Perceptions of People with Disabilities: When is Accommodation Fair?

Cite: Paetzold, R., García, M. F., Colella, A., Ren, R., Triana, M., Ziebro, M. (2008). Perceptions of people with disabilities: When is "reasonable" accommodation fair? Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 30, 27-35. doi: 10.1080/01973530701665280.

Link to final paper at Taylor & Francis web site:
http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01973530701665280#.VavN61tRFjo

Abstract

We experimentally examined fairness perceptions of accommodating people with disabilities by manipulating the granting of an accommodation, reward structure, and the person who performed best on a word search task. Data from 134 undergraduate students indicated that granting an accommodation was seen as less fair than not granting it, that having a person with a disability excel in performance was seen as less fair than when the person did not excel, and that fairness perceptions were lowest when the person with a disability received an accommodation and excelled in her performance . Results show a perplexing paradox: The intent of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) may be to level the playing field for people with disabilities, but when the provisions of an accommodation help the requester, others think it is unfair.

Keywords: Accommodation Fairness – Disability – Performance – Cooperation - Competition

Perceptions of People with Disabilities: When is Accommodation Fair?

The granting of an accommodation to a person with a disability is a major stipulation of the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which was originally proposed as a way of reducing discrimination against those with disabilities by leveling the playing field at work for them. Accommodations for people with disabilities can take many forms, ranging from architectural improvements to providing special software for people with sensory impairments to allowing people more flexible work schedules to accommodate their medication schedule. The purpose of an accommodation is to allow people with disabilities the same advantages and opportunities at work as those without disabilities.

When the ADA first came into effect, employers were very concerned about the financial cost of accommodating people with disabilities. These fears were unfounded (Lee & Newman, 1995), but once they abated, new fears arose about the potential for some employees to abuse the accommodation stipulation or the possible unfairness to other employees when employees with disabilities receive accommodations (Colella, 2001; West & Cardy, 1997). Recently, Colella and her colleagues have put forth two conceptual models to explain the conditions under which coworkers will find accommodations to be both distributively (Colella, 2001) and procedurally (Colella, Paetzold, & Belliveau, 2004) unfair. Understanding the conditions under which coworkers' fairness perceptions are reduced in the context of granting an accommodation may help in attenuating potential negative effects for the accommodated person.

Colella (2001) argued that accommodations may be perceived by others to be distributively unfair because they will tilt the equity equation in favor of the person being accommodated. Providing an accommodation can affect fairness perceptions of coworkers by influencing all four aspects of the equity comparison (Adams, 1965). First, accommodations

may be perceived as reducing the accommodated person's inputs, while retaining the same outcomes as others. An accommodation that is perceived as making the accommodated person's job easier would be one such outcome. One example of this surfaced when golfer Casey Martin asked to play in a Professional Golf Association tournament using a golf cart (Ritter, 2000). Other players protested because they felt that it made it easier for him to play, thus providing an unfair advantage. Second, accommodations may be viewed as making one's own inputs greater, such as when coworkers feel that the accommodation is making their own jobs more difficult, time consuming, or unpleasant. For example, if an accommodation requires that someone be excused from a stressful aspect of the job, coworkers may be required to fill-in and perform more of these stressful parts of the job.

Third, accommodations may be construed as being a valuable outcome that is provided to another but not to oneself. For example, accommodations such as special chairs, flexible hours, rest periods, working at home, and exemption from stressful tasks may be viewed by others as desirable outcomes or perks and therefore seen as unfair outcomes. Finally, accommodations for others can be perceived as reducing one's own outcomes. An accommodation may require resources or effort on the part of coworkers, and perhaps, in actuality or in coworkers' perceptions, be detrimental to coworkers' abilities to perform their own jobs or to the satisfaction they derive from their jobs. Also, an accommodation may be viewed as using up valuable resources that could be given to or used by others. For example, when money is spent on special assistive technology, coworkers may think that the money could have been used for more personally beneficial causes (even if this is unlikely). Finally, if rewards are meted out on a competitive basis (e.g., merit pay and promotions), certain accommodations may be viewed as providing a performance advantage, making the accommodated person more competitive in the eyes of coworkers.

It is important for organizations to be able to identify situations in which coworkers are likely to have negative attitudes about accommodations, because negative consequences for persons receiving the accommodations can result (e.g., social isolation, loss of status, negative stereotyping, harassment, or other discriminatory conduct). Armed with such knowledge, organizations can identify the circumstances in which it may be effective to provide education and training about the nature of the ADA, types of disabilities that may require particular forms of accommodation, and the role that such accommodations play for employees with disabilities. They may also be able to take other actions, such as redistribute workloads in ways that are perceived to be more fair, or provide some forms of accommodation (e.g., those viewed as perks) to *all* employees (for example, new chairs, soft music, or more flexible schedules).

The present study is a test of some of the factors that may influence perceptions of accommodations, and thus, one of the first empirical tests of the conditions influencing fairness perceptions of accommodating people with disabilities. In this study participants performed a timed task. The requested accommodation was more time on the task, one of the most common accommodations in both the US and the UK (Bruyère, Erickson, & VanLooy, 2004). This accommodation was requested for disability (dyslexia) reasons. Participants were told that someone had a disability, although this disclosure would be impermissible under the ADA. We disclosed this information to make participants aware of the characteristics of the accommodation and the type of disability for purposes of the laboratory study. In real life, accommodations such as allowing more time for a task might signal some type of disability to coworkers, and their reactions to the accommodation would be based on their suspicions.

The requested accommodation was one that would help the accommodated person's performance. Since this accommodation was one in which performance would be affected, we

argue that participants would think the accommodation would be less fair if it were granted than if it were denied. The reasoning behind this is simple. Since this is a timed task and performance is being measured, the accommodation would make the task easier (i.e., by providing more time) than would no accommodation. Thus, the accommodation should be perceived as unfair.

Furthermore, since the accommodation was requested for dyslexia, an invisible disability, we would predict that the accommodation would be perceived as less fair if it were granted compared to denied. One major issue in coworkers' reactions to accommodation is whether or not the coworker is perceived to have a "legitimate" disability (Colella, 2001). It seems reasonable to assume that if coworkers are told that a person is being given an accommodation because of his or her disability, they will make judgments about whether that person truly has a disability warranting an accommodation. When a disability is invisible, coworkers may believe that the person with the disability is actually faking the disability to get an accommodation. Thus we hypothesize that participants will perceive an accommodation that is granted as less fair than an accommodation that is denied.

We also examined two additional conditions posited by Colella (2001) that were predicted to affect others' perceptions of the fairness of an accommodation: the performance rewards of the accommodated person and the degree of competitiveness of the work situation. Although providing an accommodation in itself should produce perceptions of unfairness, these perceptions are likely to be more negative when the accommodated person outperforms others (Colella, 2001). If the accommodated person performs better than others, then he or she may obtain better outcomes (as was the case in the present study). Second, since people often characterize people with disabilities as unfortunate and incompetent (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002), then to have a person with a disability outperform them may be particularly ego

threatening. If the enhanced performance is attributed to the accommodation, then the accommodation is likely to be perceived as unfair. Thus, we hypothesize that participants' perceptions of fairness of the accommodation will be less fair when the accommodated person performs better than others compared to when the accommodated person does not. We also hypothesize that there will be an interaction between accommodation and performance of the requesting person, such that the negative effect of granting an accommodation on fairness perceptions will be greatest when the accommodated person outperforms others.

Finally, we expect that the granting of an accommodation would be perceived as more unfair in competitive situations than in cooperative situations. Past work has found that people without disabilities tend to avoid and be more negatively biased towards persons with disabilities in competitive situations (Stone & Michaels, 1993). Thus, competitive situations are likely to bring about negative attitudes towards people with disabilities, which would make accommodations for them seem less acceptable. In addition, based on cooperation-competition theory (Deutsch, 2000), cooperative situations should attenuate perceptions of accommodation unfairness. Cooperation is based on the value of reciprocity, which implies fairness (Deutsch, 2000). In cooperative situations people tend to help others, to look at others as part of oneself, to develop friendlier interpersonal relationships, and to have open communication (Deutsch, 1973). Thus, in cooperative situations people will be more willing to accept accommodations to others as fair. Also, in cooperative situations there is more interdependence among everyone involved. Because respondents' own outcomes depend on the performance of the accommodation requester, respondents should feel that an accommodation is fair because it will enhance their own outcomes, as well as those of the requester. Thus, we propose that there will be an interaction between accommodation and competitiveness of the situation such that (a) the

negative effect of granting an accommodation on fairness perceptions will be greater when the situation is competitive as compared to cooperative, and (b) fairness perceptions of a denied accommodation will be more negative in a cooperative situation compared to a competitive situation.

Method

Sample

The data were collected at a southwestern university in the United States, with 163 undergraduate students from a management class participating in an experiment in exchange for extra credit. Females represented 53.4% of the sample. The modal age was twenty-one years old. The majority of the students were White (73.6%), followed by Hispanic (19%), African-American (4.3%), Asian-American (1.2%), or Other (.6%). Over 70% of the students had full-time work experience, and except for five participants, everybody had part-time work experience. Some participants told the experimenter at the end of the study that they either had previous experience with people who had dyslexia (e.g., friends or coworkers) or that they themselves had a learning disability. Such participants were excluded from analysis. We also eliminated those participants who did not believe that the confederate had a disability or had too many missing values on key variables. This resulted in data from 135 participants to be used in the analysis.

Procedure

Students were recruited in Spring 2005 to participate in a task about performance and rewards. Three factors were manipulated in the experiment. First, the accommodation was either granted or denied. Second, the participants in the experiment either competed with each other as individual members within a group for individual rewards (competition condition) or

they cooperated as members of a group to get rewards (cooperation condition). In the third manipulation, either the confederate was the highest performing individual (confederate is top performer) or some other participant was (other person is top performer). The confederate in this study was a female graduate student who indicated, for purposes of this study, that she had dyslexia that resulted in reading difficulties. Thus, the experiment consisted of a two (accommodation granted/ accommodation denied) by two (competition/cooperation) by two (confederate/other is top performer) factorial design.[1]

Task

Participants performed a word search task. Given the word "remembrance," they had to come up with as many different words that could be formed from subsets of its letters as possible within 5 minutes. Each new word was required to be at least 3 letters in length; if participants repeated the word "remembrance" it was not counted. Prior to the task, participants were given two different practice word search tasks to make sure they understood the purpose of the task.

The Experiment

At the beginning of the session all participants and the confederate met in a room where the experimenter introduced the study. The experimenter gave each individual an information sheet explaining the purpose of the study (which was supposedly the effect of rewards on performance). The confederate pretended to have difficulty reading this information sheet and continued reading beyond the time when all of the other participants had signaled, by looking up, that they had finished reading. All participants noticed that it took the confederate longer to read the information sheet. The confederate then asked the experimenter if she could talk to her in private for a minute. The experimenter responded that she would take the other participants to their individual rooms and that she would be back to talk to her.

The experimenter then led the other participants into separate windowless rooms one by one and gave them an introduction handout, a scantron, and two practice word search task exercises. Although participants could not see each other, they could hear the doors to the other rooms opening and closing. After taking each of the participants to their individual rooms, the experimenter went back to talk to the confederate for a minute. At this point, the confederate's role was fulfilled and she left the room quietly. However, the experimenter still pretended to lead the confederate to a room. [Throughout the duration of the experiment, the experimenter always entered the "confederate's room" as she went from room to room in order to give the impression that the confederate was present and participating in the study.] Ten minutes later, the experimenter collected the scantrons with participants' names (for administrative purposes) and gave participants their first set of questionnaires intended to assess the Big Five personality traits (Goldman, 1999)[2] and demographic variables.

Fifteen minutes later, the experimenter gave participants a handout that explained how they could win money in the word search task. In the competition condition, participants were told, "The person with the largest number of correct words will receive $3. No one else will receive any money." In the cooperation condition, they were told, "You will be rewarded as a group. If the average number of words for your group members exceeds 25, then you will each get $2. Also, the person who has the most words will get another $1, for a total of $3. If the average of your group members' scores is less than 25 words, then no one will get the $2. However, the person scoring the highest will get $1."

At the same time, the experimenter also manipulated the granting or denying of accommodation. In the accommodation granted condition, the experimenter said: "One of the other participants, Monique [the confederate] asked to have an extra three minutes on the task

because she has a learning disability. She said she usually gets extra time on tests and assignments, and I decided to give Monique the extra three minutes she requested to work on the word search task. Here is the word search task. I'll knock on the door and pick yours up after 5 minutes and then ask you to wait for Monique." In the accommodation denied condition the experimenter said "… But I decided not to give Monique the extra three minutes for the word search task … I'll knock on the door and pick up everyone's task after 5 minutes."

After the word search task was completed, the experimenter counted the number of correct words written by each participant. This information was only used for the purpose of awarding the money to the person(s) who actually performed best (awarded at the end of the experiment). First, however, the experimenter announced a "fake" top performer (this person was selected at random). Whenever possible, the announced fake top performer was always a female (chosen at random from the names of the female participants), in order to keep gender constant in conditions where the confederate (a female) did not perform best. If there were fewer than two females in the session, and the manipulation required that the confederate did not perform best, then a male was announced as the top performer (name was chosen at random from the names of the male participants).[3]

After counting the words, the experimenter performed the third manipulation. In the competition condition, when the "confederate performs best" condition applied, the experimenter announced the results of the word search task by saying, "Monique had the highest score of 'x' words, so she gets $3," and when it did not apply (i.e., other is top performer), the experimenter announced the results by saying, "Cathy (Susan, or Sarah, etc.) had the highest score of 'x' words, so she gets $3." In the cooperation condition, the experimenter said, "The average of your group is above 25, so your group wins and everyone gets $2. In addition, Monique (or

Cathy, Susan, or Sarah etc., in the other is top performer condition) has the highest number of correct words and gets an additional $1, for a total of $3." The experimenter then distributed a second questionnaire with questions regarding the manipulation checks. After several minutes, the experimenter entered each room and gave each participant a fake debriefing handout that said that the purpose of the study was to examine how different kinds of rewards and reward structures influence individual performance. It further explained that they were randomly assigned to individual reward or group reward structures and how monetary rewards had been determined. It finished by asking participants not to share the purpose of the study or the manipulations used within it with future participants.

Because we were interested in assessing fairness perceptions of the accommodation, which was supposedly a naturally occurring event and not an experimental condition, we had to appear informal, acting "on the spur of the moment," to obtain participants' reactions to the accommodation. After participants were given the fake debriefing form, the experimenter told participants: "Because there was someone with dyslexia, the study changed a little bit today. But we are really interested in keeping this experiment fair, so could you please answer these remaining questions I've thrown together? You can answer the questions directly on this sheet of paper." The experimenter gave the participants a photocopy of a short set of hand-written questions that appeared to have been written by the experimenter only a few minutes earlier during the experiment itself. (Actually, the questions were prepared beforehand by the researchers to measure the dependent variable of the study, fairness of the accommodation, and one manipulation check about the granting of the accommodation.) The participants were given about five minutes to complete these last questions. After the participants completed the questions, the experimenter debriefed each of the participants, distributed the monetary rewards

(based on actual performance in the task), thanked them for participating, and told them they were free to leave.

Manipulation Checks

To test for competitive versus cooperative conditions, seven Likert-type items were averaged, with sample items including "Only the individual winner got money" and "Because the reward was based on group performance, my chances of winning were based on the total of my group's performance." An F test indicated that participants distinguished between the two condition ($F(1, 130) = 429.67$, $p < .001$. Also, participants knew whether the confederate had been accommodated ("Monique was given 3 more minutes for the word search task"), $F(1, 133) = 534.13$, $p < .001$.

Measures

Fairness of the Accommodation

We measured fairness of the accommodation with three items using a Likert-type format from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree: "Monique had an unfair advantage in this competition, " "Monique got a bigger reward than she should have," and "What happened with Monique hurt my chances of winning more money." All three items were reverse scored, with a Cronbach's alpha of .77. High scores indicated high perceptions of fairness of the accommodation. A composite measure of fairness was obtained by averaging across the three items.

Control Variables

In addition to Goldman's (1999) personality scale mentioned earlier, we also included gender as a control variable because gender may influence perceptions and/or stereotypes regarding disability (see Stone & Colella, 1996 for a review). Finally, we controlled for work

experience, because those with greater work experience may have been exposed to situations of accommodations being granted at work, causing them to have different perceptions than those who have not been exposed.

Results

Correlations, means, and standard deviations are shown in Table 1. We tested the hypotheses with ANCOVA. We first predicted that participants in the study would perceive more unfairness when an accommodation was granted compared with when an accommodation was denied. As expected, there was a main effect for accommodation, $F(1, 112)= 8.14$, $p < .01$, with $M = 3.80$ when the accommodation was granted and $M = 4.25$ when the accommodation was denied. There was also a main effect for who performed best (whether the confederate or the participant), $F(1, 112)= 4.36$, $p < .05$. As expected, the most unfair perceptions occurred when the confederate performed the best ($M = 3.86$) compared with when the confederate did not perform the best ($M= 4.19$). Thus, our second prediction was supported. We also found support for the interaction effect—as expected, participants perceived more unfairness when the accommodation was granted and the confederate performed best, $F(1, 112)= 5.82$, $p < .05$, with the mean in this condition being significantly different from the means in the other three conditions (see Table 2). The proposed interaction effect between accommodation and competition was not significant, $F(1, 112)= .09$, $p > .05$.

Discussion

Since the passage of the ADA, scholars have pursued the study of its effects on people with disabilities, mainly, whether or not the application of this act has reduced discrimination at work. Although the ADA seems to have decreased the impact of discrimination (Corrigan, 2005), there still remain problems, maybe because there are many stakeholders who have a say

(under the law or not) on the implementation of this act (Colella, 2001). In this article, we studied one stipulation of this act and its relationship to one of the many stakeholders: peers.

We found that peers perceive unfairness when a confederate receives an accommodation. This is unaffected by whether the members of the group session are competing as individuals or cooperating as a group. In other words, we found a main effect for accommodation being granted to a person with dyslexia, but no interaction based on the interdependence of the group members. This result was surprising because in the cooperation condition, the outcome for the group should have been positively enhanced by the accommodation. Other theoretical and empirical evidence has suggested that accommodations are perceived more positively in cooperative than competitive situations (e.g., Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Stone & Michaels, 1993). One possible reward-related explanation is that it was difficult for participants to assess their expected rewards, being unsure how the accommodation of one person in the group would raise the group's chances, relative to their individual chance, of receiving a monetary award. Another possible explanation is that intangible, nonfinancial rewards (e.g., recognition) accrued to the winner even in the cooperative condition, and these intangible rewards may have been salient relative to the small monetary rewards used in our experiment.

We also examined whether outcome had an effect on peers' perceptions of fairness of the accommodation and, as expected, we found that when the confederate performed the best, peers had negative perceptions. In other words, peers see an accommodation as less fair when the person with a disability who receives the accommodation outperforms others. Further, peers' fairness perceptions were the lowest when the confederate was granted an accommodation and was the top performer. This was true in our study even though the absolute dollar amount awarded to the top performer was quite small, making the results seem quite robust. Our results

are in line with literature that found that when the situation is important for the perceiver, then negative reactions occur (Colella, DeNisi, & Varma, 1998; Gibbons, Stephan, Stepahnson, & Petty, 1980; Paetzold, García, & Colella, 2005; Piner & Kahle, 1984; Stone & Michaels, 1993, 1994). Our results mean that peers are more likely to perceive unfairness when there are attempts at leveling the playing field through the granting of an accommodation, especially when the person receiving the accommodation is recognized as also being the top performer.[4]

The results of this study imply a self-serving bias. Participants perceived the results as fair only when the outcomes of the task were favorable to them (and not the person receiving the accommodation). This result is congruent with other management, social psychology, and economic research that consistently shows that when outcomes are less favorable to the self, then more unfair perceptions will occur (e.g., Babcock, Loewenstein, Issacharoff, & Camerer, 1995; Charness & Haruvy, 2000; Dahl & Ransom, 1999; Messick & Sentis, 1979). Similarly, justice researchers (Folger,1987; Grienberger, Rutte, & Van Knippenberg, 1997) have stated that people tend to be egoistically biased in their fairness perceptions when results are not to their advantage. Our results are therefore consistent with the notion that people are not particularly altruistic when it comes to accommodating a peer in the workplace.

Second, our results are also consistent with the notion of stigma, which is defined as a characteristic that "conveys a social identity that is devalued in some particular social context" (Crocker et al., 1998, p. 505). One particularly relevant stigma is the stigma of incompetence (Heilman & Haynes, 2004). Based on attribution theory (Kelly, 1987) and stereotypes concerning people with learning disabilities, participants may have discounted the possibility of the confederate being able to perform best. Thus, an alternative explanation for the outcome of the experiment is that participants may see accommodations as unfair as a result of seeing the

confederate as undeserving due to incompetence. The stigma of incompetence (Heilman & Haynes, 2004), which applies to race and sex in the context of affirmative action, may also therefore apply in the context of granting an accommodation. Other stigma associated with psychological disabilities may also play a role in perceptions that an accommodation is unfair—for example, the person may be stigmatized as childlike or irresponsible (e.g., Corrigan & Penn, 1999), and hence viewed as unsuitable for performing the task at hand.

The major strength of this laboratory study was that we were able to assess fairness perceptions of a disability accommodation. This issue is almost impossible to examine in the field due to privacy concerns. Thus, experimental laboratory research is appropriate, especially since this is an unexplored topic. However, this issue is also difficult to study in the laboratory because the experimenter must question participants about a supposedly chance occurrence (manipulation). We were able to assess these fairness perceptions without revealing the purpose of the study. In our manipulations we made sure to conceal the purpose of the study until the very end of the session (i.e., final debriefing). Several comments collected in protocols indicated that participants truly believed in the manipulation (and recall, the few that did not were eliminated from the final data analysis).

There were limitations to this research as well. We only examined one type of accommodation (more time) that was appropriate within the laboratory context. This is perhaps one of the most common accommodations among university student populations, so we selected an accommodation that is fairly representative. In the workplace, of course, other accommodations—e.g., the granting of flextime, working from home—might also be possible. Similarly, we examined only one type of impairment (dyslexia) leading to disability (difficulty in reading). Other types of impairments that may produce disabilities (particularly mental disorders

that lead to disabilities) may have more pronounced effects on the dependent variable and remain for further study. Our goal in this study was to focus on a disability that is widespread and is common for undergraduate students at the expense of more complex situations (e.g., other types of disabilities or accommodations).

This study points out a perplexing paradox. The intent of the accommodation stipulation of the ADA is to level the playing field for people with disabilities so that they can enjoy the same advantages of work that others do and perform at their highest potential. However, our results indicate that when the provisions of an accommodation help the requester, others think it is unfair, even in circumstances where they will be cooperating with the person receiving the accommodation for a common reward. As mentioned previously, these unfairness perceptions could lead to negative treatment for the person with the disability. Additionally, because of the potential for negative consequences, persons with disabilities, particularly hidden ones such as learning disorders, may decide not to request needed accommodations (Clair, Beatty, & Maclean, 2005). In both instances, the goals of the ADA would be frustrated. Therefore, organizations need to learn how to manage the accommodation process to avoid this paradox. They need to understand the combination of factors that can lead to perceptions of unfairness so that they can identify when to intervene in order to try to alter these perceptions, create a culture that welcomes accommodations for those who need them, and provide equal opportunity for persons with disabilities.

Conclusions

Results of this study are discouraging because they indicate that leveling the playing field for people with disabilities may have, as a corollary, unwelcome collateral effects. Researchers need to conduct further research on ways in which the granting of an accommodation causes the

least amount of disruption for everyone involved (for example, by granting all employees an additional small break during their workday or by educating workers on the role that extra time plays for employees with learning disorders). The granting of an accommodation needs to be perceived by all stakeholders as a fair process. In this way, the goals of the ADA can be met.

Endnotes

1. In each experimental session there were between 2 to 5 participants in addition to the confederate. An ANOVA to examine if there was any difference on participants' perceptions of fairness of the accommodation based on the number of participants per laboratory session showed no effect, $F(3, 131)= 0.48$, $p > .10$.

2. We used the Big Five Factor Markers (Goldman, 1999) as control variables because an earlier study had indicated that both agreeableness and openness to experience were positively related to perceptions of appropriateness of accommodations for persons with learning disabilities (García, Paetzold, & Colella, 2005). Cronbach's alphas were .83 for conscientiousness, emotional stability, and agreeableness, .81 for openness to experience, and .87 for extraversion. In the present study, only emotional stability demonstrated a significant positive impact on perceptions of the fairness of the accommodation, $F(1, 112) = 5.87$, $p < .05$).

3. We performed an *F* test comparing the two types of experimental sessions (those where there were at least two females as participants with those where there were fewer than two female participants) to analyze whether there was any difference in participants' perceptions of fairness of the accommodation. Results indicated no significant difference, $F(1,133)= 0.30$, $p > .10$.

4. As suggested by an anonymous reviewer, work by Crano and his colleagues (e.g., Crano & Prislin, 1995; Gorenflo & Crano, 1989) on vested interested also suggests that being interested in the outcome is associated with having one's attitudes more closely linked to one's behavior and/or judgments. Thus, because participants were actively involved in our study instead of being mere observers—i.e., their own rewards depended on the rewards given to the confederate—they were less likely to see good outcomes for the accommodated confederate as

fair. We therefore conducted an additional study to determine the effect of being a "mere observer" in the sense that one's rewards were totally unaffected by whether the accommodated confederate was also rewarded. We expected to find that for observers, perceptions of fairness would not be changed by whether the person with a disability was accommodated or received an equal reward. We repeated our original experimental conditions except that we changed the reward manipulation by allowing everyone who found 25 words within the word "remembrance" to win $2. Based on a sample of 109 participants, we found using ANCOVA that none of the manipulations—whether the confederate was accommodated ($F(1, 93) = 2.05$, $p > .10$), whether the confederate won ($F(1, 93) = .183$, $p > .60$), or whether the participant won ($F(1, 93) = 1.64$, $p > .20$)—was significantly related to judgments of fairness of the accommodation. Additionally, none of the interactions was significant (all $p > .10$). Mean fairness perceptions ranged (on a scale from 1 to 5) from 4.20 when the confederate was accommodated to 4.40 when she was not, and from 4.29 when the confederate was rewarded to 4.39 when she was not. Thus, the two studies taken together reveal that, as expected, peer perceptions of fairness of an accommodation are affected by the peers' own vested interest in the outcome: When their own rewards are determined in part as a result of rewards given to the accommodated person, they see the accommodation as unfair; when their own rewards are *lowered* as a result of rewards given to the accommodated person, they see the accommodation as even more unfair; but when their own rewards are unaffected by the rewards given to the person with a disability, their fairness perceptions remain the same regardless whether the person is accommodated or even rewarded equally to themselves.

References

Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 *et seq*. (1990).

Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.). *Advances in experimental psychology* (pp. 267-299). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Babcock, L., Loewenstein, S. I., & Camerer, C. (1995). Biased judgments of fairness in bargaining. *The American Economic Review*, 85, 1337-1343.

Bruyère, S. M., Erickson, W.A., & VanLooy, S. (2004). Comparative study of workplace policy and practices contributing to disability nondiscrimination. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 49, 28-38.

Charness, G., & Haruvy, E. (2000). Self-serving biases: Evidence from a simulated labour relationship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 7, 655-667.

Clair, J.A., Beatty, J.E., & Maclean, T.L. (2005). Out of sight but not out of mind: Managing Invisible social identities in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 78-95.

Colella, A., DeNisi, A., & Varma, A. (1998). The impact of ratee's disability on performance judgments and choice as partner: The role of disability-job fit stereotypes and interdependence of rewards. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 102-111.

Colella, A. (2001). Coworker distributive fairness judgments of the workplace accommodation of employees with disabilities. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 100-116.

Colella, A, Paetzold, R., & Belliveau, M. (2004). Factors affecting coworkers' procedural justice inferences of the workplace accommodation of employees with disabilities. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 1-23.

Corrigan, P. (2005). *On the stigma of mental illness: Practical strategies for research and social change*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Corrigan, P.W., & Penn, D.L. (1999). Lessons from social psychology on discrediting psychiatric stigma. *American Psychologist*, 54, 765-776.

Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. (1998). Social stigma. In D. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 504-553). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Dahl, G.B., & Ransom, M.R. (1999). Does where you stand depend on where you sit? Tithing donations and self-serving beliefs. *The American Economic Review*, 89, 703-727.

Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict*. New Haven, Yale University Press.

Deutsch, M. (2000). *The handbook of conflict resolution*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fiske, S.T., Cuddy, A.J.C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878-902.

Folger, R. (1987). Reformulating the preconditions of resentment: A referent cognitions model. In J. C. Masters & W. P. Smith (Eds.). *Social comparison, social justice, and relative deprivation: Theoretical, empirical and policy perspectives*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

García, M. F., Paetzold, R., & Colella, A. (2005). The relationship between personality and peers' judgments of the appropriateness of accommodations for individuals with disabilities. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35 (7), 1418-1439.

Gibbons, F. X., Stephan, W. G., Stephenson, B, & Petty, R. C. (1980). Reactions of stigmatized others: Response amplifications vs. sympathy. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 16, 591-605.

Goldman, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.). *Personality Psychology in Europe* (pp. 7-28). Tilburg, Tilburg University Press.

Grienberger, I. V., Rutte, C.G., & van Knippenberg, A. F. M. (1997). Influence of social comparisons of outcomes and procedures on fairness judgments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 913-919.

Heilman, M. E., & Haynes, M. C. (2004). Combating organizational discrimination: Some unintended consequences. In R. L. Dipboye & A. Colella (Eds.). *Discrimination at work* (pp. 353-377). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1989). *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Kelly, H. H. (1987). Attribution in social interaction. In E. Jones & D. E. Kanouse (Eds.). *Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior* (pp. 1-26). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lee, B., & Newman, K. (1995). Employer responses to disability: Preliminary evidence and a research agenda. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 8, 209-229.

Messick, D., & Sentis, K. (1979). Fairness and preference. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 15, 418-434.

Paetzold, R., García, M. F., & Colella, A. (2005). *Manipulating disability, accommodation, and outcomes: Peer perceptions of accommodation*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Piner, K. E., & Kahle, L. R. (1984). Adapting to the stigmatizing label of mental illness: Foregone but not forgotten. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 805-811.

Ritter, S. (2000, September 27). High court to hear case on PGA, golf-cart use. *The Wall Street Journal*, pp. B14.

Stone, D. L., & Michaels, C. (1993, August). *Factors affecting the acceptance of disabled individuals in organizations*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Atlanta, GA.

Stone, D. L., & Michaels, C. (1994, August). *Effects of nature of the disability and competitiveness of the reward system on selection of disabled team members*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Dallas, TX.

Stone, D. L., & Colella, A. (1996). A model of factors affecting the treatment of disabled individuals in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 352-401.

West, M. S., & Cardy, R. L. (1997). Accommodating claims of disability: The potential impact of abuses. *Human Resource Management Review*, 7, 233-246.

Table 1

Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations

Variables	Means	s.d.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Fairness of the Accommodation	4.01	.92								
2. Conscientiousness	6.18	1.26	-.11	α= .83						
3. Emotional Stability	5.63	1.31	.19*	-.22**	α=.83					
4. Openness to Experience	6.24	1.04	-.01	.08	.12	α= .81				
5. Agreeableness	7.10	1.08	.11	.18*	-.01	.18*	α= .83			
6. Extraversion	5.78	1.39	.02	-.04	.14	.35**	.26**	α=.87		
7. Gender	.58	.49	.07	-.03	-.29**	-.17*	.27**	.02	--	
8. Full-time work experience	1.96	.70	.04	.04	.09	-.02	-.16	-.02	.34**	--

Note. * Correlation < .05 level (2-tailed), ** Correlation < .01 level (2-tailed). Cronbach's α is on the diagonal.

Table 2

Mean Differences for Fairness of the Accommodation for the Interaction Accommodation by Performance

	Confederate Performs Best	Confederate Does Not Perform Best
Accommodation	3.45_b	4.15_a
No Accommodation	4.28_a	4.23_a

Note. Means with the same subscripts do not differ from each other.