Towards Hiring Persons with Disabilities. Albertson, N.Y. : Human Resources Center, 1978

Soble, S. L. & Strickland, L. H. Physical stigma, interaction, and compliance. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1974, 4, 130-132.

Torgerson, W. Theory and Methods of Scaling. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.

Triandis, H. Exploratory factor analysis of the behavioral component of social attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 420-430.

Turner, R. H. Deviance avowal as neutralization of commitment. Social Problems, 1972, 19, (3), 308-321.

Winer, B. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw Hill, 1971, 2nd Edition.

Wright, B. A. Physical Disability--A Psychological Approach. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

Yamamoto, K. To be different. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 1971, 14 (3), 180-188.

Yuker, H. E., Block, J. R. & Younng, J. H.

The Measurement of Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons. Albertson, N.Y. : Human Resources Center, 1970