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**Rounding out the conversation**

Use this worksheet to chart the shape of the conversation that you’re orchestrating in your annotated bibliography. By this point, you should be able to identify which source(s) will serve you in which capacities. Articulating that here will also help you to determine where there are gaps in your research that you will need to address. Please note that you may identify multiple uses for any given source (so that a source may appear in more than one block).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Source(s) that provide examples/ illustrations I can exploreNorstedt, M. (2019). Work and invisible disabilities: Practices, experiences and understandings of (non)disclosure. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*: SJDR, 21(1), 14-24. <https://doi.org/10.16993/sjdr.550>Using both the perspectives of the employer representatives and the persons with invisible disabilities, the article contributes with new knowledge by showing that these two groups have different understandings of disclosure. In the interviews the employer representatives referred to ‘ideal’ institutional practices and understandings in line with laws and guidelines, while the persons with invisible disabilities based their understandings of disclosure on their past experiences. The tension between the different understandings indicate that employers need a greater knowledge of the problem's persons with invisible disabilities face in working life and of how disclosure affects their work situations.Gray, A. W., Parkinson, B., & Dunbar, R. I. (2015). Laughter’s influence on the intimacy of self-disclosure. Human Nature: An Interdisciplinary Biosocial Perspective, 26(1), 28-43.It is suggested by current research theory that laughter works to build relationships between people. Therefore, laughter should be connected to interpersonal connection important to the development of relationships. To develop close social bonds, disclosing behaviors are seen as a way to help this process. It is thought that the act of laughing could momentarily reduce a laugher’s reluctance to disclose personal information. In this experiment, characteristics of self-disclosing statements produced by those who had watched previously one of three video clips differed in the extent to which they elicited laughter and positive affect. The results show that disclosure intimacy is significantly higher after laughter than in the control group. This suggests that this effect may be due, in part, to laughter itself. On the other hand, the research further indicates that an individual can feel shame for being laughed at for a disability. | Source(s) that provide useful vocabulary or theory I can borrowGreenberg, M., & Smith, R. A. (2016). Support seeking or familial obligation: An investigation of motives for disclosing genetic test results. *Health Communication, 31*(6), 668-78.Research found in their work that young people have a tendency to see more value in disclosure than those who are older. This tendency is in part based on upbringing and the perceived acceptability of disclosing personal information, such as genetic testing.Santuzzi, A. M., Waltz, P. R., Finkelstein, L. M., & Rupp, D. E. (2014). Invisible disabilities: Unique challenges for employees and organizations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* 7(2), 204-219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12134>Workers with invisible disabilities encounter unique challenges compared to workers with other concealable identities and even workers with visible disabilities. These challenges occur not only in the decisions of whether to disclose the invisible disability in the workplace but also in the detection and acceptance of having a disability to disclose. Disclosure of disabilities in the workplace likely has implications for the individual worker's health, social relationships, and work performance as well as for an employing organization's outcomes. A key issue is the requirement that workers with invisible disabilities disclose the disability to an employer in order to be covered by legislation. | Source(s) that complicate my thinking—raise questions or issues that I need to explore furtherSchumer, L. (2019). Disclosing your disability to your employer.*The New York Times.*Individuals with “visible” disabilities for the first time were presented with a choice of revealing their disability in the virtual learning environment or not? Is this different from people with invisible disabilities? |
| Source(s) that represent influential thinking on the subject (i.e. seminal works and/or those by respected scholars)Peck, B., & Kirkbride, L.T., (2011). Why businesses don’t employ people with disabilities*. Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 16, p. 71-75.This research is from a business perspective and shares the unspoken fears within theemployer community related to the hiring and advancement of people with disabilities. Itdiscusses the importance of understanding these fears and the strategies that will benecessary for combating these issues. Businesses seldom acknowledge the actual reason that stops them from hiring people with disabilities. It appears fear could be an overriding motivation for not hiring a personwith a disability.Afifi, T., & Steuber, K. (2009). The Revelation Risk Model (RRM): Factors that predict the revelation of secrets and the strategies used to reveal them. *Communication Monographs*, 76(2), 144-176.The primary goal of this research is to advance the risk revelation model (RRM) that explains the factors that predict when people will reveal or continue to conceal secrets. Among other things, people will assess the risks involved with the disclosure of secrets and that this risk assessment is what predicts people's "readiness" or willingness to reveal them. People are more willing to reveal their secrets under certain conditions: (1) for catharsis, (2) if the target needs to know/has the right to know the information, and (3) if other people (including the target) are encouraging the person to reveal the secret. Finally, the RRM assumes that people are more willing to actually reveal their secret when they have communication efficacy or they believe they have the ability to talk about it. As far as disclosure, it is a decision that necessitates weighing perceived outcomes and benefits with unknown results (Afifi & Steuber, 2009). | Source(s) that I want to counter in some wayBezyak, J., Moser, E., Chan, F., & Iwanaga, K. (2020). Predictors of automatic preference for people without disabilities over people with disabilities: A chi-squared automatic interaction detector analysis. *Rehabilitation Research, Policy, and Education*, 34(3), 159-175. <https://doi.org/10.1891/RE-20-15>Employers shy away from providing people with disabilities opportunities to secure employment. Results indicate that men over 55 without a disability, who scored neutral or high on explicit preference for people without disabilities, who are religious and conservative, are likely to have higher automatic and explicit preference for people without disabilities. A negative attitude regarding people with disabilities is often the result of lack of education of employers.Lu, W. (2020). How equity is lost when companies hire only workers with disabilities. *New York Times* (Online)A recent hiring strategy may win pats on the back, but advocates fear it may pigeonhole people with disabilities. But in the last five years, many businesses have adopted hiring practices that prioritize workers with disabilities, often receiving praise for their diverse hiring efforts. Some of these companies build their brands around hiring only people with disabilities, sometimes operating as charities to save money. In the technology sector, companies such as Microsoft have created programs designed for recruiting workers with autism.These well-intentioned strategies are an improvement from what are known as sheltered workshops, which disability rights advocates said can become exploitative make-work programs that paid below minimum wage and segregated them from the competitive work force and their communities.Advocates said this new targeted approach should not be the end goal because it could still sequester people with disabilities and limit their options for employment. | Source(s) whose thinking I really appreciate—whose values, language, approach have been formative for my projectBrostrand, H. L. (2006). Tilting at windmills: Changing attitudes toward people with disabilities. The Journal of Rehabilitation, 72(1), 4.An example of an organization that made a conscious effort made to increase diversity in the workplace includes developing strategies for hiring, advancing and retaining people with disabilities is Wells Fargo (Brostrand, 2006). The logic of this is also based on the enormous consumer market of potential customers that happen to have a relationship with people with disabilities, intimately or through personal contacts.Zollner, O. (2000). David L. Morgan/Richard A. krueger : *The focus group kit. 6 bande; thousand oaks, london, new delhi: Sage 1998, insgesamt 696 seiten.*  Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-000-0157-9There is a tendency to self-disclose in non-threatening and interim situations (Zollner, 2000); a person can open up to a perfect stranger sitting next to them, get into adeep conversation and then leave that situation. Once they leave that situation the individual can once again return to their anonymity without commitment to furthering the relationship. |