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Abstract

The present study investigated the impact of confrontation style, empirically modeling distinctions between call-out and call-in confrontations, on third-party inferences of confronter motive and anticipated target internalization and compliance. Perceived effectiveness of confrontation styles may be considered through the lens of communication accommodation theory (CAT), which addresses strategies used to manage social distance and facilitate comprehension. As accommodating styles facilitate positive interactions, trust, and willingness to comply with requests, they may be effective for confronting prejudice, while nonaccommodating styles should be seen as ineffectual. Participants read a confrontation in which confrontation style varied to mirror “call-in” (where the confronter accommodates and does not self-promote), “educational” (non-accommodating and non-promoting), and “call-out” (non-accommodating and self-promoting) styles; participants then reported their beliefs about confronter motive and confrontation outcomes. The call-in style was associated with more positive inferred confronter motives and marginally more expected internalization relative to educational and call-out styles; there were no differences in expected compliance. Meditational analysis revealed that positive inferred motives fostered greater expectations of target compliance and internalization. The findings of the present study integrate CAT with persuasion research in the context of third-party categorizations of confrontations and have implications for how non-targets can facilitate effective, educational confrontations.
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Speech accommodation theory (SAT; Giles, 1984), known more broadly as communication accommodation theory (CAT; Giles, Mulac, Bradac, & Johnson, 1987), posits that communication serves to manage interpersonal and intergroup relationships, and that individuals use a variety of communicative strategies to reduce (or enhance) communicative differences (Gallois & Giles, 1998). Broadly, adjusting one’s communicative strategies to suit those of an interaction partner, also known as accommodation, promotes successful interactions. For example, interactions in which both partners accommodate are more likely to be marked by comprehension and increased liking, and to be considered by both parties as successful interactions (Giles & Gasiorek, 2013). Researchers have suggested that one of the core functions of accommodating interaction partners is facilitating comprehension (see Street & Giles, 1982) and in this way, CAT is theoretically and logically related to research on persuasion.

Accommodation work has not, though, been directly related to a significant area of persuasion research – work on confronting prejudice. Prejudice confrontation as persuasion research is a connection established by previous scholarship (Gervais & Hillard, 2014). This connection has been further bolstered by a wide range of research examining the particular contextual, content-based, and communicator-dependent factors that impact how confrontations of prejudice are encoded, responded to, and received. While the relationship between CAT and confrontations of prejudice is a novel connection to the best of my knowledge, it promises to be a fruitful one. Moreover,
differences in confronter accommodation and self-presentation may be a useful analog for lay categorizations of different types of confrontations – namely, ‘call-outs’ and ‘call-ins.’ A popular distinction in discourse on particularly online confrontations of prejudice, call-outs refer to public, performative confrontations which self-righteously emphasize the confronter’s superior knowledge or moral values, while call-ins denote more private confrontations which acknowledge the humanity and fallibility of the individual being confronted (e.g., Friedersdorf, 2017; Mahan, 2017). In particular, I posit that the distinction between these confrontation styles may be associated with and functionally modeled by differences in accommodation and self-presentation. In this way, the present study will examine the relationship between CAT, confronting prejudice, and call-outs and call-ins, with a focus on how a confronter’s accommodation and self-presentation styles impact third-party judgements of confrontations of prejudice. In particular, I am interested in how confrontation style (i.e., confronter accommodation and self-presentation) may impact third-party perceptions of confronter motivation and confrontation outcomes, including public behavior change and private attitude change, clarifying the mechanisms behind disparate definitions of and responses to call-outs and call-ins.

**Calling-out vs. Calling-in**

A primary focus of the present study is to examine the potential mechanisms underlying the lay distinction between (and disparate responses to) call-out and call-in confrontations. A confronter ‘calls-out’ a target by publicly and performatively confronting oppressive speech or behavior in a manner which emphasizes their own superior knowledge. Conversely, ‘calling-in,’ a practice popularly suggested as a
constructive alternative to calling-out, refers to confrontations that entail a personal conversation addressing problematic speech or behavior in a more private, compassionate setting (Mahan, 2017). Activist and educator Jennifer Mahan asserts, “[c]alling-in recognizes that people are multi-faceted and that an instance of oppressive behavior does not define the totality of who we are” (p. 1). Call-out confrontations, on the other hand, prioritize the performative, public nature of the confrontation over confrontation outcomes. Ahmad (2015), for example, argues that “the act of calling out is seen as an end in itself,” and serves to maintain the boundaries of activist communities rather than focusing on having effective, educational interactions (p. 1).

While there has been a solid theoretical focus on calling-out and calling-in in discourse on appropriate and effective confrontations of prejudice, the lay distinction between confrontation styles has received little to no empirical focus. The present study posits that the distinction between these confrontation styles (as well as third-party perceptions of and inferences about the outcomes of these styles) can be associated with differences in confronter accommodation and self-presentation. Namely, call-out confrontations are typified by non-accommodating confronters preoccupied with self-promotion at the expense of education, while call-in confrontations are characterized by appropriately accommodating confronters who prioritize education over demonstrating the superiority of their own knowledge. Additionally, the present study incorporated a simple, unadorned “educational” control confrontation where the confronter neither accommodates nor self-promotes, to investigate the relative impact of confronter accommodation and self-presentation on different inferences about and responses to call-out and call-in confrontations.
Communication Accommodation Theory

CAT suggests that individuals adjust their communication with two factors in mind: the goal of maintaining a positive social identity, and their ideas about their interaction partner’s characteristics. Adjusting communication, effectively or not, serves to manage social distance and enable comprehension (Gallois, Ogay, & Giles, 2005). Appropriate accommodation also requires communicators to adjust according to ‘interpretive competence,’ or a sense for their partner’s (in)experience with a certain topic (Giles, 2008). One does not, for example, discuss politics the same way with elementary school children as with political science college students; one who did so would be a poor judge of interpretive competence. More broadly, accommodation (particularly interpretive competence) often relies more on people’s subjective perceptions of their interaction partners, rather than their partner’s communicative reality. The subjective nature of accommodation invites miscommunication, as people’s assumptions and stereotypes about interaction partners influence their decisions about how and when to accommodate (e.g., Ryan, Giles, Bartolucci, & Henwood, 1986).

In this way, appropriate accommodation and interpretive competence requires a communicator to have a focused understanding of their partner’s perspective in order to effectively relay information, which can be accomplished through ‘discourse management’ processes such as perspective taking (Watson & Gallois, 1998). Successful perspective taking, for example, entails conceptualizing another individual’s thoughts and feelings (Galinsky, Ku, & Wang, 2005) and has been associated with more situational and less internal judgements of difficulties the target may be experiencing (Vescio, Sechrist, & Paolucci, 2003). Similarly, Gasiorek (2015) demonstrated that greater
perspective taking on the part of the receiver in a communication is associated with more positive perceived motives and greater perceived speaker accommodation in non-accommodative interactions. While Gasiorek’s findings refer to a receiver’s perspective taking, they nonetheless suggest a highly useful connection between perspective taking and greater perceived accommodation. Though research has not explicitly demonstrated a connection between communicator perspective-taking and communicator accommodation, it follows that perspective-taking may improve the effectiveness of communicator interpretive competence, improving accommodation efforts. Among other possible adjustment behaviors, accommodation can take the form of convergence, a strategy where interaction partners strive to reduce their communicative differences (e.g., reducing use of jargon; Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991).

In sum, appropriate and successful accommodation entails a communicator minimizing social distance and developing a functional, empathetic view of their interactant’s thoughts and feelings to maximize interpretive competence and facilitate understanding. In this way, appropriate accommodation may be seen as a key underlying factor associated with call-ins, relative to call-outs, in that calling-in entails a more private, personal interaction between communicators. Moreover, discourse on calling-in mirrors the sympathetic, situational judgements associated with perspective taking (Vescio, Sechrist, & Paolucci, 2003), which has been theoretically and empirically linked to accommodation research (Gasiorek, 2015).

Conversely, characteristics of call-outs also mirror research and theory on unsuccessful accommodation where interactants do not make appropriate communicative adjustments based on their interaction partner, also known as nonaccommodation.
Nonaccommodation can take place in several forms, including divergence, maintenance, and overaccommodation. Divergence, for example, is a strategy whereby people engage in behaviors to accentuate rather than attenuate their speech differences (e.g., speech rate, use of technical rather than lay terminology). Nonaccommodation may also take the form of maintenance, where individuals simply do not consider their communication partner and operate under their default communication strategies, or underaccommodation, where speakers underperform behaviors designed to facilitate interaction comprehension. Finally, nonaccommodation can include overaccommodation, where the speaker overuses accommodative behaviors relative to the levels warranted by the situation or their communication partner’s needs (Giles & Gasiorek, 2013).

Overaccommodation, in particular, has accrued much scholarship on concepts like patronizing and baby-talk (Ryan, Bourhis, & Knops, 1991). While relatively more research on nonaccommodation has addressed overaccommodation (Giles & Gasiorek, 2013), the present study is primarily interested in differences between appropriate and underaccommodation, which is more analogous to the communication techniques that characterize call-out confrontations. Additionally, research on CAT has suggested that among young adults, underaccommodation is experienced more often than overaccommodation, rendering this form of nonaccommodation more appropriate and familiar for an undergraduate sample (Gasiorek, 2010). Therefore, the term nonaccommodation when utilized in the present review refers specifically to underaccommodation (unless otherwise specified) rather than other forms of nonaccommodation, such as overaccommodation.
In particular, writing on call-out confrontations largely resembles characteristic nonaccommodation. For example, confrontations categorized as call-outs are criticized for prioritizing the confronter’s goals of social gratification or espousing their superior knowledge over goals such as improving the target’s understanding of the potential harms of their words. Rather, confronters who call-out achieve the social gratification of demonstrating their topic knowledge by *emphasizing* differences between their language and their targets (e.g., Mahan, 2017), relying on jargon rather than accessible language to facilitate an educational interaction (Ahmad, 2015). These communication strategies, of course, strongly resemble research on the aforementioned nonaccommodation strategies divergence and maintenance, rendering nonaccommodation a useful analog for lay characteristics of call-out confrontations.

Communication accommodation also plays a crucial role in how (non)accommodation simultaneously cues and is a product of interactants’ perceived social power, which is another characteristic on which discourse on call-outs and call-ins differ. For example, undercutting an interaction partner’s interpretive competence by relying on esoteric jargon that is unlikely to be understood accentuates a power or status difference between partners. Similarly, *who* accommodates in an interaction is often a product of social power. In cross-sex interactions, for example, women accommodate men more than men accommodate women (Namy, Nygaard, & Saureteig, 2002). Analogously, in a study on police-civilian accommodation during traffic stops of White and Latinx drivers, researchers found that White police officers accommodated Latinx drivers less relative to White drivers, and that driver accommodation was predicted by the
officer’s initial accommodation level (Dixon, Schell, Giles, & Drogos, 2008; Giles, Linz, Bonilla, & Gomez, 2012).

In this way, nonaccommodation strategies are used both to cue differences in social power and to maintain social distance. In other words, less accommodation by White officers prompted less accommodation from Latinx drivers relative to that from White drivers, leading to interactions judged as more dismissive overall. Nonaccommodation, then, is a particularly good fit for the self-righteous, superiority-asserting focus of call-out confrontations, while appropriate accommodation’s focus on acknowledging an interaction partner as another individual with agency and humanity fits well with the tenets behind call-in confrontations. Ahmad (2015), for example, discusses calling-out as a method of constructing boundaries around progressive and activist communities. By utilizing language and terminology espoused by these communities in call-outs with outgroup members (who do not share the common understanding of terms), confronters maintain group boundaries and alienate their interaction partners under the guise of teaching them. That is, confronters who call-out rather than call-in engage in nonaccommodative strategies designed to heighten communicative differences, undermining rather than promoting understanding, and reinforcing (activist) group boundaries.

**Accommodation is Persuasion**

Although a variety of scholars extoll the virtues of calling-in relative to calling-out as a strategy for successful confrontation and education (e.g., Mahan, 2017), to my knowledge no empirical work has addressed the relative persuasive success of call-out and call-in confrontation styles. However, Communication Accommodation Theory’s
connection to persuasion research may be a route to investigating these proposed differences in effectiveness: appropriate accommodation does facilitate persuasion. For example, one hallmark of accommodation is speech rate similarity and research has demonstrated that people are more susceptible to influence by others with a more similar speech rate (Buller & Aune, 1992; Seiter & Gass, 2004). Buller and Aune (1992) posited that similar speech rate increased compliance by increasing the social attractiveness of the speaker, finding that more similar speech rate was associated with more perceived intimacy and more positive evaluations of the speaker’s sociability and character.

Similarly, appropriate accommodation is associated with an array of positive interaction outcomes that may increase likelihood of persuasion, including decreasing social distance and uncertainty in an interaction, and increasing liking, perceived competence, and credibility by enhancing interpersonal similarities (e.g., Aune & Kikuchi, 1993). These and related findings fit easily into a framework of research on similarity and persuasion – simply put, people like more similar others (Burger, Messian, Patel, del Prado, & Anderson, 2004) and are more likely to comply with others that they like (Cialdini, 2009). Considered in this framework, successfully accommodating communication minimizes communicative differences between interaction partners, facilitating similarity, comprehension, and likely persuasion.

Related support has found that both actual and perceived similarity between interactants’ language intensity is correlated with perceptions of source credibility and message agreement (Aune & Kikuchi, 1993). Accommodation and persuasion have also been connected in applied work on physician accommodation and patient compliance with treatment recommendations. Hajek, Villagran, and Wittenberg-Lyle (2007), for
example, found that perceived physician accommodation predicted patients’ intentions to comply with recommended treatment. Further work has suggested that the relationship between perceptions of physician accommodation and compliance is due to the relationship between positive accommodation and trust (e.g., Williams, Giles, Coupland, Dalby, & Manasse, 1990). Finally, this relationship between accommodation, trust, and compliance and persuasion has been demonstrated in the realm of police-civilian interactions. Hajek et al. (2008) found that the more participants saw officers as accommodating them (e.g., How well do police officers explain things?), the greater their reported trust in police and intent to comply with police instructions. In this way, CAT, and in particular appropriate accommodation, have been inextricably linked to persuasion and compliance, which suggests a useful link to a particular area of persuasion research: confronting prejudice.

Especially germane to present purposes, previous scholarship has also demonstrated that third-party perceivers recognize these benefits associated with successful accommodation. This research on CAT, then, also suggests that investigating lay perceptions of differences in accommodation between call-out and call-in confrontations of prejudice may be useful. Ryan et al. (1991), for example, found that participants assigned to read an interaction between a nurse and an elderly patient rated the nurse in a patronizing interaction as less competent, respectful, nurturant, and benevolent relative to the nurse using more neutral language. Previous work examining third-party ratings of both students and lecturers who varied in degree of accommodation also demonstrates that uninvolved parties recognize the benefits of accommodating. Jones, Gallois, Barker, and Callan (1994) found that third-party participants evaluated
accommodating lecturers higher on a social attractiveness measure they dubbed *solidarity*, relative to nonaccommodating counterparts. Items under the solidarity measure included ‘helpful,’ ‘easy to understand,’ ‘I would respect this person,’ and ‘successful.’ Jones et al.’s (1994) findings demonstrate that third-parties see accommodating as facilitating the tasks required for those in a teaching role. As such, Jones et al.’s (1994) work will inform the present study’s expectations of third-party perceptions of accommodating (i.e., calling-in) confronters, who should be seen as more effective educators.

Perhaps even more connected to the proposed study’s aims, prior research has demonstrated that third-party perceptions of *motive* impact how communications differing in degree of accommodation are perceived. Gasiorek and Giles (2015) found that when third-party perceivers inferred a positive motive (e.g., helping), the same interaction was seen as more accommodating relative to when fewer positive motives were inferred. This finding in particular will inform my expectations of the positive impact of inferred motive on expected confrontation outcomes – namely, inferences of positive motive increase perceptions of accommodation, so more positive inferred motives ought to elicit better expected confrontation outcomes across confrontation styles. Similarly, prior work on accommodation has demonstrated that more insufficient instructions (analogous with under- or nonaccommodation) are associated with fewer positive inferences about communicator motive (Gasiorek & Dragojevic, 2017). In this way, there is a body of prior work suggesting not only that third-party observers understand the benefits of accommodation in interactions that they observe or read, but also that it is significant to survey their perceptions of *motive* as well. The present study
will build on these findings by varying degree of accommodation to mirror call-in vs. call-out confrontation styles and surveying participant perceptions of confronter motive and expected of confrontation outcomes.

**Persuasion and Confronting Prejudice**

Confronting prejudice, broadly put, occurs when an individual sees bias being expressed or enacted and voices their disapproval to the individual or group responsible (Ashburn-Nardo, Blanchar, Petersson, Morris, & Goodwin, 2014; Becker & Barreto, 2014). Research on confrontations, particularly confronting prejudice, can also logically be considered in terms of persuasion – much confrontation literature considers a confronter’s attempts to persuade their target to see their actions or words in a different light and alter their behavior accordingly. This connection is established by previous scholarship (Gervais & Hillard, 2014). Gervais and Hillard contextualized such confrontations using a persuasion framework and demonstrated the importance of features of the confrontation (e.g., context and message content) to its effectiveness. The researchers operationalized ‘confrontation effectiveness’ as the perceived likelihood that the confrontation will prevent future sexist events. Their work found, for example, that third-party observers expect prejudiced comments to reoccur less in public relative to private confrontations. This finding in particular suggests that participants in the present study may expect more public behavior change, or compliance, when the confronter calls-out and does not accommodate, as the context is more public and direct. The proposed study will build on this basis by including not only perceptions of compliance, but also participants’ expectations about private attitude change, or internalization, and inferences about the confronter’s motivation. Gervais and Hillard’s experiments also
focused on third-party perceptions, providing further support for the present study’s approach of beginning with lay perceptions of confrontation style’s impact on confrontation outcomes.

Much work on confronting prejudice additionally focuses on third-party perceptions of confrontations. For example, Schultz and Maddox (2013) surveyed third-party perceptions of confronters in a series of studies examining the impact of confronter characteristics and extremity of claim on evaluations of confronters. Similarly, Petty et al. (2001) surveyed third-party perceivers in a series of studies finding that when participants were confronted with a stereotypical communication (e.g., a Black individual in support of civil rights), the message was processed superficially, while less expected stances were processed more deeply. This body of work demonstrates that different styles of confrontation affect how those being confronted, particularly observers of confrontations, process confrontation messages and evaluate confronters. Research on confronting prejudice, however, has not yet directly explored the impact of differences in communication accommodation on confrontation outcomes.

Further research on confronting prejudice has demonstrated the importance of a variety of interpersonal factors to confrontation reception and outcomes, with many approaches emphasizing the importance of communication-specific factors. For example, research has demonstrated that a variety of factors from confronter characteristics (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006), context (Gervais & Hillard, 2014), to the content of the message (Schultz & Maddox, 2013) all affect the outcome of confrontations. In a series of studies examining confrontations of racial prejudice, Czopp and Monteith (2003) found that target confrontations elicited more discomfort and
feelings of irritation and were more likely to be perceived as an overreaction than confrontations by non-targets who were White confronters.

Similarly, research has demonstrated the importance of communicative factors in a series of experiments which varied levels of confronter hostility and found that more hostile or direct interactions elicited more negative self-directed affect in targets, as well as more negative evaluations of the confronter (Czopp & Monteith, 2006). Complementary work by Martinez, Hebl, Smith, and Sabat (2017) offers an even more nuanced approach to the impact of (in)directness to confrontation outcomes, finding that hostile and direct confronters were rated most negatively by observers. Additionally, although not significant, their results suggest a trend such that confronters who are direct but non-hostile (i.e., calm) were rated most positively by third-party observers. Czopp and Monteith’s and Martinez et al.’s findings that more direct and hostile confrontations elicit negative evaluations of confronters will inform my expectations in the present study as nonaccommodation, relative to accommodation, is considerably more direct and less compassionate and may elicit less charitable inferences about confronter motivations.

Similarly, prior work has demonstrated the positive impact of message quality and clarity on the extent to which targets process confrontation messages (e.g., Petty, Fleming, Priester, & Feinstein, 2001; Schultz & Maddox, 2013). These findings, in particular, are suggestive of a useful connection to CAT, which posits that one of the key functions of accommodating is facilitating comprehension (Street & Giles, 1982). Similarly, scholars have argued that call-in confrontations are more effective educational interactions relative to call-outs as the confronter is more concerned about the outcomes of the confrontation rather than merely performing the act of confronting (e.g., Ahmad,
2015). This prior work will inform my expectations about lay perceptions of confrontation outcomes, particularly private attitude change, or internalization. Accommodating call-in confronters, for example, may be seen as more likely to facilitate comprehension and deeper processing of confrontation messages, encouraging more internalization relative to nonaccommodating call-out confrontations.

**Individual Differences and Confrontation**

An additional consideration affecting perceptions and outcomes of confrontations is interactants’ own level of prejudice. For example, Plant and Devine (2001) found that individuals low in internal (and high in external) motivation to respond without prejudice responded to other-imposed pro-Black pressure with anger and backlash, also known as reactance. Contextualized in the present study, a confrontation of racial microaggressions can be considered in terms of other-imposed pressures, so participant prejudice may play a role in their expectations of confrontation outcomes. Similarly, Roussos and Dovidio (2018) found that greater anti-Black prejudice is positively associated with a tendency to see anti-Black discrimination as protected under freedom of speech rights (see also White & Crandall, 2017). As such, participants especially prejudiced against people of color may be predisposed to negative inferences about confronter motive (and more pessimistic expectations about confrontation outcomes) regardless of accommodation and self-presentation. To control for participant prejudice, particularly in the context of voicing prejudicial remarks, the present study will utilize the Motivation to Express Prejudice Scale, which includes sub-scales addressing internal and external motivation to express prejudice (MP; Forscher, Cox, Graetz, & Devine, 2015).
Participants’ ideas about malleability, as related to constructs like prejudice, may also affect their responses to differences in confronter accommodation and self-presentation, as the present study investigates expectations of change in the target of the confrontation. For example, research has shown that individuals who see personality as a malleable construct are more likely to take responsibility for a wrongdoing relative to those who see personality as fixed (Schumann & Dweck, 2014). Individuals who see empathy as more malleable relative to fixed report greater effort to empathize in challenging contexts (Schumann, Zaki, & Dweck, 2014). In particular, Schumann et al. (2014) found that those with more malleable (vs. fixed) theories of empathy spent more time listening to a racial outgroup member’s emotional story. Similarly, individuals who see prejudice as more fixed, relative to malleable, show less interest and are more uncomfortable in interracial interactions due to greater concern about revealing prejudice or discovering it in oneself (Carr, Dweck, & Pauker, 2012).

Also germane to the present study’s goals, research has also addressed how one’s beliefs about malleability affect judgements of a third-party. For example, Black participants who were primed with a fixed (vs. malleable) view of Whites’ prejudice then perceived Whites as more prejudiced (Simon, Schaffer, Neel, & Shapiro, 2018). As such, participant beliefs about the malleability of prejudice could impact their ratings of interactants in the present study’s confrontations – in particular, participants who view prejudice as especially malleable may be more likely to expect internalization in the target of the confrontation, even after controlling for confrontation style. The present study will utilize Carr et al.’s (2012) Theories of Prejudice Scale, which measures ideas about the malleability of prejudice, to investigate this exploratory hypothesis.
**Confronting and Self-Presentation**

The present study will also incorporate self-presentation style as an additional factor impacting the relationship between accommodation style and lay perceptions of confronter motivation. In particular, I am interested in the impact of whether or not the confronter is self-promoting. The inclusion of self-presentation style will provide for a more nuanced comparison of call-out and call-in confrontation styles, which differ not only in terms of accommodative language, but also in terms of confronter self-presentation. In particular, confronters engaging in call-outs are typically seen as preoccupied with the performance of the confrontation, self-righteous, and emphasizing the superiority of their knowledge over the target of the confrontation (Mahan, 2017). Conversely, lay characteristics of call-in confrontations do not include self-promotion and are more target- and outcome-focused confrontations.

Previous research on attitudes toward activists or morally motivated others has demonstrated that the social impact these groups have can be mitigated by people’s stereotypes about or expectations of activist groups. For example, work on ‘do-gooder derogation’ has demonstrated that individuals demean these morally motivated others in an effort to mitigate the possibility of rejection (Minson & Monin, 2012; O’Connor & Monin, 2016). For example, O’Connor and Monin (2016) theorized that that phenomenon of ‘do-gooder derogation’ is rooted in people expecting that moral others will reject them, leading people to preemptively reject these others. Confronters who self-promote their issue knowledge or apparent moral superiority, then, undercut their own potential impact on receivers’ attitudes and behavior.
Self-presentation style in confrontations of prejudice can also be tied theoretically to scholarship on facework, strategies that individuals utilize to manage their face, an aspect of projected social identity (Goffman, 1967; Marlow, 2016). Facework research posits that individuals expect their projected face to be validated by interactions with others, and criticism or confrontation represent a challenge to one’s face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Moreover, criticism (e.g., one’s behavior being labeled as prejudiced) threatens one’s need for social approval while also limiting autonomy. In this way, facework has implications for how the confronter’s confrontation style may impact third-party perceptions of their motive and of outcomes. In particular, self-promoting call-out confronters (seen as overly concerned with their own face and unconcerned with the target’s) may be seen as having more negative motivations. In this way, I expect call-out confrontations (which are both non-accommodating and self-promoting) to be associated with greatest expectations of compliance, as participants may feel the target’s face is more threatened, warranting more reparative public behaviors.

Some rejections of morally motivated others, like confronters of prejudice, are a product of meta-perceptions – third-party beliefs about how these do-gooders see themselves. For example, Minson and Monin (2012) found that participants disliked vegetarians on the basis of their moral refusal to eat meat, and were also more likely to associate negative terms with vegetarians the more they expected the group to see themselves as morally superior. O’Connor and Monin (2016), however, show that this relation may depend on who the perceiver is. When a rebel refused to take part in a prejudiced task, they were praised by third-party observers but derogated by the implicated actors who had taken part in the task (O’Connor & Monin, 2016). In light of
these later findings, it seems likely that the majority of the observer participants in Minson and Monin’s (2012) study on moral vegetarians ate meat. These findings imply that observers not personally threatened or implicated by a confrontation of prejudice like confronters, perhaps because their removed vantage allows them to identify with the confronter and imagine that they would have acted similarly. While participants in the present study are third-party observers, this work on do-gooder derogation nonetheless provides a useful framework for the present study’s aims and clearly demonstrates that people’s ideas about the self-perceptions and motives of moral actors impacts their judgements of said actors. Additionally, in the context of the present study, I propose that whether or not the confronter self-promotes may impact this third-party tendency to view confronters positively. In particular, a self-promoting call-out confronter should undercut the benefits of a third-party audience identifying with and therefore having more positive views of said confronter.

This work also suggests that third-parties freely ascribe a sense of moral superiority in others who perform ‘moral behaviors’ (e.g., being vegetarian) even without language designed to invoke a sense of self-promotion. Thus, when a confronter actively self-promotes, I expect this effect to be amplified, leading to more negative evaluations of confronter motivations, even among a third-party audience. Though O’Connor and Monin’s (2016) aforementioned work does complicate these findings, I nonetheless expect participants to draw negative conclusions about a self-promoting confronter’s motivations due to the increased salience of the confronter’s sense of moral superiority. Moreover, a confronter utilizing the call-out style who both self-promotes and does not accommodate (thereby accentuating communicative differences with a target and,
perhaps, a third-party audience) may be less easily identified with, seen as less similar to third-party viewers, and therefore seen in a less positive light (Burger et al., 2004). In this way, the call-out confrontation style (entailing non-accommodation and self-promotion), relative to non-promoting confrontations, is unlikely be effective or prompt positive inferences of motive.

Additionally, the present study included a third confrontation style ("educational"), in which the confronter does not actively accommodate or self-promote in order to draw more qualified conclusions about the relative impact of accommodative and self-presentation differences between call-out and call-in confrontations. For example, while call-out/in distinctions involve both accommodative and self-presentation differences, the "educational" condition may disentangle whether accommodation vs. self-presentation is a more impactful factor underlying lay distinctions between these confrontation styles. While the "educational" and "call-out" confronters both do not accommodate, only the latter also self-promotes. The present study investigated whether these confronters motives were seen similarly or differently, and if expected outcomes (internalization and compliance) varied between these conditions.

Self-promotion may also affect the impact of confrontation style on perceptions of internalization by impeding understanding. In particular, confronters who call-out may disrupt the comprehension-facilitating functions of accommodation (Street & Giles, 1982) by focusing on self-congratulation at the expense of making a clear explanation of why the target’s comment was problematic. Additionally, based on do-gooder derogation work, it follows that call-out confronters, by virtue of explicit self-promotion, will be liked less by an audience, which may undercut the confronter’s capacity for persuasion
(Cialdini, 2009). In this way, I expect the callout, relative to call-in confrontations, to be associated with less expected internalization.

The Present Study

Building on a wealth of work connecting CAT and confronting prejudice to persuasion and, thus, to each other, the present study sought to understand outcomes of confronting prejudice through an accommodation lens. In particular, I was interested in how confronter accommodation and self-presentation may form a useful analog of lay categories of call-out and call-in confrontations and may account for differences in perceptions of confronter motivation and confrontation outcome between these different styles. College student participants read an interaction in which one White, male college student confronts another White, male student for espousing stereotypes about several of their Black classmates. The interaction varied in degree of accommodation and type of self-presentation to create three between-groups conditions: call-out, call-in, and the pseudo-control “educational” confrontation style condition, which I expected to impact participants’ views of the confronter’s motives and confrontation outcomes.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: The call-in confrontation style will elicit more positive inferences about confronter motivation relative to educational and call-out styles, with the call-out confrontation style associated with least positive inferred motives.

Exploratory Hypothesis 1a: Confrontation style will indirectly predict expected confrontation outcomes (i.e., more compliance and internalization) by fostering positive inferences of confronter motivation, such that accommodating and non-
promoting confrontations are associated with more positive inferred motives, which in turn encourage more positive expected outcomes.

**Hypothesis 2:** The call-out confrontation style will elicit greater expectation of compliance (or public behavior change) relative to call-in and educational confrontations, with the call-in style eliciting least expected target compliance.

**Hypothesis 3:** The call-in confrontation style will elicit greater expectation of internalization (or private attitude change) relative to educational and call-out styles, with the call-out confrontation style associated with least expected target internalization.

**Method**

**Participants and Design**

Participants were 168 White students (137 women, 30 men, and one individual identifying as non-binary\(^1\)) aged between 18-22 years \((M = 18.92, SD = .95)\) recruited at a private university in the southern United States and compensated with points toward their courses. The sample size was based on the proposed analyses (e.g., MANCOVA with main effects) and the most conservative effect size found in previous scholarship dealing with evaluations of confronters \((d = 0.57;\) Chu, 2017) and generated using Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, and Lang’s G*Power (2009). This sample size of 168 was appropriate to obtain enough power to detect a medium effect for the design and (which would be an effect size \(d = 0.57;\) Faul et al., 2009). Participants were randomly assigned

\(^1\) A multivariate analysis of covariance investigating sex differences in the three main dependent variables was significant \((F(3, 145) = 4.41, p = .005)\). Follow-up ANOVAs indicated that there was a sex difference only in inferred confronter motive, such that cisgender women inferred more positive motives across confrontation style \((M = 5.66, SD = .80)\) relative to cis-men \((M = 5.04, SD = .96)\); \(F(1, 147) = 7.47, p = .001\). However, this difference is based on a comparison of unequal N and there was no interaction effect between sex and confrontation style. Moreover, the impact of confrontation style was robust when including sex as a covariate, so results are presented collapsed across sex.
to read a vignette with one of three confrontation styles (Call-in, Educational, or Call-out) in a one-way between-subjects design.

Materials

**Questionnaires.** Participants completed Carr, Dweck, and Pauker’s (2012) Theories of Prejudice scale to assess ideas about the malleability of prejudice. Participants’ Theories of Prejudice scores were included in analyses as a covariate. The present study also utilized the Motivation to Express Prejudice Scale, which includes subscales addressing participants’ internal and external motivation to express prejudice (MP; Forscher, Cox, Graetz, & Devine, 2015). Participants also completed demographics items, single item measures of their liking, empathy, and similarity to both the confronter and target, and a modified Positive and Negative Affect Schedule questionnaire (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). For the purposes of the present study, two additional items were added to the traditional PANAS: “defensive” and “attacked.” Participants also answered open-ended questions regarding the confrontation (e.g., “Is there anything Will should not have said to make this a more effective interaction?”) and whether they expected the target to make similar comments again.

Finally, participants reported their expectations of the target’s compliance and internalization following the confrontation. Reliability analysis indicated that the compliance dependent variable (the mean of five items) had a Cronbach’s alpha of .706, which is marginally acceptable. The removal of one reverse-scored item (“In the future, Adam will be more likely to make comments like these again”) only would have

---

2 These PANAS items were included to test for whether there was a target mood difference between confrontation styles. A multivariate analysis of variance examining positive and negative affect between confrontation styles was not significant, so PANAS results are not discussed further; F(4, 292) = .989, p = .414.
increased the alpha to .708, so that item was retained. The internalization dependent variable (the mean of six items) had a Cronbach’s alpha of .756, which is acceptable. The removal of one item (“To what extent will Adam change his private beliefs”) only would have increased the alpha to .757, so that item was retained.

**Perceptions of Confronter Motivation.** The present study also created a novel scale measuring perceptions of confronter motivation, the 14-item Confronter Motivation Questionnaire (CMQ), which assessed primarily positive and negative confronter motives, but also included four exploratory sub-scales assessing perceived motives to avoid negative consequences, activism/education, punishment, and self-promotion. The CMQ was assessed using exploratory factor analysis. All 14 items correlated significantly ($p_s \leq .0005$) with at least 3 other items. Additionally, Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(91) = 901.84, p < .0005$) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .84, which is above the typically recommended value .6. A scree plot indicated three factors should be retained for the principle components analysis. All fourteen items were significantly correlated with ($p_s < .01$) and 13 items had loadings of .4 and above on the first component extracted, which can be interpreted as the positive/negative motivation dimension of the CMQ. Preliminary interpretation suggests the two additional factors may relate to education/avoiding bad outcomes (component 2) and activism/social justice (component 3) motivations. Overall, these analyses indicated that three overlapping factors were underlying responses to the CMQ, with the greatest variance explained by component 1, the positive/negative motivations dimension. Moreover, given that the positive/negative motivations dimension was the main
dimension of interest, it was gratifying that this factor emerged clearly as the first and most explanatory dimension of the questionnaire.

Finally, I also computed Cronbach’s alpha for the CMQ to assess the reliability of the scale. Cronbach’s alpha for the 14-item questionnaire was .839, indicating high internal consistency. Only one item (“Will wanted to let other students know that the class is a safe space”), would have increased the alpha (to .847) if deleted, so it was retained.

Procedure

Recruitment materials informed participants that they would be taking part in three allegedly unrelated studies grouped together to reach 30 minutes: one validating new scales about social attitudes and prejudice, one investigating students’ experiences of romantic attachment, and one investigating perceptions of classroom interactions. The procedure took place entirely online on the survey platform Qualtrics and took 30 minutes.

As a part of the ‘first study,’ participants completed the MP Scale (Forscher et al., 2015) and the Theories of Prejudice Scale (Carr et al., 2012) to provide a measure of their ideas about the malleability of prejudice (e.g., “No matter who somebody is, they can always become a lot less prejudiced.”). Participants also completed demographics measures as a part of ‘study one.’ Participants then began the ‘second study,’ which bolstered the present study’s cover story and also comprised a distractor task between the prejudice questionnaires and study’s main manipulation. Participants completed abridged versions of the Adult Attachment Scale (Collins & Read, 1990), Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998), and Relationship Assessment
Scale (Hendrick, 1988). Finally, participants were informed by the survey platform that they had reached the third and final study, which assessed perceptions of classroom interactions. All participants read the same introduction to an interaction:

“Several students in a Macroeconomics course have arrived at their classroom early and are talking about the class. One student, Adam, comments on the number of empty desks in the room. He says to a couple of people near him, ‘This class is getting less diverse by the day! Looks like those couple of Black kids didn’t stick around past syllabus week. Not that I blame them – macro’s supposed to be freakin’ hard. Well, maybe football – or basketball? – will have a winning season.’”

In the rest of the interaction, another student, Will, confronts Adam about the inappropriateness of his comment. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three continuations of the vignette, which varied along the dimensions of self-presentation and accommodation: “Call-in” (where the confronter accommodates and does not self-promote), “Educational” (a straightforward, non-accommodating, but also not self-promoting confrontation), and “Call-out” (where the confronter does not accommodate and does self-promote). These three variations of the same confrontation were designed to mirror the phenomenon of call-out/call-in discourse online (For full text, see Appendix A). Random assignment was completed by programming in the platform Qualtrics.

After reading the brief interaction, participants completed the CMQ, rating a series of statements about the confronter’s possible motivations (e.g., “Will was trying to make himself look better by putting Adam down.”) on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much so). Participants also completed questionnaires assessing their expectations of
target compliance and internalization, and regarding their liking for, perceived similarity to, and empathy for both Will and Adam. For full text of measures created for the present study, see Appendix B. Finally, participants completed a modified PANAS (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), open-ended questions, and manipulation and attention checks before being debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Data cleaning and manipulation checks. Nine participants withdrew their consent after being debriefed or did not release their data and seven participants failed two or more attention checks and were excluded from analyses leaving N = 152 participants. To investigate the success of the confrontation style manipulation, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) investigated the impact of confrontation style on three manipulation check items assessing the degree to which the confronter protected the target’s feelings, attempted to educate the target, and tried to seem superior to the target during their interaction. These items were intended to map onto our three confrontation styles: call-in (accommodating and non-promoting), educational (non-accommodating and non-promoting) and call-out (non-accommodating and self-promoting).

An omnibus MANOVA indicated that experimental condition had a significant effect on the manipulation check items; Wilks’Λ = .795, F(6, 240) = 4.87, p < .0005. Tests of between-subjects effects were followed up with pairwise Bonferroni comparisons. Confrontation style had a significant effect on perceptions of the confronter protecting the target’s feelings (F(2, 122) = 11.42, p < .0005), such that the confronter in
the call-in condition was seen as attempting to protect the target’s feelings during the confrontation ($M = 4.62, SD = 1.71$) significantly more than in the educational ($M = 3.18, SD = 1.35$) and call-out ($M = 3.33, SD = 1.62$) conditions; $p < .0005$. The educational and call-out conditions did not differ in terms of perceived ‘protecting the target’s feelings’ motivations. Confrontation style also had a significant effect on perceptions of the confronter attempting to seem superior to the target during their interaction ($F(2, 122) = 5.60, p = .005$), such that the confronter in the call-out condition was seen as ‘trying to seem superior’ ($M = 3.02, SD = 1.80$) significantly more than in the call-in condition ($M = 1.95, SD = 1.34$); $p = .004$. However, the call-out and educational conditions did not differ significantly on ratings of ‘trying to seem superior’ ($p = .110$). Finally, there was no effect of confrontation style on perceptions of the confronter trying to teach the target ($F(2, 122) = 1.20, p = .304$). These results support a successful priming of accommodation in the call-in, and non-accommodation in the educational and call-out conditions. However, the lack of difference in perceived ‘trying to seem superior’ motives between educational and call-out conditions casts doubt on whether the call-out condition effectively primed self-promotion, or if participants were simply responding to differences in confronter accommodation.

**Theories of prejudice.** I also examined the usefulness of including malleable prejudice belief in the main analysis as a covariate. As malleable prejudice belief was measured before the present study’s randomized manipulation of confrontation style, it was unlikely that the construct would be related to the independent variable. A univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing for group differences in beliefs about the malleability of prejudice between confrontation styles was not significant, supporting this
conclusion; \( F(2, 149) = .46, p = .630 \). However, it was likely that malleable prejudice belief would be related to more than one dependent variable, as compliance and internalization both assessed expectations of change. A correlation analysis revealed that prejudice-malleability belief was correlated with expected compliance \((r = .21, p = .009)\) and internalization \((r = .26, p = .001)\) such that stronger beliefs that prejudice is malleable are associated with greater expected compliance and internalization. Additionally, prejudice-malleability belief was marginally significantly correlated with inferred confronter motivation \((r = .14, p = .087)\). These findings indicated that including malleable prejudice belief as a covariate should increase power, as it was related to all three main dependent variables, but not the independent variable. Therefore, the following main analysis includes malleable prejudice belief as a covariate.

**Hypothesis Tests**

**Confronter motives.** An omnibus multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) assessing differences in inferred confronter motivation, and expected internalization and compliance was significant, indicating that there are differences in these dependent variables among the three confrontation styles, controlling for malleable prejudice beliefs; \( F(6, 292) = 4.26, p < .0005, \text{Wilks' } \Lambda = .846, \text{ partial } \eta^2 = .080. \) See Table 1 for estimated marginal means of the main dependent variables, accounting for participants’ malleable prejudice beliefs.

Tests of between-subjects effects were followed up by *a priori*, orthogonal Helmert contrasts following predicted results comparing the call-in condition with educational and call-out conditions and comparing educational and call-out conditions with one another. Confrontation style has a significant effect on inferred confronter
motivations \( (F(2, 148) = 11.87, p < .0005) \), such that those in the call-in condition inferred significantly more positive confronter motivations \( (M = 5.97, SD = .87) \) relative to educational \( (M = 5.44, SD = .71) \) and call-out conditions \( (M = 5.23, SD = .81); p < .0005 \). There were no significant differences in perceived confronter motivation between educational and call-out conditions; \( p = .237 \). See Figure 1 for mean inferred confronter motivation by confrontation style. These results indicate that hypothesis one is partly supported – the call-in confrontation style elicited more favorable inferences of confronter motivation relative to educational and call-out confrontations, though there was no difference between the latter two conditions.

**Internalization.** Confrontation style did not have a significant effect on expected internalization \( (F(2, 148) = 1.82, p = .164) \). However, I also conducted exploratory orthogonal Helmert contrasts comparing expected internalization in the call-in and educational and call-out conditions, and between educational and call-out conditions (see Figure 2), as these comparisons had larger mean differences than expected compliance, the other ‘expected change’ outcome variable. These contrasts revealed that expectations of internalization were marginally higher in the call-in \( (M = 4.04, SD = .91) \) relative to educational \( (M = 3.74, SD = .89) \) and call-out \( (M = 3.80, SD = .81) \) conditions; \( p = .066 \). There was no difference in expected internalization between educational and call-out conditions; \( p = .594 \). These results indicate that hypothesis three may be partly supported, as the call-in confrontation style did elicit marginally higher expected internalization relative to educational and call-out conditions which, again, did not differ.

**Compliance.** Confrontation style did not have the hypothesized effect on expected compliance, operationalized using the five-item composite; \( (F(2, 148) = .54, p \)
For exploratory purposes, I conducted a Chi-Square Test of Independence examining an additional forced choice item (“Do you think Adam will choose to make comments like these again?” with choices yes/no) across the three conditions. The test of independence was marginally significant ($\chi^2(2) = 5.36, p = .069$). Odds ratios for each condition showed that participants in the call-in condition were 1.48 times more likely and those in the educational condition were 2.78 times more likely to respond yes (Adam will make similar comments again) than no. However, participants in the call-out condition, which was hypothesized to elicit the most expected compliance, were 2.18 times more likely to respond no (“Adam will not make similar comments again”) than yes. Although in the hypothesized direction, these findings are marginal and inconsistent with our five-item composite for compliance, suggesting more work is needed to examine the relationship between confrontation style and expected compliance.

**Planned Exploratory Analyses.** Exploratory hypothesis 1a expected that positive inferences of confronter motivation should foster expectations of confrontation outcomes (compliance and internalization), controlling for confrontation style. To assess this exploratory hypothesis, I examined the relationship between confrontation style, perceived confronter motivation, and expected internalization and compliance using exploratory path analysis with Hayes’s (2013) PROCESS macro v3 (Model 4), which allows multcategorical independent variables and mediators (Hayes, 2016; Hayes & Preacher, 2014). The mediational analysis used SPSS indicator, or dummy, codes to make comparisons between the call-in and educational confrontation styles, and between the call-in and call-out conditions for both internalization and compliance outcome variables.
Figure 3(a) shows the total effect of confrontation style on expected internalization. As detailed below, relative to educational and call-out conditions, those in the call-in condition perceived more positive confronter motives, which in turn fostered expected internalization.

There were no differences in expected internalization between those in the call-in and educational ($p = .108$) or call-out ($p = .179$) conditions. Figure 3(b) shows the full mediational model with moderator, perceived confronter motivation, included. Participants in the call-in condition perceived significantly more positive confronter motives relative to those in the educational ($p = .0012$) and call-out ($p < .0005$) conditions. Controlling for perceived confronter motivations, there were no differences in expected internalization between call-in and educational conditions ($p = .401$) or between call-in and call-out conditions ($p = .804$). Holding confrontation style constant, those who perceived more positive confronter motivations expected greater target internalization following the confrontation ($p = .0043$). Finally, there were significant indirect effects of perceived motive on expected internalization when comparing the call-in and educational conditions (indirect effect = -.13, $SE = .07$, 95% CI[-.28, -.03]), and when comparing the call-in and call-out conditions (indirect effect = -.19, $SE = .08$, 95% CI[-.36, -.05]).

The relationship between confrontation style, perceived confronter motivation, and expected compliance was also examined using exploratory path analysis with Hayes’s (2013) PROCESS macro v3 (Model 4) using the same SPSS indicator contrasts as the analysis examining internalization. Again, as detailed below, relative to educational and call-out conditions, those in the call-in condition perceived more positive confronter motives, which in turn fostered expected compliance. Figure 4(a) shows the
total effect of confrontation style on expected compliance – there were no differences in expected compliance between those in the call-in and educational \( (p = .544) \) or call-out \( (p = .313) \) conditions. Figure 4(b) shows the full mediational model with moderator, perceived confronter motivation, included. As in the above analyses, those in the call-in condition perceived more positive confronter motivated than those in the educational and call-out confrontations. Controlling for perceived confronter motivations, there were no differences in expected compliance between call-in and educational conditions \( (p = .801) \) or between call-in and call-out conditions \( (p = .836) \). Holding confrontation style constant, those who perceived more positive confronter motivations expected greater target compliance following the confrontation \( (p = .0012) \). Finally, there were again significant indirect effects of perceived motivation on expected compliance when comparing the call-in and educational conditions (indirect effect = -.15, \( SE = .07 \), 95% CI[-.31, -.04]), and when comparing the call-in and call-out conditions (indirect effect = -.21, \( SE = .09 \), 95% CI[-.40, -.06]). Relative to educational and call-out conditions, those in the call-in condition perceived more positive confronter motives, which in turn fostered expected compliance.

**Additional Exploratory Analyses**

**Confronter motive sub-scales.** For exploratory purposes, I also investigated whether there were differences among the four confronter motives subscales (avoiding negative consequences, activism/education, punishment, and self-promotion) between confrontation styles. An omnibus multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) assessing differences in confronter motivation subscales was significant, indicating that there are differences in the subscales among the three confrontation styles; \( F(8, 292) = 7.69, p < \)
Tests of between-subjects effects were followed up with pairwise Bonferroni comparisons. See Table 2 for mean inferred confronter motives for each sub-scale by confrontation style. Confrontation style had a significant impact on mean inferred ‘avoiding negative consequences’ motivations ($F(2, 149) = 16.00, p < .0005$), such that those in the call-in condition inferred greater ‘avoiding negative consequences’ motivations relative to educational and call-out confrontation styles ($ps < .0005$), while educational and call-out conditions did not differ. Confrontation style also had a significant impact on perceived ‘punishment’ motivations ($F(2, 149) = 15.53, p < .0005$), such that those in the call-in condition inferred significantly less ‘punishment’ motivation relative to educational and call-out conditions ($ps \leq .0005$). Educational and call-out confrontation styles did not differ significantly in inferred ‘punishment’ motivation. Confrontation style also significantly affected perceived ‘self-promotion’ motivations ($F(2, 149) = 4.17, p = .017$), such that the call-out confrontation style elicited significantly greater inferences of ‘self-promotion’ motivations relative to the call-in condition ($p = .030$), and marginally greater ‘self-promotion’ motivation inferences relative to the educational condition ($p = .061$). Call-in and educational confrontation styles did not differ in terms of ‘self-promotion’ confronter motivations. Finally, there were no differences in inferred ‘activism/education’ motivations between confrontation styles; $F(2, 149) = .08, p = .924$. 

$.0005$, Wilks’ $\Lambda = 8.03$, partial $\eta^2 = .180$. 
Discussion

The findings of the present study are largely in line with or complimentary to previous research on the positive communicative impacts of accommodation, particularly in terms of research on communicator motives. For example, the present study found that the more accommodating (call-in) confrontation style was associated with more positive inferred confronter motives relative to non-accommodating confrontation styles (educational and call-out conditions). Moreover, exploratory analyses showed that the accommodating call-in confrontation style was associated with greater inferred motive to help the target avoid negative consequences and less ‘punishment’ motive relative to the non-accommodating call-out style. Similarly, research has shown that more insufficient instructions (similar to nonaccommodating) are associated with fewer positive inferences of communicator motive (Gasiorek & Dragojevic, 2017). Research has also demonstrated that when third-parties infer more positive motives in an interaction, relative to inferring fewer positive motives, the same interaction is judged to be more accommodating (Gasiorek & Giles, 2015).

The present study’s findings are also somewhat consistent with a body of previous work connecting successful accommodation to persuasion. For example, mediational analyses revealed that confrontation style had a significant indirect effect on expected compliance and internalization, such that the accommodating call-in confrontation (relative to call-out and educational styles) elicited more positive inferences of confronter motive, which in turn fostered expectations of target compliance and internalization. These findings also contribute to previous research on the mechanisms underlying the relationship between accommodation and persuasion. For example, researchers have
suggested that the relationship between accommodation and compliance may be due to the fact that successful accommodation facilitates trust (e.g., Williams, Giles, Coupland, Dalby, & Manasse, 1990). Similarly, Hajek, Villagran, and Wittenberg-Lyle (2007) found that a communicator’s accommodation was associated with intent to comply with their request. Similarly, a characteristic of successful accommodation is speech rate similarity, which research has connected to persuasion and influence (Buller & Aune, 1992; Seiter & Gass, 2004). Along with aforementioned work on accommodation and perceived motives (e.g., Gasiorek & Giles, 2015), the present findings suggest that an additional underlying factor may be that successful accommodation facilitates positive inferences of motive, which in turn encourage persuasion.

The findings of the present study also compliment and challenge previous work on persuasion in the context of confronting prejudice. A broad body of previous work has attested to the importance of context and communicator factors to perceptions and outcomes of confronting prejudice. For example, Gervais and Hillard (2014) found that third-parties expected the public vs. private context of a confrontation to impact its effectiveness, such that public confrontations are more effective, while Petty et al. (2001) investigated the impact of message clarity on the extent to which targets processed different confrontation messages. In this way, the present findings contribute to a rich history of work demonstrating that context, communicator, and language factors impact expected outcomes of confrontations of prejudice. Although the present study did not find that confronter communication style directly impacts expected confrontation outcomes, confrontation style does impact inferred confronter motive, which in turn predicts confrontation outcomes.
The present study’s results also indicated that through differences in inferred motives, private confrontations may be associated with greater expected target compliance and internalization, which complicates the interpretation of previous work on contextual factors impacting confrontation outcomes. For example, Gervais and Hillard’s (2014) findings showed that third-parties expected public confrontations to be more effective relative to private confrontations, with ‘effectiveness’ operationalized as likelihood of prejudiced comments not occurring again. While confronter accommodation does involve more than just the public/private dimension, the relationship between accommodation, context, and inferred motive may complicate these previous findings. Therefore, third-party expectations of effectiveness for public (versus private) confrontations may, for instance, vary if inferences of confronter motive are also surveyed. In this vein, the present study also contributed to previous research by surveying expectations of not only public post-confrontation behavior change (compliance), but also private attitude change, or internalization.

Gervais and Hillard’s methodology also surveyed perceptions of a workplace confrontation in which a leader, or manager, confronts an employee, which represents a power differential between confronter and target. Conversely, the present study focuses on a confrontation between two students, presumably of equal standing. For this reason, it could be that public confrontations (per Gervais and Hillard) are expected to produce more compliance in a workplace setting or power-differential confrontation, while private confrontations are expected to produce more compliance in classroom or equal-footing confrontations. Additionally, while the samples in both the present and Gervais and Hillard’s studies were college students, it could be that students in the present study had
an easier time perspective-taking with the target in the classroom relative to workplace confrontation, and therefore expected more reactance and less compliance and internalization in the public setting. Future research would benefit by attempting to reconcile these findings and examine the impact of accommodating in status-matched vs. power-differential confrontations, particularly given that who accommodates in interactions is closely related to perceived social power (e.g., Dixon, Schell, Giles, & Drogos, 2008; Giles, Linz, Bonilla, & Gomez, 2012; Namy, Nygaard, & Saureteig, 2002).

**Limitations and Future Directions**

The present findings must, though, be weighed with several limitations in mind. The sample in the present study is, for example, a convenience sample made up of young, college-aged students, who are not always representative when compared with population averages (e.g., Hanel & Vione, 2016). While call-out vs. call-in discourse on confrontations of prejudice, often referring specifically to online confrontations are likely more familiar to a college sample (e.g., Ritter, 2012), it may still be useful to replicate and extend these findings to larger and more varied samples.

In a similar sense, the confrontations modeled in the present study are not the most representative of a typical call-out or call-in, which are generally considered to be two classes of *online* confrontations. The present study utilized a classroom face-to-face context for the three confrontation styles in an effort to best suit the college student sample, but future work should seek to replicate these findings using online confrontations. Replicating using online call-outs and call-ins may strengthen these findings as the distinction between private call-in and public call-out is heightened given
the ultra-public and lasting nature of the internet as a domain for communication and dissemination of information. In particular, while both face-to-face and computer-mediated communication can be private or public, public communications online are more likely to be recorded or archived semi-permanently. An audience to a public communication online is also not necessarily restricted by time and space in the same way as face-to-face public communications (which typically can only be viewed by an immediately present audience within earshot), which may render this instance of public confrontation ‘ultra-public’ and aggravate the impact of the public context. Additionally, it is important to replicate the present findings using an online context for the confrontation vignettes as a wide range of research attesting to the importance and impact of the medium of communication – for example, internet-mediated communication vs. face-to-face communication – to communication outcomes (Bordia, 1997; Ritter, 2012).

Another difference between typical online call-outs and the call-out utilized in the present study is the presence of audience participation – that is, online call-outs are also typified by the fact that confronters and targets are often joined by numerous audience members participating in the call-out. For example, Sawaoka and Monin (2018), investigated the impact of a confrontation ‘going viral’ on third-party perceptions of online confronters. Confronters participating in viral (i.e., many commenters, rather than one) relative to non-viral (one-on-one) moral outrage in response to prejudiced posts online were viewed more negatively. This difference, the authors argue, is due to the perception of disproportion between one individual’s prejudiced posts and the outrage of a large group of people. The results suggest that while third-parties condone and justify being castigated by one user in response to posting prejudicial materials, too much
audience participation sways sympathies away from the confronters and toward the target of the outrage. The present study, for the sake of simplicity as a first attempt to broach these particular research questions, limited the vignette interactions such that the confronter and target receive no feedback from other classmates present. However, considering the goal of accurately modeling typical call-outs and Sawaoka and Monin’s pertinent work, future work would benefit by expanding to include a variety of levels of audience participation.

The present study also utilized a call-out demonstrating just one of several types of nonaccommodation – underaccommodation – which is most similar to archetypical call-out behavior (e.g., Ahmad, 2015) and a more familiar communication style for young adults, relative to other nonaccommodation strategies like overaccommodation or patronizing (Gasiorek, 2010). However, given the performative nature of call-out confrontations, it does follow that overaccommodating via patronizing may also be a good fit for modeling the practice of calling-out. For example, a self-promoting confronter who over- rather than underaccommodates may underscore the performative nature of the confrontation and add emphasis to their own knowledge, leading to clearer distinctions between confrontation styles. Similarly, while the present study operationalized (non)accommodation using differences in public vs. private context and acknowledgement of the target’s agency (or lack thereof), there are many more ways to cue (non)accommodation. Some earlier work around CAT, for example, focused on speech rate similarity as a cue for divergence or convergence (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991). While this particular cue was not easily compatible with the present study’s vignette format, future work would benefit by priming (non)accommodation in a
variety of ways to establish convergent validity.

As mentioned above with reference to Gervais and Hillard’s (2014) findings, the present study also utilized vignettes with status-matched student confronters and targets to render the interaction more familiar to the college student sample. However, previous research has shown that confronter status impacts expected outcomes of an interaction (Gervais & Hillard, 2014), and that who accommodates whom is often a product of relative social power (e.g., Giles, Linz, Bonilla, & Gomez, 2012) it may be useful to extend these findings by examining the impact of power-differential confrontations. For example, a student being called-out vs. called-in by a professor may be perceived differently than confrontations perpetrated by a fellow student. Similarly, the position or credentials the confronter holds may be associated with different expectations about appropriate levels of accommodation. A professor may be expected, to some degree, to overaccommodate more than the average interaction partner due to the role of teacher, conferring previously unknown information to students.

Moreover, the prejudicial comments the present study used in the three confrontations may pose a limitation. The present study sought to use a prejudicial comment that may be afforded attributional ambiguity by White undergraduate participants due to the use of a seemingly ‘positive’ stereotype of Black individuals: the stereotype of athleticism. For example, Asian and Black participants report less intent to confront prejudice in the form of ‘positive’ racial stereotypes and expect greater costs of confronting ‘positive’ stereotypes, relative to negative stereotypes (Alt, Chaney, & Shih, 2018). Moreover, Alt et al. (2018) demonstrated that targets who did confront positive
relative to negative stereotypes were in fact evaluated more negatively, partly due to the fact that evaluators found the former stereotypes less offensive.

In the confrontations used in the present study, one student asserts that his Black classmates are likely student athletes with the implication that they are, therefore, lacking in intellectual competence. This confrontation was chosen as it seemed likely that White participant ratings, influenced by the attributional ambiguity of the faux-positive stereotype, may be near the mid-point of the dependent variable scales and best suited to showing the influence of the manipulation. However, while there were some significant differences between experimental conditions, ratings of confronter motivation were above the mid-point of the 7-point scale in all conditions (see Figure 1). As such, the findings may have encountered a slight ceiling effect, such that participants were inclined to view the confronter more positively across experimental condition than expected. This could be in part due to the fact that the participants were more attentive than expected to the implication that the Black students in the vignette, assumed to be athletes, also lack intellectual competence and therefore dropped the class. While perhaps indicative of a better than expected awareness of stereotypes among the present study’s student sample, future work would benefit by replicating this paradigm with more varied vignettes. For example, a confrontation in which a student calls attention to a lesser known or more ‘ambiguous’ microaggression may counter this slight ceiling effect and more clearly show what impact confrontation style may have on inferred confronter motive, and expected compliance and internalization.

These higher ratings of motive may also be due to the fact that the present study surveyed third-party judgements of a confrontation, rather than judgements of a target
involved in or implicated by the confrontation. O’Connor and Monin (2016), for example, found that third-parties praised an individual confronting a prejudiced task, while the confronter was conversely derogated by participants who had taken part in the task. These findings, the researchers argue, suggest that observers not implicated by a confrontation of prejudice are more disposed to approve of confronters because they can more easily identify with the confronter and imagine that they would have similarly confronted the prejudice in question. As such, future studies should compare these findings to the judgements of participants actually being confronted (or imagining themselves being confronted). Similarly, the vignette format is limited in that it doesn’t allow for the back channels and paralinguistics innate to face-to-face communication (e.g., Rosenfeld, 1978). While paralinguistics like tone and body language are difficult to embody in computer-mediated communication contexts like typical online call-outs, research has shown that additional features unique to computer- and other technology-mediated communication such as ‘emojis’ serve a similar para-linguistic function to facial expressions (e.g., Lo, 2008). In sum, to develop a more wholistic understanding of how context and medium may impact the effects of confrontation style on confrontation impacts, future work would benefit by replicating the present findings in a variety of computer mediated and face-to-face contexts.

Additionally, further replication with a variety of prejudicial comments and confrontations is warranted insofar as individuals respond differently to different prejudices and stigmas. For example, Czopp and Monteith (2003) examined comparable allegations of racial or gender bias, finding that the former elicited more guilt and concern, while the latter elicited more amusement. Similarly, Woodzicka, Mallet,
Hendricks, and Pruitt (2015) found that participants rated racist jokes worthier of confrontation relative to sexist jokes. Woodzicka et al. (2015) additionally surveyed lay ideas of suitable responses to prejudiced jokes, finding that participants deemed it more appropriate to label racist jokes as racist relative to sexist jokes as sexist. In light of these findings, future work may hope to counter the third-party bias in favor of confronters (O’Connor & Monin, 2016) by including a confrontation of prejudice typically viewed as less worthy of confrontation, such as sexism.

Finally, the present study sought to use a non-accommodating and non-promoting confrontation as a purely ‘educational’ control condition without the key traits of call-out or call-in classes of confrontation. However, manipulation checks indicate that participants responded to this ‘neutral’ condition very similarly to the call-out condition, suggesting that this confrontation was not a successful control condition. The lack of differences in ratings of the confronter between call-out and educational confrontations suggest that key factor differentiating call-in and call-out confrontations may have been solely accommodation or the public/private distinction, not self-presentation. Participants rated the confronter in the educational and call-out conditions at similar levels of avoiding negative consequences and punishment motivations, and rated the educational confronter as having only marginally less self-promotion motives than the call-out condition. As the call-in condition differed from call-out in accommodation and self-presentation while the educational confrontation only differed in lack of self-promotion, these findings suggest that in the present study differences in inferred motivation were largely accommodation-driven. Given the importance of self-promotion motives to lay categorizations of call-out confrontations, future studies should attempt to reconcile these
discrepancies and perhaps prime self-promotion with more varied means. Moreover, while private one-on-one confrontations are by nature more accommodating, the confrontation styles employed by the present study do conflate accommodation level and public vs. private context. It would be beneficial for future studies to extend these findings to reconcile whether the differences in inferred confronter motive are due to public/private context, accommodation, or both.

**Conclusion**

The present study examined the impact of confronter accommodation and self-presentation style (i.e., confrontation style) on third-party perceptions of confronter motivation and confrontation outcomes, connecting accommodation to persuasion research in the context of confronting prejudice (Gervais & Hillard, 2014). Moreover, the study comprised new directions in research on confronting prejudice, which has not yet to my knowledge examined accommodation as a factor impacting confrontation outcomes or lay perceptions of confronter motivation. As such, the findings of the present study may have implications for research on factors that improve confrontation outcomes and additionally may provide a route to better contextualize and understand lay distinctions between different types of confrontations: call-outs and call-ins. The proposed study comprises a novel addition to areas of work on CAT, confronting prejudice, and in particular, lay understandings of, expectations about, and responses to different classes of confrontation.

Additionally, the consideration of accommodation and self-promotion as factors underlying lay distinctions between call-in and call-out confrontations may speak to much popular discourse on morality and political correctness. Recent work by Sawaoka
and Monin (2018), for example, examined individuals’ perceptions of confronters who expressed individual or participated in viral moral outrage in response to prejudiced comments and photos posted online. The researchers found that a commenter participating in viral outrage was seen more negatively relative to those with nonviral outrage, due to viral outrage eliciting sympathy for the target of outrage. Lay perceptions appear to acknowledge an individual’s anger over prejudiced comments as reasonable, but the sum of the same anger in every member of a crowd is perceived as cruel.

Discourse on call-out culture often cites practices analogous with nonaccommodation – public or online shaming rather than education, assumption of malintent, and a lack of productive dialogue – with an emphasis on enhancing the confronter’s credentials (Friedersdorf, 2017). Such invocations of call-out culture have been misused to silence stigmatized groups’ anger and often conflate holding individuals accountable for their actions or words with persecution (e.g., Scott, 2018). Similarly, drawing together CAT, confronting prejudice, and factors impacting successful persuasion in this way is not without theoretical roots. Respectability politics, or the expectation that marginalized groups should gain social standing by proving the similarity of their values to those of dominant groups, not by challenging said groups (Higginbotham, 1992; see also Smith, 2014), has often been applied to discourse on protest and confronting prejudice. Respectability politics, in this way, are deeply related to discourse on ‘call-out culture.’ Activist and scholar Lorde (1997), for example, remarks that calls for protest to be more ‘respectable,’ quieter, or more polite are often used to undermine calls for social change and justice, and to draw more attention to the medium than the message itself (e.g., see King, 2016).
To be clear, then, the present study’s interest in potential positive outcomes of accommodating to facilitate a ‘call-in’ during confrontations of prejudice refers to non-target confrontations (e.g., those between a White target and White confronter), and is not intended to substantiate the use of respectability politics to silence or censor target anger. Nor is my intent to obviate other benefits, such as the benefits associated with members of target groups discovering allies (e.g., Schneider, Wesselmann, & DeSouza, 2017) who are seen as truly offering support, rather than performing activism. I propose that ‘calling-out’ in non-target confrontations, or those where the confronter is not a member of the discriminated-against group in question, may benefit from accommodation. In particular, one downside of ‘calling out’ rather than ‘calling in’, is the lack of education and information involved and while it is not stigmatized groups’ responsibility to educate their oppressors, it is the responsibility of groups in power to educate their own.

Research has demonstrated that non-target confrontations are less likely to be labelled an overreaction (Czopp & Monteith, 2003) or complaining (Eliezer & Major, 2012), that target confrontations are less persuasive relative to non-target interactions (Rasinski & Czopp, 2010), and that confrontations by a non-targets are deemed more appropriate relative to the same confrontation from a target confronter (Czopp et al., 2006). This body of work clearly demonstrates the added importance of non-targets, whose confrontations can be more effective and result in fewer interpersonal losses for the confronter, having effective and educational confrontations. Thus, the present study’s findings hope to elucidate two useful factors underlying lay distinctions between call-out and call-in confrontations and lay judgements of effectiveness – accommodation and self-promotion – that non-target confronters can consider when addressing instances of
discrimination affecting other groups. In this way, the present study sought to empirically investigate the upsides of perpetrating call-in confrontations over call-outs when possible in the interest of more successfully changing minds and sharing knowledge.
Table 1

Estimated marginal means (evaluated at Mean Theories of Prejudice Malleability = 4.07) and standard deviations of the estimate for Perceived Confronter Motivation, Expected Internalization, and Expected Compliance by Confrontation Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confrontation Style</th>
<th>Call-in</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Call-out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Confronter Motivation</td>
<td>5.98&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>5.43&lt;sup&gt;b**&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Internalization</td>
<td>4.04&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.73&lt;sup&gt;b†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Compliance</td>
<td>4.38&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>4.25&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Within rows, like subscripts indicate no difference.

*<sup>**</sup>p < .0005, †p = .066
Table 2

Means and standard deviations of Confronter Motivation sub-scales between Confrontation Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confrontation Style</th>
<th>Call-in</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Call-out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid Negative Consequences</td>
<td>5.66a</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>4.32b**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>1.85a</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.61b**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Promotion</td>
<td>1.74a**</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.79a†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism/Education</td>
<td>5.82a</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>5.77a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Within rows, like subscripts indicate no difference.

** *p ≤ .001, ** *p < .05, † p = .061
Figure 1. Mean perceptions of confronter motivations between Call-in, Educational, and Call-out confrontation styles. Higher values indicate more positive inferred motivations. Error bars represent +/- 1 SD.
Figure 2. Mean expected target internalization between Call-in, Educational, and Call-out confrontation styles. Higher values indicate more expected internalization. Error bars represent +/- 1 SD.
Figure 3. A mediation model in path diagram form examining the relationship between confrontation style, perceived confronter motivation, and expected internalization (\( ** p < .01, *** p < .0005 \)).
Figure 4. A mediation model in path diagram form examining the relationship between confrontation style, perceived confronter motivation, and expected compliance (***p < .01, ****p < .0005).
Appendix A

Experimental Conditions, Full Text

Participants in the call-out (non-promoting and appropriate-accommodation) confrontation style condition will read:

“Just before class begins, another student named Will speaks up in front of the group in response. He says, ‘Hey man, I don’t care how you meant it, but you need to be careful making assumptions like that. Not all the Black students here are athletes – and plenty of White kids dropped the class too. Obviously not everyone does the extra work to be mindful about these things, but you shouldn’t stereotype like that. Plenty of people already assume the Black kids only got in here on athletic scholarships without your going around implying Black students aren’t smart. I’ve looked at the class profile and you should too – these last couple years are like the most diverse yet – they can’t all be athletes. Anyway, what you said came across wrong to anyone who knows the student profile.’”

Participants in the educational (non-promoting and non-accommodating) confrontation style condition will read:

“Just before class begins, another student named Will speaks up in front of the group in response. He says, ‘Hey man, I don’t care how you meant it, but you need to be careful making assumptions like that. Not all the Black students here are athletes – and plenty of White kids dropped the class too. You shouldn’t stereotype like that. Plenty of people already assume the Black kids only got in here on athletic scholarships without your going around implying Black students aren’t smart. Look at the class profile – these last couple years are like the most
diverse yet – they can’t all be athletes. Anyway, what you said probably came across wrong to some of our classmates.’”

Participants in the call-in (non-promoting and appropriate-accommodation) confrontation style condition will read:

“Just before class begins, another student named Will, draws Adam aside to the hallway outside the classroom and says, ‘Hey man, I’m sure you didn’t mean it this way, but you might want to be careful making assumptions like that. Not all the Black students here are athletes – and plenty of White kids dropped the class too. I know you didn’t mean anything by it, but it’s probably better not to stereotype like that. Plenty of people already assume the Black kids only got in here on athletic scholarships without folks going around implying Black students aren’t smart. You might consider looking at the class profile – these last couple years are like the most diverse yet – they can’t all be athletes. Anyway, what you said might have come across wrong to some of our classmates.’”
Appendix B

Novel measures, Full Text

Confronter Motivation Questionnaire

“How much did each of these factors contribute to Will’s motivation for confronting Adam?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much so</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. _____ Will wanted to make Adam feel bad about his comment.
2. _____ Will assumed Adam didn’t know the implications of what he said.
3. _____ Will wanted to show off his own knowledge on the topic.
4. _____ Will wanted to help Adam avoid a worse callout.
5. _____ Will wanted to help Adam avoid being misunderstood in the future.
6. _____ Will wanted to make Adam look bad.
7. _____ Will wanted to let other students know that the class is a safe space.
8. _____ Will was trying to suppress Adam’s free speech.
9. _____ Will was trying to patronize Adam.
10. _____ Will was trying not to be a bystander.
11. _____ Will was trying to make himself look better by putting Adam down.
12. _____ Will wanted Adam to understand the harms his comment could cause.
13. _____ Will wanted to help Adam avoid embarrassing himself.
14. _____ Will assumed Adam had bad intentions.

Confrontation Outcomes Questionnaire

“How likely are each of these outcomes of Adam and Will’s interaction?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. _____ Adam will make comments like these again publicly (e.g., in future classes).
2. _____ Adam will not make comments like these again privately (e.g., among friends).
3. _____ Adam will understand the implications of his comment.
4. _____ The confrontation will not encourage Adam to learn about stereotypes.
5. _____ Adam will not truly question how his behavior may impact others.
6. _____ In the future, Adam will be more likely to make comments like these.
7. _____ Adam will take responsibility for what he said.
8. _____ The confrontation will encourage Adam to change the way he thinks.
9. _____ Adam will try to avoid Will.
10. _____ Adam will confront others in the future if he sees people using stereotypes.

Compliance vs. Internalization Questionnaire

“As a result of Will confronting Adam…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much so</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. _____ To what extent will Adam change his public behavior.
2. _____ How likely is it that Adam will not change his public behavior or private beliefs.
3. _____ To what extent will Adam change his private beliefs.

Liking, Similarity, Empathy Questionnaire

“Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements using the scale below.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much so</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. _____ I empathize with Adam.
2. _____ I see myself as similar to Adam.
3. _____ I do not like Adam.
4. _____ I empathize with Will.
5. _____ I do not see myself as similar to Will.
6. _____ I like Will.

Open-ended Questions

“Please answer the following open-ended questions honestly and with as much detail as you can. We are interested in your honest thoughts and opinions. There are no right or wrong answers.”

1. Is there anything else Will should have said to make this a more effective interaction?
2. Is there anything Will should not have said to make this a more effective interaction?
3. What would you have said to Adam?
4. If Adam chooses to make similar comments again, what do you think is the cause?
5. If Adam chooses not to make similar comments again, what do you think is the cause?
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