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GLOSSARY OF TERMS

This glossary is provided as an aid to the reader in distinguishing among the more commonly used terms within this body of research.

gender, the biological sex of an individual

gender of applicant, an independent variable in this experiment; the gender of a hypothetical individual applying for a hypothetical job

gender of subject, an independent variable in this experiment; the gender of an individual who evaluates the applicants

sex, synonymous with gender

sex role, a class of behaviors and personality traits which have been considered characteristic of individuals of a particular gender. Males and females can have either masculine, feminine, or androgynous sex roles. A masculine individual behaves in a manner that has traditionally been considered the appropriate way for men to behave. Feminine males and females act in a characteristically feminine manner, and androgynous individuals behave in both traditionally masculine and feminine ways depending on the situation

sex role of applicant, an independent variable in this experiment; the sex role of a hypothetical individual applying for a hypothetical job

sex role of job, an independent variable in this experiment; the classification of a job with reference to the gender-appropriateness of the work done on that job. The sex role of a job could be either masculine, feminine, or neutral, indicating that the position has traditionally been considered as appropriate for males, females, or both, respectively

sex role stereotype, the sex role which is automatically assigned to an individual on the basis of the gender of that individual

sex type, used in some studies to refer to sex role
In recent years, many studies of differences between the sexes have been conducted in industrial psychology. In general, findings have indicated that men and women have been differentially perceived with respect to appropriate work behavior, suitability for various positions, and causes for success. These differential perceptions can perhaps be used to account for widespread differences between men and women with respect to earnings, occupational status, and inclusion in the labor market. Although there has been a general feeling that employment opportunities for women have been improving, "a look at the growing female unemployment rate, the number of women and dependent children on welfare, and the increasing male-female salary differential show clearly that...the economic situation of women as a group is remaining constant or even getting worse." (Steinem, 1977, p. 51) The unemployment rate for women over the past decade and a half has consistently been higher than that for men. From 1973 to 1975, there has been a steady increase in unemployment rates for both men and women. The nationwide female unemployment rate in 1975 was 8% whereas the male unemployment rate was 6.7%. (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1976)
Why is it that women are having such a difficult time in entering and remaining in the labor market, especially in fields which have traditionally been male dominated? Perhaps there are some commonly held stereotypes about different jobs which effect the selection of applicants. Do decision makers select men or women for certain positions because of these stereotypes? This study proposes to look at some possible answers to these questions.

To begin, a review of the literature will be made. The literature review will cover different areas of research dealing with sex differences. First, an examination will be made of some research dealing with the development of the concept of sex role. Next, will be covered studies dealing with sex differences and/or sex discrimination in various employment settings which have been explained as due to sex role stereotypes. Finally, a look will be taken at research attempting other theoretical explanations of sex differences.

The Development of the Concept of Sex Role

Traditionally, research in this area has focused on simple male/female differences. An assumption that has been made in this research is that some fundamental differences, either innate or acquired, do exist between men and women. Thus, the dependent variable of interest in these studies is gender. Researchers who have taken this approach ignore the well documented finding that more variation in behavior occurs within each sex than across the sexes (cf., Anastasi, 1969).
If this finding is considered, it is then necessary to find some other variable which could explain sex differences yet also support the notion of within sex variation.

Learning is thought to be largely responsible for many sex typed behaviors (cf., Bem and Bem, 1970; Maccoby, 1966). Members of each sex learn appropriate sex typed behaviors through a socialization process. Although, traditionally, there was general agreement within a particular culture as to what behaviors were appropriate for each sex, many people, because of their own individual experiences, did not learn the appropriate role. Sex role, a class of behaviors which has been considered socially acceptable for a particular sex, is therefore a useful concept in explaining sex differences.

Research by Bem (1976) has indicated that members of each sex behave in the socially appropriate manner to a certain degree. Using a 1975 sample of Stanford undergraduates, Bem estimated that 37% of the male sample and 34% of the female sample could be classified as same sex type, i.e., males who were masculine and females who were feminine. Sex role was assessed using the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974).

With the BSRI, individuals rate themselves on several different personality or behavioral characteristics. The BSRI is then scored, and a person is classified as either masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated. (Originally, undifferentiated types were put in the
androgynous category, but this later was changed to conform with the theoretical definition of androgy (cf., Bem and Watson, 1976).

The concept of androgy as a sex role is an important idea introduced by Bem. Bem described the androgynous individual as follows: "both masculine and feminine, both assertive and yielding, both instrumental and expressive depending on the situational appropriateness of these various behaviors..." (Bem, 1974, p. 155) Thus masculinity and femininity are conceptualized as separate dimensions rather than opposite ends of the same dimension, i.e., possession of traits commonly ascribed to one sex does not obviate the possibility of also possessing traits ascribed to the other.

The undifferentiated individual is one who possesses few masculine or feminine traits. Persons in this classification are thought to be deficient as they possess few of the positive traits commonly ascribed to men or women. In the sample of Stanford students mentioned earlier, it was found that 21% of the males and 29% of the females were androgynous, 27% of the males and 20% of the females undifferentiated, and 16% of the males and 16% of the females were cross sex typed.

Thus individuals of both sexes can be classified as either masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated. It has been hypothesized, however, that the androgynous person, a male or female who possesses a high degree of both
masculine and feminine characteristics, will be able to respond appropriately in more situations than the sex typed or undifferentiated individual and that androgyny may be more representative of a healthy mental state. Bem's research has indicated that sex role is a more important variable than gender.

In an early study, Bem (1975) was interested in testing the hypothesis that androgynous subjects would perform effectively in both traditionally masculine and feminine situations. Using male and female students who had been classified as either masculine, feminine, or androgynous sex-typed by the BSRI, Bem found partial support for her hypothesis. On a masculine task, one where an individual would have to assert his/her opinion in order to be successful, male and female subjects who had been classified as masculine or androgynous sex-typed were more successful than feminine sex-typed subjects. There were no differences between men and women. In the feminine situation, playing with a kitten, it was seen as more desirable to behave in a nurturant fashion. Consequently, it was predicted that feminine and androgynous subjects of both sexes would be more successful. This prediction held true for male subjects but not for female subjects. The feminine sex-typed females were less involved with the kitten than other females.

In a later study, Bem retested her hypothesis using different feminine situations (Bem, Martyna, and Watson, 1976).
In the new situation, subjects had to successfully interact with a human baby or another student who had a problem. In both of these situations, the original hypothesis was confirmed: androgynous and feminine sex-typed subjects of both sexes were more successful than masculine sex-typed subjects, and gender was not a significant factor.

Other research on androgyny has indicated that sex-typed individuals are uncomfortable in cross sex-typed situations and further that they actively avoid engaging in such situations (Bem and Lenney, 1976). Also, androgynous subjects have been found to have higher self-esteem than sex-typed subjects (Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp, 1975). Such findings have led Spence, et al. to conclude that androgyny "may lead to the most socially desirable consequences, the absolute strengths of both components [masculine and feminine] influencing attitudinal and behavioral outcomes for the individual." (Spence, et al., 1975, p.35)

This last body of evidence seems to indicate that sex role rather than gender is a key variable. If more information about an individual stimulus person is given, i.e., information that would be indicative of sex role orientation, this should have an impact on perceptions of the stimulus person. Perceived gender differences have resulted when sex role information is minimized, but it is thought that when judgments are based on a larger amount of information, sex role differences will emerge.
One study which did look at the individual effects of gender and sex role was conducted by Friedland, Crockett, and Laird (1973). In this study, subjects rated descriptions of male and female stimulus persons who held either expressive (social worker), instrumental (engineer), or home (mother/housewife, husband/father) occupations. Analyses of ratings indicated that role was a significant variable but gender was not. Thus, when subjects were given information which allowed them to go beyond the commonly held stereotypes, they did not rate men and women differently.

Traditional studies appear to have achieved certain results because of commonly held sex role stereotypes. Information which is presented does not allow the subject to infer anything about sex role beyond these stereotypes, i.e., males have masculine sex roles, and females have feminine sex roles. Consequently, these common stereotypes are the only basis on which a judgment is made. A brief review of this literature will indicate how this is so.

Sex Role Stereotypes in the Employment Setting

Research by Schein (1973, 1975) has indicated that both male and female managers describe successful middle managers and men, in general, using similar terms. Subjects were given a list of adjectives and were asked to describe successful middle managers; men, in general; or women, in general. Due to the nature of the stimuli, it appears that only
stereotypes could be evoked.

Rosen and Jerdee found many differences in the treatment of male and female managers even when they were described using the same terms. The methodology for examining these differences was the use of in-basket items. Subjects were all given the same information about the manager in question, but for half, the manager had a female given name, and for the other half, a male given name. The nature of the information presented here was quite general. Using this technique, it was found that male business students discriminated against female managers on promotion, development, and supervision decisions, but they discriminated against male managers when it came to personal decisions involving family obligations (Rosen and Jerdee, 1974a). In another study (Rosen and Jerdee, 1974b), male business students also discriminated against females in decision to hire for a managerial position.

This latter finding was supported using both students and professional interviewers as subjects (Dipboye, Fromkin, and Wiback, 1975). Although the information received by the subjects was identical for the male and female applicant, the male applicant was given a higher rating.

In a replication and extension of the Dipboye, et al. study (1975), Dipboye, Arvey, and Terpstra (1977) investigated the possible interaction of rater sex and physical attractiveness and ratee sex and attractiveness. Subjects rated applicants to the position of sales management trainee on
willingness to hire and allotment of salary; there was also a ranking of the candidates for hiring choice. Relevant to the present discussion, it was found that student subjects were more willing to hire males than females. Attractive and unattractive males were rated higher than attractive and unattractive females, respectively; there were no gender differences with moderately attractive individuals, however. Higher salaries were also assigned to males over females, and males were favored over females on hiring choice. No differences among raters were found.

Cash, Gillen, and Burns (1977) also were interested in the evaluation of job applicants. In this study, professional personnel consultants evaluated applicants who varied on the dimensions of gender and attractiveness. Applicants were rated for one of six jobs, two of which represented each of three sex-types: masculine, feminine, and neuter. It was found that male subjects were rated higher than females for masculine jobs, females were evaluated more favorably for feminine jobs, and no gender differences were found for the neuter jobs.

Jones (1970) had supporting evidence for this effect in a different context. He looked at the hireability of male and female counselors. Subjects were educational administrators. In general, males were recommended for hiring more than females even though credentials for the two candidates were identical. This effect was more pronounced when
judgments were made in the subjects' home rather than on a college campus.

Sex differences have also been examined in the context of performance ratings. Hamner, Kim, Baird, and Bigoness (1974) were concerned with possible bias in the ratings of work sample performance when objective rating criteria had been established. Male and female students, half of whom were Black and half of whom were White, rated a videotaped performance of 8 job applicants. Applicants stacked large cans in a grocery store setting as an appropriate work sample for the position of grocery clerk. Race (Black, White), sex (male, female), and performance (high, low) of the applicants were varied such that 8 different combinations resulted. Subjects viewed all 8 performances. In this context, sex differences were also found, but, here, they were in favor of females. A significant interaction indicated that an even greater difference in the ratings occurred for high performing males and females.

Bigoness (1976) conducted essentially the same experiment with a group of homogeneous raters (White males). Here again the females' performance was rated higher than their male counterparts'. Further examination indicated that as in the Hamner, et al. (1974) study, this result was only for the high performance group.

Hall and Hall (1976) were also interested in performance ratings but of incumbents rather than job applicants.
Student subjects were asked to rate one competent personnel director who was either White male, White female, Black male, Black female, or whose race and gender were not specified. No differences were found in ratings of ability, motivation, or overall task performance.

A study by Brief and Wallace (1976) also investigated reactions to male and female job incumbents. In this experiment, both students and librarians were asked to assume the role of supervisor of a librarian-administrator. The subjects were given an indication of the incumbent's performance over the past year and asked to assign the amount for an annual merit pay increase and to predict future effort, ability, and performance. The job incumbent to be evaluated was either a male or a female, and performance was described as either high or low. It was found that allocation of reward differed only on the performance variable. No sex differences were found on any of the dependent variables.

Performance of male and female leaders was a key variable in a laboratory study by Jacobson and Effertz (1974). Here, an examination was made of the perceptions of leader and followers in same- and mixed-sex groups. Students were assigned the role of leader or follower in a three person problem solving group. Groups were one of the following four types: male leader, female followers; male leader, male followers; female leader, female followers; female leader, male followers. Analysis of subject ratings indicated five
major results: female followers were criticized more than male followers by both male and female leaders; male and female followers were more critical of male leaders; male leaders perceived their groups as less successful and themselves as less effective leaders; followers of both sexes perceived their group as more successful when they had a female leader; and males anticipated greater success in the leadership role. Actual performance of the various groups did not differ.

One other study concerned with sex differences in the work setting used a slightly different framework. Cecil, Paul, and Olins (1973) looked at the perceived importance of 50 different variables in hiring male and female applicants. Student subjects felt that different variables were more important for applicants of each sex. The underlying factor structure of the ratings was also different for the two sexes. In general, it was thought to be more important for male applicants to have motivation, ability, skills, and education. A good female applicant was expected to have a pleasing personality and appearance and be skilled in interpersonal relations. The job to which these males and females were applying was described only as a white collar job. Subjects assumed the position to be one of an administrative-managerial nature for males but a typical clerical job for females.
Quite a number of studies examining sex differences in the work context have been presented, and the results have not been consistent. In some studies, members of one sex are favored over the other while in others these differences are not found. Although the results differ, further examination indicates that they are not in conflict. The prevailing sex role stereotype in the situation can account for the results.

In studies by Schein (1973, 1975), Rosen and Jerdee (1974a, 1974b), Dipboye, et al. (1975, 1977), Jones (1970), and Jacobson and Effertz (1974), males were expected to do better because the job with which each of these studies was concerned was generally considered to be a masculine one. Except for the Jones (1970) study which was concerned with applicants for a counselor's position, these studies looked at perceptions of males and females in relation to a managerial or leadership position. Subjects did not expect females to be in this masculine role. In the case of applicants to the position, subjects were less likely to recommend hiring of a female (Rosen and Jerdee, 1974b; Dipboye, et al., 1975, 1977; Jones, 1970). Once a female was in this masculine job, however, she was treated differently and was expected to act differently than her equivalent male counterpart (Schein, 1973, 1975; Rosen and Jerdee, 1974a; Jacobson and Effertz, 1974). Since the female is not expected to be a leader (given the feminine sex role
stereotype), the behavior of a female manager is seen as different than the male manager (Schein, 1973, 1975), the female is given more privileges to take care of family matters but is seen as less promotable and less likely to be encouraged (Rosen and Jerdee, 1974b), but once the female has succeeded, her performance is rated higher than an equally successful male (Jacobson and Efferd, 1974); since she succeeded in spite of being in the "wrong place", this woman must be special.

In the Hamner, et al. (1974) and Bigoness (1976) studies, the job in question was the unskilled one of grocery clerk. These authors felt that women applicants may have been more highly evaluated because it was more appropriate for women to hold unskilled jobs or perhaps because the grocery clerk's position was seen as masculine, and women who were successful performers had to be outstanding. Either explanation refers to the sex role stereotype held by the rater.

In the two studies where no sex differences were found (Hall and Hall, 1976; Brief and Wallace, 1976), evaluation was made on a position considered to be neither masculine nor feminine sex-typed. The jobs of personnel director and librarian-administrator were purposely selected as neutral sex-typed jobs.

In the Cash, et al. (1977) study, hiring was recommended for the applicant whose sex fit the sex type of the job.
Again, the sex role stereotype seemed to be the most important determinant of judgments made about males and females.

Other Theoretical Explanations of Sex Differences

Some attempts have also been made to look at differential attributes of success. Feldman-Summers and Kiesler (1974) found that sex role stereotypes did have an effect on the attribution process. Overall results of their study indicated that female success was attributed to motivation or luck, whereas male success was seen as due to ability. The difference in attribution of causality might possibly be taken as an explanation why women are preferred for jobs which require hard work, e.g., secretary, while men are preferred for "ability" jobs, e.g., professional or managerial positions.

Garland and Price (1977) also investigated the attribution processes. They were concerned with successful and unsuccessful women managers. It was found that positive attitudes towards women in management were associated with internal (ability and effort) attributions of causality for success. Subjects with negative attitudes toward women as managers attributed success to external factors (luck, facility of task). No trends were found in ratings of unsuccessful managers. This study indicates that when subject stereotypes do not conform to traditional stereotypes, their perceptions also do not conform to the traditional view.
Taynor and Deaux (1973) attempted to explain differences in attributions using equity theory and attribution theory. They predicted that when female performance was equal to male performance in a masculine situation, subjects would perceive the female as more deserving of reward, as performing better, and as expending more effort. These predictions were based on the equity theory finding that an individual operating under a non-voluntary constraint (in this case, being of the "inappropriate" sex for the situation) would be seen as more deserving of reward by a third party (Leventhal and Michaels, 1971). A prediction based on attribution theory was that a woman's success would be attributed to effort. Since success was not expected, explanation of such success would be due to a temporary attribute.

Student subjects who rated males and females who were either alone or with a non-acting member of the opposite sex in a masculine situation confirmed most of these hypotheses. When the female was with a non-acting male, there was no difference between her performance rating and that of a male with a non-acting female. This finding is consistent with equity theory, however, as the female who was accompanied by an "appropriate" sex member could be seen as being under less constraint than the female who was alone. All other predictions were confirmed.

A similar study was done in which the gender of the task and the performance mode were also investigated. Taynor
and Deaux (1975) looked at the effects of actor's sex, gender of task, and gender of mode (the manner in which the task was executed) on evaluation of performance, effort, and allocation of reward. In a masculine situation, the successful female was seen as more deserving of reward and as having exerted more effort. These results supported those found in the earlier study (Taynor and Deaux, 1973). The expected prediction did not result in the female situation however. Here the male and female actors were rated the same except male subjects rated the female as exerting more effort. The authors explained the unexpected results as being due to the female situation used in the experiment. Perhaps it was less difficult and less socially desirable than the male situation. Overall findings did indicate, however, that the mode of behavior might be as important as the sex of the actor: performing in the appropriate mode led to higher performance ratings.

Terborg and Ilgen (1975) designed a study to test three theoretical explanations for occupational sex discrimination. They suggested explanations which had been given previously: sex-role stereotypes, attribution theory, and equity theory. They felt that these explanations could be better examined if ratings of males and females were made at more than one point in the employment process. Specifically, they looked at student responses to males and females portrayed in an in-basket exercise. Subjects rated their willingness to hire
male and female applicants for a managerial position, allocated a starting salary to the candidates, assigned them tasks to do once they were hired, and suggested a second year salary.

Males and females with equal qualifications were hired in equal numbers. However, the salary offered to the woman was significantly less. Women were also assigned more routine than challenging tasks, and the assigned second year salary increased the discrepancy between males and females. These results supported the sex-role stereotypes explanation. Partial support was found for attribution theory predictions in that female cause of success was seen as luck. Equity theory was supported in that females were not expected to do as well as males.

To summarize, research in the area of sex differences has shown that men and women are differentially perceived in many important areas related to job and life success. Whether these differential perceptions favor males or females is highly dependent on the context in which judgments are made. The perceiver's own opinion of how men and women should behave, i.e., his or her sex-role stereotype, seems to dictate the criteria by which males and females should be judged. Since these sex-role stereotypes so rarely overlap, differential judgments of males and females have occurred with respect to the situation in which the individuals are being judged. When further information about an individual
is given, however, this seems to have an effect on these perceptions (cf., Friedland, et al., 1973). As Terborg and Ilgen have suggested "stereotypes influence sex discrimination most when little is known about the female's potential (e.g., hiring decisions), and that the effect of sex-role stereotypes diminishes as more information about the female worker is obtained." (Terborg and Ilgen, 1975, p.373).

By increasing the amount of information on which to base judgment, the reliance on sex role stereotypes should decrease. It is proposed here that when subjects are given information which indicates sex role rather than only gender, perceptions of suitability for different occupations will vary along sex role rather than gender.

Further justification for this notion is provided by the literature in person perception and interviewing. In the area of person perception, several studies have shown that subjects make judgments of other individuals based on implicit personality theories or stereotypes. Subjects are willing to judge known or unknown stimulus persons on a number of common characteristics. Results indicate that whether the subject is judging a friend, a stranger, or a hypothetical person, the same five dimensions or factors emerge (Norman, 1963; Passini and Norman, 1966; Hakel, 1974). This evidence suggests that when people make judgments of others, they do so with a particular network of traits which go together in mind. In the absence of evidence to
the contrary, judgments are based on the available data and the implicit personality theory of the rater.

The many findings of sex differences reported in the literature can be explained in terms of these implicit personality theories. Raters are given such limited information that the common stereotypes must be used in order to pass judgment. As Hakel has pointed out, "learned associations among sets of complex behavioral and personality descriptors can account for replicable, complex patterns and structures of ratings. The naive view that ratings are accurate, relevant measurements of the characteristics of the ratee must be surpassed by an acknowledgement that those ratings also reflect the characteristics of the rater. Indeed, these data show that a complex structure can emerge solely from rater's presumptions." (Hakel, 1974, p. 418)

The research of Garland and Price (1977) illustrates this point well. Subjects' own attitudes toward women affected their ratings of attributes of success. Changing the stereotype changed the ratings.

Researchers in the area of interviewing have shared these same concerns. In review after review, the interviewers have been urged to collect information as systematically as possible (cf., Wagner, 1949; Mayfield, 1964; Ulrich and Trumbo, 1965; Wright, 1969; Schmitt, 1976). Numerous biases have been shown to affect the outcome of interview decisions. Relevant to this study is the effect
of stereotyping. It has been shown that interviewers have certain preconceived notions of what an acceptable applicant for a certain position should be like. During the interview, the interviewer attempts to see how good a match exists between the applicant and the interviewer's ideal applicant stereotype. (cf., Webster, 1964; Hakel and Schuh, 1971; Shaw, 1972). A successful match will lead the interviewer to make a favorable rating of the candidate whereas an unsuccessful match would not.

Although studies of stereotyping effects in the areas of person perception and interviewing do not deal directly with sex role stereotyping, it does seem as though they are an important consideration. In studies by Rosen and Jerdee (1974a, 1974b) and Dipboye, et al. (1975, 1977), it was shown that males and females who had the same qualifications were treated differently. In the absence of sufficient information about the individual in question, subjects reverted to the commonly held stereotypes of men and women to supply the missing data.

It is felt that subjects who are making judgments about the suitability of different applicants for a certain position hold preconceived ideas about the sex role appropriate to the job. For example, if an interviewer were seeking someone to fill the position of police officer, the stereotype of an individual who is aggressive, self-reliant, forceful, willing to take risks, etc. would probably come to mind. In
interviewing someone for a position as a nurse, it is more likely that the ideal applicant stereotype would be an individual who is cheerful, compassionate, nurturant, tender, etc. Thus the ideal applicant stereotype of the police officer is a masculine one, whereas the nurse stereotype is a feminine one. If interviewers or subjects had information available which would indicate the sex role of the subject, the interviewer would not be forced to rely on sex role stereotypes.

It is the purpose of this study to investigate the decision making process involved in hiring job applicants with respect to the gender and sex role of the applicant and the sex role of the job. It is hypothesized that when subject judges are given sufficient information as to individual's sex role orientation (masculine, feminine, or androgynous), this variable rather than the applicant's gender will be more important in determining hiring decisions. Given applicants of equal qualifications, it is hypothesized that subjects will prefer applicants of both sexes who have masculine or androgynous sex roles over feminine applicants of both sexes for jobs with a masculine sex role; individuals who have feminine or androgynous sex roles will be preferred over those who have masculine sex roles for feminine jobs; and applicants of masculine, feminine, and androgynous sex roles will be equally preferred for jobs with neutral sex roles. It is further hypothesized that these preferences will be
indicated by higher ratings of an applicant's qualifications in the areas of education, work experience, interests, and personality; overall suitability; predicted success on the job; and hireability. A final hypothesis is that these preferences will also be indicated by higher rankings when applicants are compared.
The goal of pretesting phase one was to select equal status jobs with different sex roles using job titles. The method by which this was accomplished as well as the results obtained are described in this chapter.

**METHOD**

**Subjects**

Subjects were 20 male and 10 female undergraduate students enrolled in an American history survey course. All students who were present in class on the day of the experiment agreed to participate. The ages of the subjects ranged from 18 to 27 with a mean age of 19.73. Students were from all four undergraduate classes with 73% of the subjects from the freshman and sophomore classes. Students participated in this experiment as part of one of their regularly scheduled American history classes.

**Experimental Procedure**

The goal of pretesting phase one was to select equal status jobs which would represent each of the three job sex roles: masculine, feminine, and neutral. A list of 40 job titles was compiled which were considered to be of high,
medium, and low status and to represent all three sex roles. Subjects were asked to rate each of the 40 jobs on status and the likelihood that a man or a woman would hold the position. It was necessary to obtain status ratings such that the three jobs would be comparable in terms of the type of applicant who would apply for such jobs, i.e., such things as educational level and experience could be made equivalent. The rating of whether a man or a woman would hold the position was intended to be an indication of the sex role of the job; if it was felt that more men held the position, it could be classified as masculine; if more women were felt to hold the position, it could be classified as feminine; and if equal numbers of men and women were thought to hold the job, it could be classified as neutral.

Ratings of status and likelihood that a man or a woman held the position were presented as separate tasks. Ratings of status were made on a 7 point scale ranging from 1, "the job is one of the lowest status" to 7, "the job is one of the highest status." Ratings of whether a man or a woman held the position were also made on a 7 point scale. The end points of this scale were 1, "you think only men hold the job" to 7, "you think only women hold the job." Copies of materials presented to subjects are displayed in Appendices A and B. Order of presentation of the two rating tasks was randomized to eliminate order effects.
Means and standard deviations of the ratings for both status and sex role of job were computed for each of the 40 jobs. An attempt was then made to find jobs which represented each of the three job sex roles.

RESULTS

Means and standard deviations of the ratings for both status and sex role of job are presented for each of the 40 job titles in Table 1. As can be seen, the jobs of electrician, fiction writer, high school teacher, police officer, salesperson, and secretary all represented jobs at one status level. The jobs of bartender, clerk, cook, housekeeper, meter reader, telephone operator, and truck driver were representative of jobs at another status level.

From these many jobs, six were selected to represent two status levels with one job in each status level representing a masculine, a feminine, and a neutral job sex role. Selection was determined by finding three jobs within a set which would have approximately equal means and low standard deviations on the status level ratings and be as close as possible to representing the three job sex roles, i.e., would have ratings of 1-2, 4, and 6-7.

The jobs of electrician, secretary, and salesperson were selected as one set. The mean status ratings for these jobs were 4.60 (SD=0.81), 4.10 (SD=0.48), and 4.00 (SD=0.64), respectively. The electrician's job represented a masculine
### TABLE 1 - PRETESTING PHASE ONE: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF STATUS AND JOB SEX ROLE RATINGS FOR 40 JOB TITLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Status M</th>
<th>Status SD</th>
<th>Job Sex M</th>
<th>Job Sex SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank teller</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartender</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus driver</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chef</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancer</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish washer</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school teacher</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction writer</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight attendant</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage collector</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas station attendant</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school teacher</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeper</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance agent</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job Sex Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail carrier</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter reader</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery school teacher</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police officer</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate agent</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant server</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesperson</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street sweeper</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi driver</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone operator</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck driver</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typist</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
job with a mean sex role rating of 2.13 (SD=0.63). The secretary's job was seen as a feminine one with a mean sex role rating of 5.97 (SD=0.62), and the salesperson’s job with a mean rating of 3.77 (SD=0.57) was considered neutral.

Bartender, telephone operator, and cook made up the second set. For this set, the mean status ratings were 2.93 (SD=0.69), 3.43 (SD=0.63), and 3.23 (SD=0.82), respectively. The masculine job was that of bartender with a mean job sex role rating of 2.40 (SD=0.77). The telephone operator's job was the feminine job in this set with a mean job sex role rating of 5.73 (SD=0.58). The cook's job was considered neutral with respect to job sex role with a mean rating of 3.83 (SD=0.87).
CHAPTER THREE - PRETESTING PHASE TWO - METHOD AND RESULTS

The goal of pretesting phase two was to select equal status jobs of different sex roles using job descriptions. The methodology and the results of pretesting phase two are explained in this chapter.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 15 male and 16 female undergraduate students enrolled in an American history survey course. All students who were present in class on the day of the experiment agreed to participate. Subjects' age ranged from 18 to 26 with a mean age of 19.70. Students were from all four undergraduate classes with 71% of the subjects from the freshman and sophomore classes. Students participated in the experiment as part of one of their regularly scheduled history classes.

Experimental Procedure

The goal of pretesting phase two was to select three equal status jobs, one to represent each of the three job sex roles: masculine, feminine, and neutral. In this phase, actual job descriptions were used rather than job titles.
Use of the job descriptions was intended to give the rater a precise knowledge of the job which he or she was to rate. Job descriptions were taken from the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (United States Department of Labor, 1965) with some minor revisions to make each description approximately the same length.

Subjects were presented with job descriptions for 8 jobs. Six jobs were included which represented two sets of equal status jobs with one job of each sex role in each set. These were the 6 jobs that had been selected in pretesting phase one. Two jobs, one which represented a low status job and one which represented a high status job were also included to act as anchors for judgment. The final group of job descriptions to be judged by the subjects included: electrician, secretary, salesperson, bartender, telephone operator, cook, lawyer, and street sweeper.

The job descriptions of the street sweeper and the lawyer were always presented first and second, the positions for these two being changed randomly across subjects. The purpose of presenting these two first was to give subjects an idea of the range of the scale by allowing them to rate two jobs which had already been established as high and low status jobs. The order of the remaining 6 job descriptions varied randomly across subjects in positions three through eight. (Total randomness was not possible as the material had been printed on both sides of a page.)
Subjects were asked to read the job descriptions and then make two ratings: one which indicated their opinion as to the status of the job and the other which indicated their feelings as to whether men or women held the position (As will be recalled from pretesting phase one, this rating was used as an operational definition of the concept of job sex role.) Ratings were made using the same two 7 point rating scales which were used in pretesting phase one. A copy of the stimulus materials is presented in Appendix C.

Means and standard deviations were computed for each job description on each of the two dimensions. On the basis of these means and standard deviations, three jobs were selected, one to represent a masculine, one a feminine, and one a neutral job, all of equal status. These three jobs were used in the later phases of the study.

RESULTS

Means and standard deviations of the ratings for both status and sex role of job are presented in Table 2. Lawyer and street sweeper were judged representative of high and low status jobs, respectively, as in pretesting phase one. It was decided that the jobs of electrician, secretary, and salesperson best represented masculine, feminine, and neutral jobs of equal status as judged by the subject population. The ratings for this set of jobs were slightly more stable across pretesting phases one and two than the other set
TABLE 2 - PRETESTING PHASE TWO: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF STATUS AND SEX ROLE OF JOB RATINGS FOR 8 JOB DESCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th></th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartender</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesperson</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street sweeper</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone operator</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(bartender, telephone operator, and cook).

Mean status ratings for the jobs chosen were 4.73 (SD=0.83) for electrician, 4.06 (SD=0.68) for secretary, and 4.17 (SD=0.79) for salesperson. The ratings of job sex role for the chosen set were closer to the desired ratings. Electrician had a mean rating of 2.17 (SD=1.05); secretary had a mean rating of 6.00 (SD=0.52); and the salesperson had a mean rating of 3.87 (SD=0.57). These were very close to the scale points of 2, "many more men than women hold the job"; 6, "many more women than men hold the job"; and 4, "about the same amount of men and women hold the job." The jobs of electrician, secretary, and salesperson were used in constructing stimulus materials for pretesting phase three and also in the hypothesis testing phase.
CHAPTER FOUR - PRETESTING PHASE THREE - METHOD AND RESULTS

The goal of pretesting phase three was to test the stimulus materials, i.e., applicant resumes and interviewer notes on these resumes, to insure that the material was being perceived as intended. Both the qualifications of the applicant and the sex role of the applicant were tested. Both the method and the results for this pretesting phase are described in this chapter.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 60 undergraduate students enrolled in American history survey classes. There were 26 males, 24 females, and 10 subjects who did not report their sex. Subjects ranged in age from 18 to 34 with a mean age of 19.96. (Ten subjects did not report age.) Students were from the freshman, sophomore, and junior classes with 94% coming from the freshman or sophomore class. (Thirteen subjects did not report their class rank.) Fifty-two subjects participated in the experiment as part of one of their regularly scheduled history classes. All students who were present on the day of the experiment in these classes agreed to participate. Eight of the subjects were given instructions and material during
class but were asked to make their ratings at home and return the material in class the following day. (Of a total of 22 students who were given the material, eight completed and returned the forms. The return rate for this group is 36%).

**Experimental Procedure**

The goal of pretesting phase three was to construct and test stimulus materials to be presented to subjects in the hypothesis testing phase of the study. Resumes and Interviewer Notes forms were constructed by the author for hypothetical applicants to the three positions determined in pretesting phase two to be representative of masculine (electrician), feminine (secretary), and neutral (salesperson) jobs. Two sets of hypothetical applicant materials were created for each of three levels of sex role of applicant (masculine, feminine, and androgynous). It was necessary to have two sets of applicant materials to represent each sex role of applicant condition such that in the hypothesis testing phase, one of these could be used for a female (gender) person and the other could be used for a male (gender) person.

Information on the resume included address and phone number, education, work experience, and interests. An Interviewer Notes form had information pertaining to education, work experience, and other comments. In the case of applicants for the secretary's position, information about
typing skills (words per minute) and skill as a stenographer (words per minute) were also included. The Interviewer Notes form contained information that was supposedly learned by the interviewer during a selection interview. The comments made were intended to provide further information with respect to items on the applicant's resume, and also provide some insight into the applicant's motivations and personality. Information on the Interviewer Notes form was handwritten to better simulate an actual situation.

The intent was to create six applicants for each of the three jobs whose qualifications with respect to education, work experience, interests, and personality were equivalent. Information provided was also intended to reflect one of the three sex roles, masculine, feminine, or androgynous. Some of the information intended to reflect sex role orientation was suggested by the BSRI (Bem, 1974). In addition to the six applicants whose qualifications were intended to be equivalent, a seventh and eighth applicant for each job were created to represent more or less qualified (than the stimulus group) applicants. The purpose of the last two applicants was to provide reference points for the judges. Applicant names (which would have indicated the sex of the applicant) were omitted from the stimulus materials.

Subjects were asked to rate each of the eight applicant resume and Interviewer Notes forms on five dimensions: education, work experience, interests, personality, and
whether they thought a man or a woman was the applicant. Ratings of education, work experience, interests, and personality were used to establish the equivalency of the six applicants of interest. The rating of whether a man or a woman was the applicant was a check on the manipulation of sex role of applicant.

Subjects only rated applicants for one of the three jobs (electrician, secretary, or salesperson). Presentation of applicant materials was randomized across subjects for the different jobs. Within each job, presentation was randomized to the extent possible with printing of one applicant's materials on each side of the page. (See Appendices D, E, and F for the stimulus materials used for the jobs of electrician, secretary, and salesperson, respectively.)

Ratings were made on a 7 point scale. Ratings on the four dimensions, education, work experience, interests, and personality were used to establish the equivalency of the applicant materials within each sex role of job condition. The rating scale used for these four dimensions ranged from 1, "you think the applicant is way below average" to 7, "you think the applicant is way above average." In asking the subjects to guess whether the applicant was a man or a woman, it was hoped that an indication of the projected sex role of the applicant could be obtained. The rating scale used for this dimension ranged from 1, "you think the applicant could
only be a man" to 4, "you think the applicant could be a man or a woman", to 7, "you think the applicant could only be a woman". Ratings near the lower end of the scale were thought to reflect a masculine sex role, ratings towards the middle, an androgynous sex role, and ratings near the higher end of the scale, a feminine sex role.

Means and standard deviations for each of the five dimensions were computed for each of the 24 hypothetical applicants. In addition, a summary rating of the first four dimensions was also computed. The summary measure was an average rating across the dimensions of education, work experience, interests, and personality for each applicant. The summary measure was intended to indicate the overall equivalency of the applicants.

The ratings made by the subjects were used to establish the equivalency and sex role of the applicant materials. Adjustments were made in those stimulus materials which were not perceived as intended.

RESULTS

Means and standard deviations were computed for each of the 24 applicants on the dimensions of education, work experience, interests, personality, and whether a man or woman was the applicant. This information is presented in Table 3. In addition, a summary rating of the first four dimensions was also computed to get an overall indication of
# TABLE 3 - PRETESTING PHASE THREE: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR RATINGS
# OF EDUCATION, WORK EXPERIENCE, INTERESTS, PERSONALITY, AND SEX OF APPLICANT

**Electrician**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex Role</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Work Exp.</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Sex of Appl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Role</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Work Exp.</td>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Sex of Appl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3 - PRETESTING PHASE THREE: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR RATINGS OF EDUCATION, WORK EXPERIENCE, INTERESTS, PERSONALITY, AND SEX OF APPLICANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salesperson</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Work Exp.</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Sex of Appl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the equivalency of the applicants' qualifications. The summary measure was the average rating across the dimensions of education, work experience, interests, and personality, computed for each applicant. Means and standard deviations for the summary measures are given in Table 4.

Ratings indicated that the stimulus materials were being perceived as desired. The six applicants that were supposed to be equally qualified were perceived as such for each of the three jobs. Sex role ratings were also appropriate. The less qualified and more qualified applicants for each job were also perceived as intended.

It was necessary, however, that the sex role ratings of two of the applicants be improved. One of the androgynous applicants for the electrician's job received a mean sex role rating of 5.27 (SD=1.34), indicating that the perception of this applicant was "too feminine". Consequently, some of the feminine references were changed. One of the androgynous applicants for the salesperson's job was also perceived as more feminine than desired (M=5.22, SD=1.00). Some feminine references for this applicant were also changed.

Since the materials that had not been perceived as intended were revised in light of the findings, it was now assumed that the stimulus materials represented the qualifications and the sex roles of the applicants as desired. For each of the three jobs, there were eight applicants. Two applicants had a masculine sex role, two had a feminine sex
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex Role</th>
<th>Electrician</th>
<th>Secretary</th>
<th>Salesperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
role, and two had an androgynous sex role. One of the eight applicants was more qualified than these six, and the final applicant was less qualified than the six.
 CHAPTER FIVE - HYPOTHESIS TESTING - METHOD AND RESULTS

The goal of this phase was to test the hypotheses of interest. In general, it was hypothesized that the variable of sex role of applicant would have a greater influence on post-interview personnel decisions than gender of applicant. Specifically, it was hypothesized that decision makers would prefer applicants whose sex role (rather than gender) matched the job to which the applicants were applying, i.e., masculine and androgynous applicants would be preferred for masculine jobs; feminine and androgynous applicants would be preferred for feminine jobs; and all equally qualified applicants would be equally preferred for neutral jobs. These preferences would be indicated by subject ratings of the education, work experience, interests, and personality qualifications of the applicant; the rating of the overall suitability of the applicant; the rating of the predicted success on the job; and the subject's decision to hire the applicant. Preferences would also be manifest in rank orderings of applicants for each job.

The methodology used to test these hypotheses and the results obtained are presented in this chapter.
METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 63 male and 39 female undergraduate students enrolled in American history survey courses. Of the 103 students who were asked to participate, only one refused due to illness (making the response rate equal to 99%). The subjects ranged in age from 18 to 30 with a mean age of 20.07 (One subject did not report age.) Students were from all four undergraduate classes with the majority (69%) in their freshman or sophomore years. Subjects participated in this experiment as part of one of their regularly scheduled history classes.

Experimental Procedure

Each subject was given a booklet containing instructions, a job description for one of the three jobs, resumes, and Interviewer Notes for each of the eight applicants, rating forms, and a ranking form. Copies of the stimulus materials are presented in Appendices G, H, and I for the electrician's, the secretary's, and the salesperson's jobs, respectively.

Subjects were asked to pretend they were managers in a medium sized company. Applicants for an opening in their department had been interviewed by a company interviewer, and now, the subject/manager would have to rate each of the eight applicants on several dimensions and rank order the applicants for a hiring decision.
Job descriptions were edited versions of those used in pretesting phase three. Certain sections were eliminated to omit ambiguity in the descriptions. Also, omissions were made to further equate the length of the three job descriptions. Resumes and Interviewer Notes were the same as those used in pretesting phase three with the changes described in the Results section of that phase. One applicant from each sex role was randomly assigned a female name and the other was randomly assigned a male name. The less qualified and more qualified applicants were treated as a pair, and one of the two was randomly assigned a male name and the other a female name. The same eight names were used for all three jobs, but the sex role/name combinations varied for each job.

Ratings were made for each applicant on seven dimensions: education, work experience, interests, personality, overall suitability, predicted success, and hiring decision. Each rating was made on a 7 point scale ranging from 1, "you think the applicant is way below average" to 7, "you think the applicant is way above average".

After rating each of these eight applicants, the subjects were asked to rank order the eight applicants to indicate the order in which they would hire the applicants for the job.

Each subject reviewed applicants for only one of the three jobs, electrician, secretary, or salesperson. Distribution of jobs was random across subjects. Within each
booklet, the applicants were randomly ordered to the extent possible with printing on both sides of the page.

Subjects were given approximately one half hour to complete the experimental task. At the conclusion of this time period, all materials which had not been handed in were collected, and a brief explanation of the hypotheses was given.

**Analyses**

Rating data for only the six applicants of interest for each job were analyzed using a multivariate analysis of variance. (The less qualified and more qualified applicants were only included in the task to serve as references for subject judgment; they were not of interest for the actual hypothesis testing.) The independent variables of interest were gender of subject, sex role of job, gender of applicant, and sex role of applicant. Gender of subject and sex role of job were considered between subjects factors, and gender of applicant and sex role of applicant were considered within subjects factors. Gender of subject had two levels, male and female. Sex role of job had three levels, masculine, feminine, and neutral. Gender of applicant had two levels, male and female; and sex role of applicant had three levels, masculine, feminine, and androgynous.

The dependent variables of interest were the 7 rated variables: education, work experience, interests, personality, overall suitability, predicted success, and hiring
The ranking information for all eight applicants for each of the three jobs was analyzed independently of the rating data. Means and standard deviations were computed for the 24 applicants.

RESULTS - RATING DATA

Subject ratings of the 18 applicants of interest were analyzed using a 2 X 3 X 2 X 3 multivariate analysis of variance. The independent variables were gender of subject (male, female), sex role of job (masculine, feminine, neutral), gender of applicant (male, female), and sex role of applicant (masculine, feminine, androgynous). The dependent variables were the seven ratings which subjects made on 7 point rating scales. These included ratings of each applicant's education, work experience, interests, personality, overall suitability for the job, predicted success on the job, and hireability as indicated by hiring decision.

The results of the univariate analysis of variance using hiring decision as a dependent variable will be presented before the multivariate analysis. Hiring decision is the most important of the seven dependent measures because it could be the major indicator of discrimination. If no effects are found on the hiring decision variable, practical implications of the study are limited regardless of the ratings given on
the other six variables. For this reason, a more thorough analysis of the hiring decision variable is given.

Results of the univariate analyses of variance are presented in Table 5. F tests indicated that there were statistically significant differences on six effects, one main effect, four two way interactions, and one three way interaction. The significant main effect of sex role of applicant was an important finding ($F(2,190)=48.999, p < .001, \omega^2 = .12$). Of the four significant two way interactions, three, sex role of job by gender of applicant ($F(2,95)=3.198, p < .05, \omega^2 = .01$), gender of subject by sex role of applicant ($F(2,190)=4.741, p < .05, \omega^2 = .02$), and gender of applicant by sex role of applicant ($F(2,190)=3.040, p < .05, \omega^2 = .01$), accounted for a very small proportion ($4\%$) of the total variance. The sex role of job by sex role of applicant interaction, however, was more important ($F(4,190)=20.244, p < .001, \omega^2 = .14$). The three way interaction of sex role of job by gender of applicant by sex role of applicant was statistically significant ($F(4,190)=3.468, p < .05$) but accounted for a small proportion of the total variance ($\omega^2 = .02$).

To summarize the univariate analysis of variance using hiring decision as a dependent variable indicated six statistically significant effects. Of the six, only two effects, the main effect of sex role of applicant and the interaction of sex role of job by sex role of applicant, accounted for a sizable proportion of variance in the design.
TABLE 5 - ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GENDER OF SUBJECT (A) X SEX ROLE OF JOB (B) X GENDER OF APPLICANT (C) X SEX ROLE OF APPLICANT (D) FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE OF HIRING DECISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.584</td>
<td>6.274</td>
<td>2.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.451</td>
<td>7.225</td>
<td>2.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/AB</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>258.090</td>
<td>2.712</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>1.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.332</td>
<td>2.666</td>
<td>3.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC/AB</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79.189</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91.647</td>
<td>45.823</td>
<td>48.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.868</td>
<td>4.434</td>
<td>4.741*.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.729</td>
<td>18.932</td>
<td>20.244*.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD/AB</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>177.460</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.587</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>3.040*.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.185</td>
<td>2.046</td>
<td>3.468*.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.618</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD/AB</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>112.100</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001
Consequently, the trends for only these two effects will be discussed.

For the main effect of sex role of job, masculine applicants ($M=5.233$, $SD=0.958$) were preferred over androgynous applicants ($M=4.812$, $SD=0.913$) who were preferred over feminine applicants ($M=4.282$, $SD=0.996$). For the interaction of sex role of job by sex role of applicant, the pattern of means varied by job. For the masculine job (electrician), masculine applicants ($M=5.957$, $SD=0.611$) were preferred over androgynous ($M=4.457$, $SD=1.039$) and feminine applicants ($M=4.429$, $SD=1.079$). For the feminine job (secretary), masculine applicants were also preferred ($M=5.235$, $SD=0.761$). Androgynous applicants received the next highest ratings ($M=4.882$, $SD=0.817$) and feminine applicants were rated lowest ($M=4.206$, $SD=1.016$). On the neutral job (salesperson), androgynous applicants received the highest ratings ($M=5.125$, $SD=0.741$) followed by masculine applicants ($M=4.438$, $SD=0.830$). Feminine applicants received the lowest ratings ($M=4.203$, $SD=0.888$).

In general, masculine applicants were preferred over androgynous and feminine applicants. This was changed somewhat for the neutral job, where androgynous applicants received the highest ratings. Feminine applicants received the lowest ratings for all three jobs.

The results of the multivariate analysis of variance will now be reviewed. Data were analyzed using the Components
Analysis of Variance (CANOVA) computer program. Due to the internal structure of this program, some deviations were made from the customary way of conducting such an analysis. These changes were concerned with the handling of missing data and the treatment of repeated measures factors within the program.

The CANOVA program handles missing data by completely eliminating a subject from the analysis if any data points are missing. Running the program under this option would have involved the loss of 20 of the 102 subjects or nearly 20% of the total data. Consequently, it was decided to replace missing ratings with cell modes. Examination of cell means and modes indicated that the two measures of central tendency were approximately equal. Cell modes were used to eliminate the necessity of keypunching the data another time.

The type and amount of missing data can be characterized, indicating to what extent the results of the analysis were influenced. One of the 20 subjects who had missing data did not complete any of the ratings. Due to some misunderstanding of or unwillingness to follow the instructions, this subject only completed the rankings. Consequently, this subject was eliminated from all analyses of ratings.

Of the remaining subjects who had missing data, the type of data could be characterized as one of three types. Eight subjects failed to make ratings for some or all applicants on a particular dependent variable. Two subjects
neglected to make ratings for a particular applicant; and
nine subjects overlooked rating one or two items. The
amount of missing data which was replaced by cell modes was
equal to 1.6% of the total data.

Because the CANOVA program was not designed to handle
within subjects factors, these factors must be treated as
dependent variables within the program in order that the
proper error term be used to test the multivariate F's.
This was accomplished by creating orthogonal contrasts of the
effects to be tested. In the present analysis, the variables
of gender of applicant and sex role of applicant were treated
in this manner. Tests of the dependent measures which
involved the main effects of these variables or interactions
of these variables with other independent variables were
run as multivariate tests.

Results of the multivariate analysis of variance are
given in Table 6. The significance of the multivariate roots
was tested using Wilk's Lambda criterion. An F approxima-
tion is given in the table. Intercorrelations among the 7
dependent variables are given in Table 7.

The results of the multivariate analysis were similar
to those found for the hiring decision variable. The
similarities and differences between the two analyses will
be discussed.

In the multivariate analysis, the main effects of sex
role of job (F(14,178)=2.952, p < .001), gender of applicant
TABLE 6 - HYPOTHESIS TESTING - MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SUBJECT RATINGS FOR 7 DEPENDENT VARIABLES

MAIN EFFECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender of Subject</th>
<th>Sex Role of Job</th>
<th>Gender of Applicant</th>
<th>Sex Role of Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multivariate Tests</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st root</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>2.952***</td>
<td>10.319 ***</td>
<td>8.221***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>(7,89)</td>
<td>(14,178)</td>
<td>(7,89)</td>
<td>(14,82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd root</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6,89.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univariate Tests</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6.975</td>
<td>4.508*</td>
<td>8.636</td>
<td>5.581***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>21.090</td>
<td>8.916***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>6.286</td>
<td>2.352</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suitability</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>4.872</td>
<td>1.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Success</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>4.698</td>
<td>1.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Decision</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>6.274</td>
<td>2.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>(1,95)</td>
<td>(2,95)</td>
<td>(1,95)</td>
<td>(2,190)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001
TABLE 6 - HYPOTHESIS TESTING - MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SUBJECT RATINGS FOR 7 DEPENDENT VARIABLES

TWO WAY INTERACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender of Subject X Sex Role of Job</th>
<th>Gender of Subject X Gender of Applicant</th>
<th>Gender of Subject X Sex Role of Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multivariate Tests</strong></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st root</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>1.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>(14,178)</td>
<td>(7.89)</td>
<td>(14,82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd root</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>(6,89.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Univariate Tests</strong></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>2.873</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suitability</td>
<td>4.787</td>
<td>1.920</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Success</td>
<td>11.479</td>
<td>4.143*</td>
<td>0.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Decision</td>
<td>7.225</td>
<td>2.660</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>(2,95)</td>
<td>(1,95)</td>
<td>(2,190)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p < .05
\**p < .01
\***p < .001
TABLE 6 - HYPOTHESIS TESTING - MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SUBJECT RATINGS FOR 7 DEPENDENT VARIABLES

TWO WAY INTERACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multivariate Tests</th>
<th>Sex Role of Job X Gender of Applicant</th>
<th>Sex Role of Job X Sex Role of Applicant</th>
<th>Gender of Applicant X Sex Role of Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st root</td>
<td>F 9.063***</td>
<td>F 7.071***</td>
<td>F 6.416***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>(14,178)</td>
<td>(28,164)</td>
<td>(14,82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd root</td>
<td>F 1.388</td>
<td>F 4.351***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>(6,89.5)</td>
<td>(13,82.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Univariate Tests   | MS 25.238                           | MS 12.179                             | MS 10.061***                                |
|--------------------| F 60.147***                         | F 31.693***                           | F 23.001***                                 |
| Education          | Work Experience                     | Interests                             | Personality                                 |
|                    | MS 0.586                            | MS 0.286                              | MS 1.353                                    |
|                    | F 0.996                             | F 0.531                               | F 2.811                                     |
|                    | (14,82)                             | (6,89.5)                              | (13,82.5)                                   |
| df                 | (2,95)                              | (4,190)                               | (2,190)                                     |

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001
TABLE 6 - HYPOTHESIS TESTING - MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SUBJECT RATINGS FOR 7 DEPENDENT VARIABLES

THREE WAY INTERACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multivariate Tests</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st root</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>1.189</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>2.758***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>(14,178)</td>
<td>(14,82)</td>
<td>(28,164)</td>
<td>(28,164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Root</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>(6.89.5)</td>
<td>(13,82.5)</td>
<td>(13,82.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Univariate Tests</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>2.353</td>
<td>5.378***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>2.078</td>
<td>3.803**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>1.723</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>1.597</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>4.551</td>
<td>7.180***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suitability</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>1.997</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td>2.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Success</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>1.729</td>
<td>2.507*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Decision</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>2.046</td>
<td>3.468**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>(2,95)</td>
<td>(2,190)</td>
<td>(4,190)</td>
<td>(4,190)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001
TABLE 6 - HYPOTHESIS TESTING - MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SUBJECT RATINGS FOR 7 DEPENDENT VARIABLES

FOUR WAY INTERACTION

Gender of Subject X Sex Role of Job X
Gender of Applicant X Sex Role of Applicant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multivariate Tests</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>1st root</th>
<th>1.026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>(28,164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd root</td>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>(13,82.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univariate Tests</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>1.911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suitability</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>1.452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Success</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Decision</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>(4,190)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>WE</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>HD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suitability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The averages were computed from the correlations among the 7 dependent variables found for each of the 6 gender/sex role combinations of applicants across all subjects and all jobs.

N=101, p < .005 for all correlations
(F(7, 89) = 10.319, p < .001), and sex role of applicant (F(14, 82) = 8.221, p < .001) were statistically significant. Tables 8, 9, and 10 display the means for these effects. In the hiring decision analysis, only the sex role of applicant main effect was significant.

For the two way interactions, the multivariate tests indicated three significant effects. The sex role of job by gender of applicant interaction was significant (F(14, 178) = 9.063, p < .001). Sex role of job by sex role of applicant had two significant roots (F(28, 164) = 7.071, p < .001) and (F(13, 82.5) = 4.351, p < .001). Gender of applicant by sex role of applicant was also a significant interaction (F(14, 82) = 6.416, p < .001). Tables 11, 12, and 13 give the means for interpreting these effects. The two way interaction of gender of subject by sex role of applicant found for hiring decision should be disregarded because the test of the appropriate multivariate interaction was not significant.

The findings for the three way and four way interactions were the same as on the hiring decision variable. The sex role of job by gender of applicant by sex role of applicant was the only significant effect of the three and four way interactions (F(28, 164) = 2.758, p < .001). Appropriate means and standard deviations for interpreting this result are given in Table 14.

Specific findings will be discussed beginning with the main effects and continuing with the various interactions;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine (N=35)</th>
<th>Feminine (N=34)</th>
<th>Neutral (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>4.624 0.543</td>
<td>4.275 0.473</td>
<td>4.208 0.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Experience</strong></td>
<td>5.152 0.692</td>
<td>4.534 0.570</td>
<td>4.698 0.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interests</strong></td>
<td>4.490 0.763</td>
<td>4.588 0.589</td>
<td>4.510 0.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality</strong></td>
<td>4.710 0.605</td>
<td>4.853 0.482</td>
<td>4.714 0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Suitability</strong></td>
<td>4.948 0.734</td>
<td>4.760 0.569</td>
<td>4.635 0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicted Success</strong></td>
<td>5.029 0.847</td>
<td>4.848 0.573</td>
<td>4.740 0.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hiring Decision</strong></td>
<td>4.948 0.754</td>
<td>4.775 0.618</td>
<td>4.589 0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (N=101)</td>
<td>Female (N=101)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.277</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>4.960</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>4.528</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>4.657</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suitability</td>
<td>4.842</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Success</td>
<td>4.931</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Decision</td>
<td>4.792</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine (N=101)</td>
<td>Feminine (N=101)</td>
<td>Androgynous (N=101)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>4.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>5.035</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>4.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>4.748</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>4.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>4.980</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>4.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suitability</td>
<td>5.084</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>4.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Success</td>
<td>5.223</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>4.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Decision</td>
<td>5.233</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>4.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masculine (N=35)</td>
<td>Feminine (N=34)</td>
<td>Neutral (N=32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>4.143</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>4.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk. Exp.</td>
<td>5.371</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>4.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.</td>
<td>4.524</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>4.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers.</td>
<td>4.695</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>4.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. Su.</td>
<td>5.105</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>4.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr. Su.</td>
<td>5.181</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>4.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi. De.</td>
<td>5.076</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>4.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>Androgynous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5.057</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>3.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>5.786</td>
<td>4.900</td>
<td>4.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>4.929</td>
<td>4.129</td>
<td>4.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>5.343</td>
<td>4.229</td>
<td>4.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suitability</td>
<td>5.671</td>
<td>4.529</td>
<td>4.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Success</td>
<td>5.857</td>
<td>4.543</td>
<td>4.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Decision</td>
<td>5.957</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>4.457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12 - HYPOTHESIS TESTING - MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SEX ROLE OF JOB X SEX ROLE OF APPLICANT RATINGS

FEMININE SEX ROLE OF JOB (N=34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th></th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th></th>
<th>Androgynous</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.294</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>4.029</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>4.794</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>4.265</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>4.544</td>
<td>0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>4.779</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>4.132</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>4.853</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>5.015</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>4.676</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>4.868</td>
<td>0.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suitability</td>
<td>5.029</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>4.397</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>4.853</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Success</td>
<td>5.176</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>4.456</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>4.912</td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Decision</td>
<td>5.235</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>4.206</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>4.882</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12 - HYPOTHESIS TESTING - MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SEX ROLE OF JOB X SEX ROLE OF APPLICANT RATINGS

NEUTRAL SEX ROLE OF JOB
(N=32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Androgynous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.109</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>4.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>4.469</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>4.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>4.516</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>4.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>4.547</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>4.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suitability</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>4.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Success</td>
<td>4.578</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>4.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Decision</td>
<td>4.438</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>4.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (N=101)</td>
<td>Female (N=101)</td>
<td>Male (N=101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>4.248</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>4.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk. Ex.</td>
<td>5.158</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>4.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.</td>
<td>4.762</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>4.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers.</td>
<td>4.851</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>5.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. Su.</td>
<td>5.040</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>5.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr. Su.</td>
<td>5.158</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>5.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi. De.</td>
<td>5.158</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>5.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 14 - HYPOTHESIS TESTING - MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SEX ROLE OF JOB X GENDER OF APPLICANT X SEX ROLE OF APPLICANT RATINGS

**MASCULINE SEX ROLE OF JOB**

(N=35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Androgynous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Educ.    | 4.343     | 0.765    | 5.771       | 0.877    | 4.143       | 0.692    | 5.571       | 1.195    | 3.943       | 0.725    | 3.971       | 0.785    |
| Wk. Ex.  | 5.829     | 0.923    | 5.743       | 0.817    | 5.286       | 1.045    | 4.514       | 1.197    | 5.000       | 1.163    | 4.543       | 1.067    |
| Int.     | 4.943     | 0.998    | 4.914       | 1.067    | 4.114       | 1.323    | 4.143       | 1.061    | 4.514       | 1.197    | 4.314       | 0.758    |
| Pers.    | 5.343     | 0.838    | 5.343       | 0.998    | 4.057       | 1.056    | 4.400       | 1.006    | 4.686       | 0.900    | 4.429       | 0.778    |
| Ov. Su.  | 5.686     | 0.832    | 5.657       | 0.725    | 4.714       | 1.100    | 4.343       | 1.211    | 4.914       | 1.197    | 4.371       | 1.262    |
| Pr. Su.  | 5.886     | 0.963    | 5.829       | 0.985    | 4.714       | 1.226    | 4.371       | 1.352    | 4.943       | 1.136    | 4.429       | 1.220    |
| Hi. De.  | 5.971     | 0.747    | 5.943       | 0.725    | 4.571       | 1.220    | 4.286       | 1.274    | 4.656       | 1.207    | 4.229       | 1.262    |
TABLE 14: HYPOTHESIS TESTING - MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR
SEX ROLE OF JOB X GENDER OF APPLICANT X SEX ROLE OF APPLICANT RATINGS

FEMININE SEX ROLE OF JOB
(N=34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Androgynous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>4.324</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>4.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk. Ex.</td>
<td>4.824</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>4.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.</td>
<td>4.794</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>4.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers.</td>
<td>4.647</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>5.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. Su.</td>
<td>4.882</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>5.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr. Su.</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>5.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi. De.</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>5.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14 - HYPOTHESIS TESTING - MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SEX ROLE OF JOB X GENDER OF APPLICANT X SEX ROLE OF APPLICANT RATINGS

NEUTRAL SEX ROLE OF JOB
(N=32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Androgynous</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>4.063</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>4.156</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>4.281</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>4.156</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk. Ex.</td>
<td>4.781</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>4.156</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.</td>
<td>4.531</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>4.281</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>4.313</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers.</td>
<td>4.531</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>4.563</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>4.563</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ov. Su.</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>4.281</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr. Su.</td>
<td>4.531</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>4.438</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>4.344</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi. De.</td>
<td>4.438</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>4.438</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>4.156</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


two way interactions, three way interactions, and the
four way interaction. The significance of the multivariate
tests will be examined first followed by the univariate tests
for each effect. In the following description of results of
the analysis, statements made about trends in the data are
based on an examination of the means.

Main Effects

Three of the four multivariate tests of main effects
were significant, sex role of job, gender of applicant, and
sex role of applicant. The gender of subject was not a
significant main effect. Since the multivariate tests were
significant, an examination of the univariate tests can be
made to see which of the dependent variables were associated
with the differences found.

For the main effect of sex role of job, the dependent
variables of education ($F(2,95)=5.581, p < .001$) and work
experience ($F(2,95)=8.916, p < .001$) were significant. The
overall means and standard deviations for the three levels of
sex role of job are presented in Table 8. On the ratings of
education, applicants for the masculine job were rated
slightly higher than those for the feminine or neutral jobs.
Ratings on the work experience variable were also slightly
higher for the masculine job than the feminine or neutral
jobs.
Table 9 presents the overall means and standard deviations for male and female applicants. For the main effect of gender of applicant, significant differences were found on three of the dependent variables: education (F(1,95)=13.690, p < .001), work experience (F(1,95)=26.389, p < .001), and personality (F(1,95)=13.175, p < .001). Overall, females were rated higher than males on education and personality. Males were seen as having better work experience than females.

For the main effect of sex role of applicant, all seven univariate tests indicated significance. Overall means and standard deviations for the three applicant sex roles are given in Table 10. On the education variable (F(2,94)=10.700, p < .001), masculine applicants were rated higher than feminine applicants who were rated higher than androgynous applicants. On the remaining six variables, work experience (F(2,94)=30.031, p < .001), interests (F(2,94)=20.316, p < .001), personality (F(2,94)=15.853, p < .001), overall suitability (F(2,94)=29.933, p < .001), predicted success (F(2,94)=34.142, p < .001) and hiring decision (F(2,94)=44.237, p < .001), a slightly different pattern emerged. The masculine applicants were rated the highest, followed by the androgynous applicants. The feminine applicants were given the lowest ratings.
Two Way Interactions

Three of the six multivariate two way interactions were significant, sex role of job by gender of applicant, sex role of job by sex role of applicant, and gender of applicant by sex role of applicant.

The appropriate means and standard deviations for interpreting the sex role of job by gender of applicant interaction are displayed in Table 11. Univariate F's indicated that there were significant differences on four variables, education (F(2,95)=60.147, p < .001), overall suitability (F(2,95)=3.303, p < .05), predicted success (F(2,95)=4.631, p < .05), and hiring decision (F(2,95)=3.198, p < .05). On the education variable, females were rated higher for the masculine (electrician's) job, males were rated higher on the feminine (secretary's) job, and males and females were rated about the same for the neutral (salesperson's) job. Trends for the variables of overall suitability and predicted success indicated that males were favored over females for the masculine and feminine jobs, and the two were judged about equal for the neutral job. On the hiring decision variable, males were rated higher than females for the electrician's job, but the two sexes were rated about the same for the other two positions.

Sex role of job by sex role of applicant was a first order interaction which had two significant roots. Univariate tests of the first root indicated that all seven dependent
variables achieved significance, education ($F(4, 188) = 29.164, p < .001$), work experience ($F(4, 188) = 15.967, p < .001$), interests ($F(4, 188) = 5.688, p < .001$), personality ($F(4, 188) = 9.774, p < .001$), overall suitability ($F(4, 188) = 12.280, p < .001$), predicted success ($F(4, 188) = 15.929, p < .001$), and hiring decision ($F(4, 188) = 18.529, p < .001$). For the second root, only education was significant ($F(1, 94.5) = 6.340, p < .05$).

Table 12 displays the means and standard deviations for interpreting these results. For the masculine job, the masculine applicants were rated higher than the feminine applicants who were rated higher than the androgynous applicants on the education and work experience variables. For the interests, personality, overall suitability, and predicted success variables, the order of the means was masculine, androgynous, feminine. On hiring decision, the masculine applicants were given the highest ratings with the feminine and androgynous applicants rated about equal.

For the feminine job, the ordering of means on the education variable was androgynous, masculine, feminine. On five of the variables, work experience, personality, overall suitability, predicted success, and hiring decision, masculine applicants were rated highest followed by androgynous, then by feminine applicants. Androgynous and masculine candidates were rated higher than the feminine ones on the interests variable.

For the neutral job, androgynous and feminine applicants were given higher ratings than masculine applicants on the
education variable. Androgynous applicants were rated higher than masculine or feminine candidates on the work experience and personality variables. For rating of interest, overall suitability, predicted success, and hiring decision, the order of the means was androgynous, masculine, feminine.

The final significant first order interaction was that of gender of applicant by sex role of applicant. Means and standard deviations of ratings for this interaction are given in Table 13. Five of the seven dependent variables achieved significance of the univariate tests, education \( F(2,94) = 26.210, p < .001 \), work experience \( F(2,94) = 6.504, p < .01 \), overall suitability \( F(2,94) = 4.379, p < .05 \), predicted success \( F(2,94) = 4.689, p < .05 \), and hiring decision \( F(2,94) = 3.558, p < .05 \).

For the masculine applicants, females were rated higher than males on education, predicted success, and hiring decision. The two sexes were rated near equal on work experience and overall suitability. For the feminine applicants, females were rated higher than males on the education variable but rated lower on the other four variables. For the androgynous applicants, males were rated higher than females on education, and the two sexes were rated near equal on the other variables.

Three Way and Four Way Interactions

Of the four three way interactions, one was significant. The four way interaction was not significant. There was a significant multivariate effect for the first root of the sex
role of job by gender of applicant by sex role of applicant interaction. Significant differences were found on five of the univariate tests. These indicated that there were differences among the groups on the variables of education ($F(4,188)=6.683, p < .001$), work experience ($F(4,188)=3.385, p < .01$), personality ($F(4,188)=2.478, p < .05$), predicted success ($F(4,188)=2.478, p < .05$), and hiring decision ($F(4,188)=3.212, p < .05$).

Appropriate means and standard deviations for interpreting this interaction are given in Table 14. For the masculine (electrician's) job, the order of means on the five variables indicated that masculine male and female applicants were preferred over feminine and androgynous male applicants who were preferred over feminine and androgynous females. For the feminine (secretary's) job, masculine applicants were again preferred, followed by androgynous males and females, with feminine males and females receiving the lowest ratings. On the neutral (salesperson's) job, the androgynous applicants received the highest ratings followed by masculine applicants who were preferred over the feminine applicants.

RESULTS- RANKING DATA

Means and standard deviations of the rankings assigned by both male and female subjects to the 24 applicants are given in Table 15. With respect to the less qualified and more qualified applicants to each position, it can be seen
TABLE 15 - MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF RANKING DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Electrician (N=36)</th>
<th>Secretary (N=34)</th>
<th>Salesperson (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine Male</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>4.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine Female</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>1.864</td>
<td>2.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine Male</td>
<td>4.778</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>5.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine Female</td>
<td>5.457&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>5.697&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous Male</td>
<td>4.861</td>
<td>1.791</td>
<td>3.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous Female</td>
<td>5.556</td>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>4.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Qualified</td>
<td>7.667</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>7.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Qualified</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>1.369</td>
<td>1.706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> N=35  
<sup>b</sup> N=33  
<sup>c</sup> N=31
that five out of the six were given the lowest or highest rankings, respectively. The more qualified salesperson applicant was ranked a little lower than the androgynous female applicant. The larger standard deviation for the highly qualified applicant's ranking indicates that there was less agreement on this ranking than on that of the androgynous female.

A graphic representation of the means is presented in Figure 1. The ranking patterns follow those of the ratings. The order of rankings is similar to the order of means for the three way interaction of sex role of job by gender of applicant by sex role of applicant. (See Table 16.) Males or females with feminine sex roles were consistently ranked lower than other applicants regardless of the job to which they were applying. The androgynous female was given fairly low rankings for the electrician's and secretary's positions, but unusually high rankings were assigned to this applicant for the salesperson's position. The androgynous male, however, was usually given medium rankings which were higher than the androgynous female's in all except the salesperson's job. The masculine applicants of both sexes did much better as a group than did applicants of other sex roles. Generally, the rankings of these candidates were high or at least middle range. Masculine applicants of both sexes did extremely well for the electrician's and secretary's jobs, and they also did fairly well on the salesperson's job.
FIGURE 1 - MEAN RANKINGS OF APPLICANTS FOR JOBS OF ELECTRICIAN, SECRETARY, AND SALESPERSON
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Electrician (N=36)</th>
<th>Secretary (N=34)</th>
<th>Salesperson (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>Rk.</td>
<td>HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.971</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.943</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>5.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>4.778</td>
<td>4.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>5.457a</td>
<td>5.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.229</td>
<td>5.556</td>
<td>4.824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a N=35
b N=33
c N=31
To summarize, the trend in the ranking data seemed to be a preference towards masculinity in the form of sex role, part of a sex role (androgyny), or gender. Applicants who were in some way associated with maleness were preferred. The masculine (sex role) applicants had masculine characteristics; the androgynous (sex role) applicants had some masculine traits; and the male (gender) applicants possessed some masculine identification by virtue of their biological identity.

Masculine applicants of both sexes were given high rankings more than other applicants. Male applicants were also given fairly high rankings as were androgynous applicants. Feminine or female applicants were often given low rankings, and the feminine female was consistently ranked near the bottom for each position.

Examining the rankings by job, it can be seen that there were some slight variations from the general trends within each job. For the electrician's job, the pattern is rather clear cut. Masculine males ($\bar{X}=2.472$, $SD=1.341$) followed by masculine females ($\bar{X}=3.111$, $SD=1.864$) are given the highest rankings. The other four applicants are ranked in the middle of the distribution with males of feminine ($\bar{X}=4.778$, $SD=1.588$) and androgynous ($\bar{X}=4.861$, $SD=1.791$) sex roles being ranked slightly higher than females with feminine ($\bar{X}=5.457$, $SD=1.721$) and androgynous ($\bar{X}=5.556$, $SD=1.423$) sex roles.

For the position of secretary, the masculine female ($\bar{X}=2.879$, $SD=1.616$) was ranked highest. The androgynous
male (M=3.941, SD=1.984) and masculine male (M=4.121, SD=1.691) applicants were ranked next at approximately equal ranks. Androgynous females (M=4.824, SD=1.642) and feminine males (M=5.182, SD=1.722) received the third highest rankings, (M=5.697, SD=1.704).

Androgynous females (M=2.406, SD=1.456) followed by androgynous males (M=3.594, SD=1.583) were ranked highest for the salesperson's position. Masculine males (M=4.452, SD=2.127), feminine males (M=4.742, SD=1.861), and masculine females (M=4.903, SD=1.832) were ranked next, and the feminine female was ranked lowest (M=5.406, SD=1.739).
CHAPTER SIX - DISCUSSION

The results of the analyses of the rating data and the means and standard deviations of the ranking data indicate that the hypotheses of interest were partially supported. This discussion provides some suggestions as to why these results were obtained and discusses the implications of this study for future research and for applications to the employment setting.

Specifically it was hypothesized that given applicants who were equally qualified, subjects would give higher ratings and rankings to applicants whose sex role matched that of the job, i.e., masculine and androgynous applicants would be preferred over feminine applicants for masculine jobs; feminine and androgynous applicants would be preferred over masculine applicants for feminine jobs; and candidates of all three sex roles would be evaluated equally for neutral jobs. Ratings of preference were made on seven variables, education, work experience, interests, personality, overall suitability, predicted success, and hiring decision.

Results indicated several significant multivariate effects, sex role of job, gender of applicant, sex role of applicant,
sex role of job by gender of applicant, sex role of job by sex role of applicant, gender of applicant by sex role of applicant, and sex role of job by gender of applicant by sex role of applicant.

Examination of the univariate analysis of variance with hiring decision as the dependent variable aids in the interpretation of these results. The most important results appeared to be the sex role of applicant main effect and the sex role of job by sex role of applicant interaction. On the sex role of applicant ratings, in general, masculine applicants were preferred over androgynous applicants who were preferred over feminine applicants.

The sex role of job by sex role of applicant interaction indicated that for the masculine job (electrician), masculine applicants were rated highest with androgynous and feminine applicants being rated equally and lower. For the feminine job (secretary), the ordering of means was androgynous, masculine, feminine. For the neutral job (salesperson), the order of means was androgynous, masculine, feminine.

Ranking data supported the rating data.

Support was found for the hypotheses in that applicant sex role played a significant part in determining ratings on the dependent measures. The exact part which sex role played in determining these ratings was not precisely as suggested. Specifically, it was found that masculine applicants were preferred for masculine and feminine jobs, and that
feminine applicants were devalued for all positions. The androgynous applicants received middle ratings except for the salesperson's position. (This last finding might have been due to the qualifications of the androgynous female being perceived as better than other applicants' qualifications.) It appears, then, that rather than finding a one-to-one correspondence between applicant sex role and job sex role, the applicant masculine sex role has been valued for jobs of all sex roles.

Some cautions are necessary in interpreting these results. First, the representation of sex role of job by a single position is a limitation of the present study. Although results may generalize across equal status jobs of the various sex roles, a hierarchical design where several jobs were used within each sex role of job category would be necessary to test this.

A second possible problem is the confounding of applicant sex role with interest in the job. A post hoc judgment of applicant interest indicated that subjects may be responding to the interest in the job expressed by the applicant rather than merely to applicant sex role. Ratings by four expert judges indicated a trend for masculine applicants to be rated as most interested, followed by androgynous then feminine applicants (See Appendix J.) It is difficult to say whether this was a fault of the stimulus materials or whether it reflected tendencies to perceive
feminine traits as less indicative of job interest. Interpretation in this discussion is based on the latter. However, further studies which untangle the effects of sex role and interest in the job should be conducted.

Given the above caveats, an attempt will be made to explain the findings. There is consistency between findings in this study and findings in the interview training literature. Interviewers generally are attempting to find qualified applicants who exhibit characteristic traits such as ambition, assertiveness, forcefulness, independence, and self-reliance. These characteristics have been identified as indicative of a masculine sex role (Bem, 1974). Because these characteristics were attributed to masculine (and also, to some extent, androgynous) applicants in the present study, they did have an influence on judgments made by raters. The same biases which operate in the context of the selection interview seem to have been operating here because this same information regarding applicant characteristics was made available.

Rather than attempting to find an applicant who matched the "ideal worker stereotype", judges did indeed look for individuals who matched their "ideal applicant stereotypes". Since the ideal applicant conveys the impression of possessing traditionally masculine traits, masculine applicants are preferred. Since androgynous applicants (as portrayed in this study) possess a lesser amount of these traits, their ratings were slightly lower. Feminine applicants who possessed none
of the characteristics of the ideal applicant were rated lowest of all.

In light of these findings, there is now even more evidence to suggest that interviewers and decision makers ought to be aware of possible "latent" discrimination. Do these masculine traits really indicate that the applicant is a better worker? It seems unlikely. However, in our culture, the successful job applicant has always been one who is seen as responsible, aggressive, able to make decisions, etc. Why shouldn't the applicant who is equally qualified but conveys the impression of being loyal, understanding, and compassionate fare as well?

Interviewers and decision makers should be trained to avoid making judgments based on personality characteristics rather than qualifications when such personality characteristics are not relevant criteria. A further suggestion would be that interview training should be carried out to encourage applicants to display these "masculine" traits. Indeed, such training programs have been conducted (cf., Francesco and Imada, 1976), but they are not widespread and they do not operate on the principle that selecting applicants on the basis of such traits might be discriminatory. More such training programs should be conducted for both decision makers and applicants such that all are aware of the potential biasing effects of exhibiting certain traits.
To summarize, results of this experiment have indicated that applicant sex role is an important factor in decision making in the selection process. Rather than making a decision such that an ideal worker stereotype would be selected, subjects in this study gave preference to the ideal applicant stereotype, i.e., subjects gave higher ratings to masculine applicants in most cases because they possessed traits such as responsibility, confidence, and assertiveness which have traditionally been considered indicative of a good applicant.

These findings seem at first to be inconsistent with what has been found in previous research. However, two factors make this study different than those reviewed earlier. In general, their treatment in the present study has given cause for the claim of greater external validity.

First of all, in this study, applicants of various gender/sex role combinations were directly compared rather than judged in isolation. This task of making comparisons among applicants for a particular position better approximates an actual situation than did some of the experimental tasks in earlier studies where the candidates of interest were not directly compared (cf., Cash, et al., 1977; Dipboye, et al., 1975, 1977; Rosen and Jerdee, 1974a). Since interviewers and decision makers are most often in a position where they make comparisons among applicants, the present experimental task seems to be a much better simulation. If certain groups
of applicants are systematically discriminated against when compared to other groups whose qualifications are no better, then a violation of the law has occurred. In the situation where only one applicant is being considered, a legal case for discrimination would be difficult to prove.

A second factor which has improved the external validity of this study is the reporting of information such as that which is learned in a selection interview. The use of the Interviewer Notes form provided a way to manipulate the sex role of the applicant. However, this type of information would generally be made available to a decision maker as pre-employment interviews are conducted as part of the selection procedure for the vast majority of existing jobs. It would be an extremely rare circumstance in which decision makers had only the types of information made available in earlier studies (e.g., Dipboye, 1975, 1977; Rosen and Jerdee, 1974a) on which to base a hiring decision.

In this study where direct comparisons of applicants for a single position have been made and information such as that available in most selection situations has been provided, subject raters did show some preference for masculine applicants. Since all applicants had been judged to be equally qualified, other candidate groups would have cause to claim unfair discrimination.

Returning to Bem's findings (Bem, 1976) of the percentages of males and females who could be classified into each sex
role, we find that 37% of all males (in her sample of Stanford undergraduate students) and 16% of all females were classified as masculine. On the other hand, 16% of all males and 34% of all females were classified as feminine. If there were systematic discrimination against feminine applicants, more than half the time would result in discrimination against women applicants. By the same reasoning, systematic preference for masculine applicants would result in male applicants being preferred over female applicants more than half the time.

Given the nature of the Stanford student body, it is likely that these estimates of individuals whose sex role is the same as their gender, i.e., masculine males and feminine females, are very conservative estimates of what numbers would be found in the population at large. Consequently, selection based on sex role of applicant would have a fairly large negative impact on certain members of the population, namely females.

Thus this study has supported the finding that women are discriminated against in selection for different types of jobs. With the exception of the Cash, et al (1977) study, other research in the area of sex discrimination in selection has indicated that females are discriminated against. In the Cash, et al. study, the interview information about the applicants was not available. Since subjects made a selection for a position directly (without interview information available), perhaps in this case, the ideal worker stereotype was more
pervasive.

The conclusions of this and earlier research thus are the same. In spite of general feelings to the contrary, females are still being discriminated against in selection for jobs. This discrimination is occurring even in jobs which have traditionally been held by females (as evidenced by ratings of applicants for the secretary's position in this study.) Not only are the stereotypes of decision makers a cause of this discrimination but the characteristics of a large group of women, i.e., feminine females, work to their disadvantage in an employment selection situation.

It is important that applicants and decision makers be aware of such effects. Women must be trained to exhibit certain characteristics considered desirable for a job applicant if they wish to be successful in obtaining jobs. Interviewers and decision makers must continue to try to become as systematic as possible in obtaining information about job applicants such that selection decisions are based on true qualifications rather than impressions made during an interview.

Perhaps more of a problem, though, is the cultural value on masculinity. Not only are masculine traits more valued (cf., Schein, 197?, 1975), but the society as a whole has continued to be structured such that a male is more likely to possess these valued traits. In the Stanford sample referred to earlier (cf., 197?), less than half of
all females (45%) possessed a significant number of masculine traits (as indicated by a masculine or androgynous sex role), whereas, the majority of males (64%) possessed these traits. Again, it must be emphasized that these effects are most likely more pronounced in the general population.

Although legislation against discrimination has been on record for some time, it is likely that women as a group will continue to be discriminated against until such time as cultural values on masculinity change and/or child rearing practices are altered such that females are socialized to behave in more masculine ways.

To summarize, results of this study have indicated that sex role of the applicant is an important variable in the selection decision making process. The characteristics usually considered as desirable in an interview situation have been identified as masculine, and an explanation of the results has been given within this framework. It has been shown that findings of this and previous research are consistent in that discrimination against women as a group has been indicated. The present study provides a greater claim to external validity and gives an explanation as to why such discrimination might exist.

With respect to future research in this area, it is recommended that more studies which are truer representations of real selection situations be conducted. Comparisons among applicants are made, and decision makers do have information
available about the personality characteristics of an applicant (as manifest in an interview) so these factors should be included in future studies of selection decision making processes.

Other factors might be systematically varied within this context to examine their influences. These include the status level of the job, the level of the position, i.e., entry vs. more advanced levels, the educational level of the applicant, and the previous work experience of the applicant.

It is suggested that status level of the job be used as an independent variable. In this study, the status level of the job was held constant. By studying the independent effect of this variable, more can be learned as to how the context of the job influences decision making relative to hiring employees for that job. In past research (cf., Cash, et al., 1977; Dipboye, et al., 1975, 1977; Hamner, et al., 1974), gender differences have been found in different directions depending on the status level of the position.

Another variable that could be studied in the future is the preparation of the applicant with respect to the level of the position. Research in the past has focused on hiring of applicants who were taking entry level positions. In the present study, all the applicants had some previous specialized training preparing them for the position and some previous relevant job experience.
Another variable for future study is the educational level of the applicant. Perhaps different effects occur for applicants with different educational backgrounds. In the past, research has focused on jobs which require fairly general academic backgrounds. Looking at the kind of job where specific preparation is needed compared to a job where a general background is acceptable might lead to some further enlightenment.

Still another variable for future study would be the past performance of the applicant in other positions. Thus far, performance had only been studied in the context of promotion or development for the same job. No one has yet looked at the effects of success or failure in previous positions on subsequent hireability.

Systematic study of these variables would provide data as to whether discrimination occurred in other common employment settings as well. Perhaps varying these situations would lead to a greater understanding of the selection process.

To summarize, a test was made of the hypothesis that sex role characteristics of applicants affected decision making in the employment setting to a greater extent than did gender of applicant. Some evidence was found to support this hypothesis. Although the anticipated results were not found for all variables, there was some indication that masculine traits were valued in job applicants to a variety
of positions. Findings of this study were discussed in terms of implications for interviewers and decision makers and potential applicants and possibilities for future research.
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APPENDIX A

Sex____  Age____  Year in School_______

On this page is a list of common jobs. We would like you to give your opinion of the status or prestige of each job. Please indicate your opinion using this rating scale:

- Mark a 7 if the job is one of the highest status
- Mark a 6 if the job is one of high status
- Mark a 5 if the job is one of medium to high status
- Mark a 4 if the job is one of medium status
- Mark a 3 if the job is one of low to medium status
- Mark a 2 if the job is one of low status
- Mark a 1 if the job is one of the lowest status

Please read over the list of jobs before making your ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bartender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garbage collector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scientist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gas station attendant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electrician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street sweeper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nursery school teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bank teller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chef</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiction writer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truck driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real estate agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mail carrier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bus driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hairdresser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clerk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housekeeper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>librarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insurance agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sales person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dish washer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taxi driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurant server</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telephone operator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receptionist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meter reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elementary school teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dancer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flight attendant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On this page is a list of common jobs. We would like you to give your opinion as to whether you think men or women hold each job. Please indicate your opinion using this rating scale:

Mark a 1 if you think that only men hold the job
Mark a 2 if you think that many more men than women hold the job
Mark a 3 if you think that more men than women hold the job
Mark a 4 if you think that about the same amount of men and women hold the job
Mark a 5 if you think that more women than men hold the job
Mark a 6 if you think that many more women than men hold the job
Mark a 7 if you think that only women hold the job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bartender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>garbage collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gas station attendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>electrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>street sweeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>banker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nursery school teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bank teller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fiction writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>truck driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>police officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>real estate agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mail carrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>musician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bus driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hairdresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>housekeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>insurance agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sales person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dish washer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taxi driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>restaurant server</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high school teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>telephone operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>receptionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meter reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elementary school teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>flight attendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>typist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Sex______ Age______ Year in School_______

On the following pages, you will find eight (8) job descriptions. We would like you to give your opinion of the status of each job. Please indicate your opinion using this rating scale:

Mark a 7 if you think the job is one of the highest status.
Mark a 6 if you think the job is one of high status.
Mark a 5 if you think the job is one of medium to high status.
Mark a 4 if you think the job is one of medium status.
Mark a 3 if you think the job is one of low to medium status.
Mark a 2 if you think the job is one of low status.
Mark a 1 if you think the job is one of the lowest status.

We would also like your opinion as to whether you think men or women hold each of the eight (8) jobs. Please indicate your opinion using this rating scale:

Mark a 7 if you think that only women hold the job.
Mark a 6 if you think that many more women than men hold the job.
Mark a 5 if you think that more women than men hold the job.
Mark a 4 if you think that about the same number of men and women hold the job.
Mark a 3 if you think that more men than women hold the job.
Mark a 2 if you think that many more men than women hold the job.
Mark a 1 if you think that only men hold the job.

Please read each job description carefully before making your ratings.
LAWYER

Conducts criminal and civil lawsuits, draws up legal documents, advises clients as to legal rights, and practices other phases of law: Gathers evidence in divorce, civil, criminal, and other cases to formulate defense or to initiate legal action. Represents client in court, and before quasi-judicial or administrative agencies of government. May act as trustee, guardian, or executor. May teach college courses in law. May specialize in particular phase of law.

My rating of the status of this job is_______.

My rating of whether men or women hold this job is_______. 
STREET SWEeper

Sweeps refuse from municipal streets, gutters, and sidewalks into pile and shovels it into movable container that is pushed from place to place. May pick up paper and similar rubbish from lawns, flower beds, or highway median strips, using spike-tipped stick.

My rating of the status of this job is_____.

My rating of whether men or women hold this job is_____. 
BARTENDER

Mixes and serves alcoholic and non-alcoholic drinks to patrons of bar, following standard recipes: Mixes ingredients, such as liquor, soda, water, sugar, and bitters, to prepare cocktails and other drinks. Serves wine and draught or bottled beer. Collects money for drinks served. Orders or requisitions liquors and supplies. Places bottled goods and glasses to make attractive display. May slice and pit fruit for garnishing drinks. May prepare appetizers, such as pickles, cheese, and cold meats.

My rating of the status of this job is_____.

My rating of whether men or women hold this job is_____.
SALESPEOPLE

Sells merchandise to business or industrial establishments, or to individuals, utilizing detailed knowledge of specific characteristics of merchandise, at sales office, store, showrooms, or customer's home or place of business.
Calls on customers in person or by phone, or talks to customer on the sales floor. Displays merchandise, using samples or catalog. Demonstrates article, emphasizing salable features. Estimates or quotes prices, credit terms, and trade-in allowances. Prepares forms and sales contracts. Prepares reports of business transactions and keeps expense accounts. May set up window displays and advertising posters. May collect payment of products sold.

My rating of the status of this job is__________.

My rating of whether men or women hold this job is_______.
COOK

Prepares and cooks family-style meals for crews, work crews, or residents and employees of institutions: Cooks foodstuffs in quantities according to menu and number of patrons to be served. Washes dishes. Bakes bread and pastry. Cuts meat. Plans menu taking advantage of foods in season and local availability. May serve meals. May order supplies and keep records and accounts. May supervise activities of one or more workers who assist in preparing and serving meals.

My rating of the status of this job is__________.

My rating of whether men or women hold this job is__ ____.
TELEPHONE OPERATOR

Operates cord or cordless switchboard to relay incoming, outgoing, and interoffice calls. Pushes switch keys to make connections and relay calls on cordless switchboard. On cord type equipment, plugs cord in jacks mounted on switchboard. May supply information to callers and record messages. May keep record of calls placed and toll charges.

My rating of the status of this job is__________.

My rating of whether men or women hold this job is__________.
SECRETARY

Schedules appointments, gives information to callers, takes dictation, and otherwise relieves officials of clerical work and minor administrative and business detail: Reads and routes incoming mail. Locates and attaches appropriate file to correspondence to be answered by employer. Takes dictation in shorthand or on stenotype machine and transcribes notes on typewriter, or transcribes from voice recordings. Composes and types routine correspondence and other records. Answers telephone and gives information to callers or routes call to appropriate official and places outgoing calls. Schedules appointments for employer. Greets visitors, ascertains nature of business, and conducts visitors to employer or appropriate person. May arrange travel schedule and reservations. May compile and type statistical reports.

My rating of the status of this job is__________.

My rating of whether men or women hold this job is______.
ELECTRICIAN

Plans layout and installs and repairs wiring, electrical fixtures, apparatus, and control equipment: Plans new or modified installations to minimize waste of materials, provide access for future maintenance, and avoid unsightly, hazardous, and unreliable wiring, consistent with specifications and local electrical code. Prepares sketches showing location of all wiring and equipment or follows diagrams or blueprints prepared by others, insuring that concealed wiring is installed before completion of future walls, ceilings, and flooring. Measures, cuts, bends, threads, assembles, and installs electrical conduits. Splices wires. Connects wiring to lighting fixtures and power equipment, using handtools. Installs control and distribution apparatus. Connects power cables to equipment and installs grounding leads. Tests continuity of circuits to insure electrical compatibility and safety of all components, using standard instruments. Observes functioning of installed equipment or system to detect hazards and need for adjustments, relocation, or replacement. May repair faulty equipment or systems.

My rating of the status of this job is _____.

My rating of whether men or women hold this job is _____.
APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS

We are studying how people make decisions about hiring applicants for different jobs. We would like your opinion on the background qualifications of a number of job applicants. There are four areas of background information with which we are concerned: education, work experience, interests, and personality. We would like your opinion as to how these applicants compare to people in general in each of these four areas. Use this rating scale to give your opinion:

Mark a 7 if you think the applicant is way above average.
Mark a 6 if you think the applicant is quite a bit above average.
Mark a 5 if you think the applicant is somewhat above average.
Mark a 4 if you think the applicant is average.
Mark a 3 if you think the applicant is somewhat below average.
Mark a 2 if you think the applicant is quite a bit below average.
Mark a 1 if you think the applicant is way below average.

In addition, we would also like you to guess whether the applicant is a man or a woman. Use this rating scale to indicate your opinion:

Mark a 7 if you think the applicant could only be a woman.
Mark a 6 if you think the applicant is much more likely to be a woman than a man.
Mark a 5 if you think the applicant is more likely to be a woman than a man.
Mark a 4 if you think the applicant could be either a man or a woman.
Mark a 3 if you think the applicant is more likely to be a man than a woman.
Mark a 2 if you think the applicant is much more likely to be a man than a woman.
Mark a 1 if you think the applicant could only be a man.

INSTRUCTIONS CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
At the bottom of each applicant's page, you will see a chart on which to indicate your ratings. The chart looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart will help you to make your ratings. The L, A, and H at the top of the chart stand for Low, Average, and High. Use these to help you rate the education, work experience, interests, and personality. The M and W at the bottom of the chart stand for Man and Woman; ? indicates that it could be either a man or a woman.

Circle the rating that indicates your opinion.
RESUME

2214 South Street
Columbus, Ohio 43218
Phone: 614-481-9288

Education:
Worthington High School
Worthington, Ohio
Diploma: June 1973
Franklin County School of Vocational
Education: Columbus, Ohio
Electrician's certificate: June 1975

Work Experience:
Cotkin Construction
Columbus, Ohio
Electrician's assistant-Aug. 1975-present

Interests:
drag racing, sailing, diving, ice hockey

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Other Comments:
Was ambitious, wants to change position. Experience in industrial setting, would like to become independent contractor after getting more experience.
RESUME

May 1, 1977

289 Bodega Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43212
Phone: 614-868-4299

Education:
South High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma: June 1973

Work Experience:
Steve's Super Selection
Columbus, Ohio
Grocery clerk October 1976 to present

Interests:
Playing pool, bowling, pinball, making electric motors

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name__________________________________

Education took college course 1 yr, then switched to business, liked bookkeeping class
Work Experience works in grocery store as check out clerk, occasional bagging groceries, stocks shelves, files, works with customers
Other Comments enjoys making electric motors. Thinks it would be fun to work as electrician; seems rather uncertain about future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

68 Hillside Avenue
New Albany, Ohio 43718
Phone: 614-264-8120

May 5, 1977

Education:
New Albany High School
New Albany, Ohio
Diploma: June 1974

Work Experience:
New Albany Electrical Contractors
New Albany, Ohio
Electrician's assistant; Sept. 1974-present

Interests:
Football, baseball, Little League coach, auto repairs

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name

Education
Work Experience
Other Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M/W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42 Arizona Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43211
Phone: 614-423-8182

Education:
Franklin High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1973

Work Experience:
Francesco's Foundry
Columbus, Ohio
Electrician's helper; July 1975-present
Riverside Hospital
Columbus, Ohio
Nurse's Aide; August 1973 to May 1975

Interests:
Bowling, gymnastics, plays guitar, cake decorating

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name

Education

Work experience

Interests

Personality

M/W
RESUME

41 Mohegan Street
Columbus, Ohio 43201
Phone: 614-291-3761

May 6, 1977

Education:
Washington High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1973

Columbus Technical Institute
Columbus, Ohio
Electrician's Certificate, June 1975

Work Experience:
Alvin's Appliance and Hardware Store
Columbus, Ohio
Appliance repair technician. July 1975 to present

Interests:
making clothes for self and family,
church school teacher, needlepoint,
Italian cooking

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name ________________
Education: took remedial course in math but didn't enjoy math, decided to pursue career as electrician instead
Work Experience: have worked at Home, doing repair work in small appliances such as radio, blender, telephone, etc
Other Comments: enjoy repair work at Home and want to work somewhere quieter where I can spend more time with children

Education 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Work experience 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Interests 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Personality 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
M/W 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
May 8, 1977

71 Lee Street
Oberlin, Ohio 48519
Phone: 513-262-3012

RESUME

Education:
Lafayette Preparatory School
Dublin, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1974

Oberlin College
Oberlin, Ohio
B.A., June, 1977 (expected)
Major: Electrical engineering

Work Experience:
Ford Motor Company
Dearborn, Michigan
electrical technician 6/75-8/75, 7/76-8/76

Interests:
playing chess, skiing, horseback riding, camping

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name
Education: college prep school, liked science courses
especially physics best, also liked math: will receive degree in electrical engineering in June

Work experience: worked for Ford last 2 summers,
assisted in installation of electrical systems in various model cars

Other comments: seems ambitious, wants experience in different types of electrical work, open
position as stepping stone to better position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

122
RESUME

May 2, 1977

311 Sorrento Street
Groveport, Ohio 43185
Phone: 614-229-7898

Education: Gahanna High School
            Gahanna, Ohio

Work experience: Michael Lippman
                 Groveport, Ohio
                 Electrician's assistant
                 July 1974 to present

Interests: bread making, Community Chest volunteer
           fund raiser, canning, quilting

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name

Education: took college course in k 3 physical science, work with electricity first, did not want to go on to college

Work Experience: works for independent electrician in Groveport as assistant, primary work repairing faculty equipment, does some installation of parts
                 in complete systems, occasionally does anxiety for
                 new systems

Other Comments:
                 wants to stay with present employer but Lippman is retiring & applicant wants new work
                 elsewhere, seems rather shy & soft spoken
RESUME

May 2, 1977

54 West Street
Hilliard, Ohio 41859
Phone: 614-565-2989

Education:
Lincoln High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma: June 1975

Work experience:
Rapaport Construction Company
Hilliard, Ohio
Construction assistant
June 1975 to December 1975
Electrician's assistant
January 1976 to present

Interests:
Sky diving, sailing, macramé, making candy

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name _________________________

Education: took manual training course in hä, wood, metal shop, home economics, class

Work Experience: began as construction assistant after graduation, did loading, lifting, assisted carpenter; after 6 months, moved to Electrician's assistant in assisting in installing electrical systems in new buildings

Other Comments: wish to pursue career in this field, also want to move back to Columbus to be closer to family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>M/W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTIONS

We are studying how people make decisions about hiring applicants for different jobs. We would like your opinion on the background qualifications of a number of job applicants. There are four areas of background information with which we are concerned: education, work experience, interests, and personality. We would like your opinion as to how these applicants compare to people in general in each of these four areas. Use this rating scale to give your opinion:

Mark a 7 if you think the applicant is way above average.
Mark a 6 if you think the applicant is quite a bit above average.
Mark a 5 if you think the applicant is somewhat above average.
Mark a 4 if you think the applicant is average.
Mark a 3 if you think the applicant is somewhat below average.
Mark a 2 if you think the applicant is quite a bit below average.
Mark a 1 if you think the applicant is way below average.

In addition, we would also like you to guess whether the applicant is a man or a woman. Use this rating scale to indicate your opinion:

Mark a 7 if you think the applicant could only be a woman.
Mark a 6 if you think the applicant is much more likely to be a woman than a man.
Mark a 5 if you think the applicant is more likely to be a woman than a man.
Mark a 4 if you think the applicant could be either a man or a woman.
Mark a 3 if you think the applicant is more likely to be a man than a woman.
Mark a 2 if you think the applicant is much more likely to be a man than a woman.
Mark a 1 if you think the applicant could only be a man.

INSTRUCTIONS CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
At the bottom of each applicant's page, you will see a chart on which to indicate your ratings. The chart looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart will help you to make your ratings. The L, A, and H at the top of the chart stand for Low, Average, and High. Use these to help you rate the education, work experience, interests, and personality. The M and W at the bottom of the chart stand for Man and Woman; ? indicates that it could be either a man or a woman.

Circle the rating that indicates your opinion.
RESUME

May 4, 1977

22 Park Street
Columbus, Ohio 43212
Phone: 614-488-9155

Education: Columbus West High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma, June 1977 (expected)

Work Experience: Ajax Instant Printing
Columbus, Ohio
Clerk, June 1976 to August 1976

Interests: Cub Scout leader, Sunday school teacher, photography

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name _________________________________
Education: will graduate from high school in
June; taking Business/Agri. course.
Enjoy working with people.

Work Experience: summer job at Ajax - did
Typing. Gave customers handbil distro.

Skills: Typing - 35 WPM; clerk - 20 WPM.

Other Comments: rather quiet, shy; seems
amiably about getting a position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H 6
A 7
M W
90 East Andover Street
Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43526
Phone: 614-626-8585

May 5, 1977

Education:
Whetstone High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1976

Work Experience:
Columbus and Southwestern Ohio Spring
Company; Columbus, Ohio
Typist; January 1977 to present

Columbus Tool and Die Company
Columbus, Ohio
Clerk; June 1976 to December 1976

Interests:
Fishing, swimming and diving, sailing,
auto mechanics

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name

Education: Business course in the: sales, bookkeeping, 
file, shorthand, data entry; was member of crew team 
were to go on to business school at junior college when

Work Experience: 
Working 
now works as only typist for small company. Type
letters and reports for the necessary offices. Job is clerk

Skills: 
 filed 5 letters in 10 minutes. Type 28 words per minute

Other comments:

Seems ambitious, independent, able to make
accurate decisions quickly.

Education   L 2 3 4 5 6 7
Work Experience   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Interests      1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Personality    1 2 3 4 5 6 7
M/W            1 2 3 4 5 6 7
RESUME

May 6, 1977

149 Walden Road
Columbus, Ohio 43203
Phone: 614-428-9057

Education:
Westerville High School
Westerville, Ohio
Diploma: June 1973

Work Experience:
Women's Christian Temperance Union
Westerville, Ohio
Receptionist: June 1973 to Sept. 1973

Fixler Real Estate Agents, Inc.
Columbus, Ohio
Secretary/receptionist: Sept. 1973 to present

Interests:
Bridge, oil painting, bicycling,
community chorus member

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name

Education: left college courses wanted to go on and not
received; the total concentration at Indiana for
Certificate in Music program in September.

Work Experience:
Very good period as WEU receptionist
and enjoyed the people there. Their work is
Secretary/receptionist to operate, type, etc. Two years.

Skills:
Word typing and telephone typing.

Other Comments:
Would like job with more opportunity for advancement.

Personality

L 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
M 2 3 4 W
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

M/W

2 3 4 5 6 7
RESUME

May 7, 1977

290 E. Dublin-Granville Rd.
Worthington, Ohio 43122
Phone: 614-488-9285

Education: Groveport-Madison High School
Groveport, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1976

Work Experience: Hill Haberdashery
Reynoldsburg, Ohio
Clerical Assistant: August 1976 to present

Interests: Crocheting, hospital aide, amateur theatre

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name

Education: took business course, liked psychology
business world & have excellent sight & typing

Work Experience: works as an assistant to Dr. hill, does
secretarial tasks, answers phones, files, etc.

Skills:
Typing 60 WPM, dictation 45 WPM

Other Comments: like job but would like piece of
business to be closer to home so could spend
more time with family. Engage customer in store

Education 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Work Experience 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Interests 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Personality 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
M/W 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
May 5, 1977

1090 Main Street
Gahanna, Ohio 43538
Phone: 614-299-3766

Education:
Gahanna High School
Gahanna, Ohio
Diploma: June 1975

Work Experience:
Hartman Industries
Gahanna, Ohio
Clerk-typist: August 1975 to present

Interests:
Sewing, canning, raises Siamese cats, knitting

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name______________________

Education: took business course, liked typing +
shorthand course best; member of Future
Homemakers of America. No plans to continue
education
does typing, filing, takes dictation

Skills: typing 65 wpm steno 50 wpm

Other Comments: very friendly, seems to be
dedicated to present employer but can't
move to new location (Texas) with company
because of family commitments, some hesitation to

Education
1 2 3 4 5 6

Work experience
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Interests
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Personality
1 2 3 4 5 6

M/W
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
RESUME

289 E. Oakland Ave.
Columbus, Ohio 43202
Phone: 614-291-3894

Education:
- Hilliard High School
  Hilliard, Ohio
  Diploma: June 1975

Work Experience:
- Buckeye Wine Industries
  Columbus, Ohio
  File Clerk: Sept. 1975 to June 1976
  Secretary: June 1976 to present

Interests:
- Jogging, hunting, sports car racing, archery

INTerviewer Notes

Name

Education: Left general course after 3 yrs then switched to commercial course, liked bookkeeping course, company sent me to learn typing & data entry skills.

Work Experience: Worked for 1 yr as file clerk, after taking typing courses was promoted to secretary.

Skills: Typing 65 WPM, typing 55 WPM

Other Comments: Wants new job because there is little opportunity for advancement in present position. Willing to continue education to advance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</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>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

May 2, 1977

20 Fairfield Place
Columbus, Ohio 43209
Phone: 614-742-1897

Education:
Columbus North High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1975

Work Experience:
Columbus Office Supply House, Inc.
Columbus, Ohio
Secretary: June 1975 to present

Interests:
Horseback riding, swimming, volleyball,
lifeguard at church camp

INTERVIEWER NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>M/W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Business course in k e. related to work keeping class, wants to take evening classes.</td>
<td>Works as secretary for president's assistant, keeps typing of letters, reports, answers phone. Takes occasional dictation.</td>
<td>Horseback riding, swimming, volleyball, lifeguard at church camp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typing 65 WPM average 50 WPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Comments:</td>
<td>Wants to leave present job for more advancement opportunities, seems aggressive but not overpowering.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

May 8, 1977

654 LeConte Ave.
Springfield, Ohio 44109
Phone: 513-882-9189

Education:
Dayton High School
Dayton, Ohio
Diploma: June 1974

Miami University
Oxford, Ohio
Attended: 9/74 - 6/75

Work Experience:
Southwest Ohio Metal Products
Springfield, Ohio
Receptionist: 9/75 to present

Interests:
Softball, water and snow skiing, gourmet cooking, needlepoint

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name
Education: took college prep courses in H.S.,
didn't want to continue college after 1st year.
Is considering resuming college part time.

Work Experience: works as receptionist - answer
phone, greets clients & direct them to appropriate
office, have light typing & filing

Skills: Typing 65 WPM
       Stenography 55 WPM

Other Comments: waste better position at typing
4 steno skills can be used. Enjoy working
with people

| Education | I | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Work experience | I | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Interests | I | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Personality | M | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| M/W | I | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
APPENDIX F

INSTRUCTIONS

We are studying how people make decisions about hiring applicants for different jobs. We would like your opinion on the background qualifications of a number of job applicants. There are four areas of background information with which we are concerned: education, work experience, interests, and personality. We would like your opinion as to how these applicants compare to people in general in each of these four areas. Use this rating scale to give your opinion:

Mark a 7 if you think the applicant is way above average.
Mark a 6 if you think the applicant is quite a bit above average.
Mark a 5 if you think the applicant is somewhat above average.
Mark a 4 if you think the applicant is average.
Mark a 3 if you think the applicant is somewhat below average.
Mark a 2 if you think the applicant is quite a bit below average.
Mark a 1 if you think the applicant is way below average.

In addition, we would also like you to guess whether the applicant is a man or a woman. Use this rating scale to indicate your opinion:

Mark a 7 if you think the applicant could only be a woman.
Mark a 6 if you think the applicant is much more likely to be a woman than a man.
Mark a 5 if you think the applicant is more likely to be a woman than a man.
Mark a 4 if you think the applicant could be either a man or a woman.
Mark a 3 if you think the applicant is more likely to be a man than a woman.
Mark a 2 if you think the applicant is much more likely to be a man than a woman.
Mark a 1 if you think the applicant could only be a man.

INSTRUCTIONS CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
At the bottom of each applicant's page, you will see a chart on which to indicate your ratings. The chart looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart will help you to make your ratings. The L, A, and H at the top of the chart stand for Low, Average, and High. Use these to help you rate the education, work experience, interests, and personality. The M and W at the bottom of the chart stand for Man and Woman; ? indicates that it could be either a man or a woman.

Circle the rating that indicates your opinion.
90 Battery Lane
Columbus, Ohio 43214
Phone 614-426-9898

Education: Columbus East High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma, June 1976

Work Experience: Blair Books
Worthington, Ohio
Sales clerk
August 1976 to present

Interests: reading, Salvation Army kitchen volunteer,
knitting, embroidery.

Name _____________________________________
Education: took Commercial Course took typing
class test
Work Experience: like books, magazine, newspaper
to meet customers, suggest reading material

Other Comments: wants to find new position
because Blair Books is interesting to buy.

Personality: sensitive to needs of others, cheerful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>M/W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M/W | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
222 Bokirk Place
Worthington, Ohio
Phone: 614-491-8203

Education: Worthington High School
Worthington, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1975

Work Experience: Nelson Tractor Sales
Worthington, Ohio
Salesperson: December 1975 to present

Interests: Football, motorcycling, softball, scuba diving

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name
Education: took business & agricultural courses, did farm service classes last, no plans to further education
Work Experience: works as sales person, sells tractors & other farm equipment to individuals, handles credit, trade ins, & sales transactions
Other Comments: took 6 month cross country motorcycle trip after high school, wants new type of position, seems sure of life style, enjoys sales

Education  L  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Work experience  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Interests  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Personality  M  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
M/W  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
RESUME

May 4, 1977

3415 E. Trenton Ave.
Granville, Ohio 43918
Phone: 614-228-3091

Education:
Granville High School
Granville, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1975

Work Experience:
V.L.H. Enterprises
Granville, Ohio
Salesclerk; October 1976 to present

Milt's Tacos
Granville, Ohio
Salesclerk; August 1975 to June 1976

Interests:
Macrame, water ballet, modern dance,
4-H leader

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name

Education: Took six years of agricultural courses. Enjoyed courses in bookkeeping, accounting, farm management.

Work Experience: After graduation, sold Victory
food at country store. Worked at Milt's Tacos, built barbecue grill.

Other Comments: Wants to leave present position to move to Columbus where space will be available.

scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>M/W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W
RESUME

28 Peabody Street
Columbus, Ohio 43214
Phone: 614-299-8107

Education:
Toledo South High School
Toledo, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1973
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
Attended: September 1973 to June 1975

Work Experience:
Glenn's Gourmet Shoppe
Toledo, Ohio
Sales representative; July 1975 to April 1977

Interests:
Marxist study group leader, mountain climber, traveling, gourmet cooking

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name

Education: college prep course in U. S. history, math, English
Courses at OSU - left for financial reasons, plane
Work Experience: to resume education next quarter in
               academic division
               Sold gourmet cooking equipment to
               buy-ins from retail stores. Traveled around Ohio,
               giving demonstrations.

Other Comments: moved back to Columbus to

               continue education - some interesting,
               articulate, able to express opinions, able to
               work independently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Personality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>M/W 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

May 6, 1977

82 Sara Court
Dayton, Ohio 41981
Phone: 513-828-3934

Education:
Dayton North High School
Dayton, Ohio
Diploma: June 1976

Work Experience:
Barbara's Bedroom Boutique
Dayton, Ohio
Salesperson; August 1976 to present

Interests:
Jewelry making, leather work, ballroom dancing, fencing

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name:

Education:
Work experience:
Interests:
Personality:
M/W:

L 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
M
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

RESUME

May 6, 1977

19 Oakland Manor Road
Columbus, Ohio 43204
Phone: 614-328-5699

Education: Parkview Military School
Mt. Vernon, Ohio
Diploma - June 1976

Work Experience: Barry's Camp Out
Columbus, Ohio
Salesperson - October 1976 to Present

Interests: Camping, backpacking, rock climbing, raquetball

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name

Education: attended private school, college prep., with military emphasis; disliked high school, only enjoyed classes in manual arts.

Work Experience: like camping equipment, do retail customers at Barry's Camp Out. Be familiar with all equipment sold by future, make sales transactions.

Other Comments: more generally interested in sales work, want to become familiar with other types of sales positions, more experience desirable except able to operate in store.

| Education | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Work experience | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Interests | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Personality | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| M/W | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
RESUME

May 5, 1977

42 Lowell Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43202
Phone: 614-297-8192

Education: New Albany High School
New Albany, Ohio
Diploma: June 1976

Work Experience: Lazarus Department Store
Columbus, Ohio
Sales clerk: July 1976 to March 1977
Assistant buyer: March 1977 to present

Interests: Hiking, volunteer to fire department,
weaving, Chinese cooking

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name

Education: took commercial course in the first
Course in retailing & bookkeeping, hopes to go
to business school in future

Work Experience: worked in record dept as sales
clerk, promoted to assistant buyer, keeps
selection of merchandise to be purchased, keeps
records of sales

Other Comments: seems aggressive, cheerful, likes people,
wants to leave present job to get experience
in different types of selling positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

May 3, 1977

84 Stewart Avenue
Dublin, Ohio 41860
Phone: 614-889-4501

Education:
Dublin High School
Dublin, Ohio
Diploma: June 1977 (anticipated)

Work Experience:
Andy's Ice Cream
Dublin, Ohio
Ice cream truck driver and salesperson
June 1976 - August 1976

Interests: stamp collecting, butterfly collection

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: ________________________

Education: will graduate in June, business course - doesn't enjoy school

Work Experience: drove ice cream truck for Andy’s ice cream last summer, sold ice cream to neighborhood people

Other Comments: enjoyed selling ice cream, thinks sales work would be interesting career, likes working with children

Education  L  A  H
Work experience  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Interests  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Personality  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
M/W  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
APPENDIX G

Sex_________ Age_________ Year in School_________

INSTRUCTIONS

We are studying how people make decisions about hiring applicants for different jobs. We would like you to pretend that you are a manager for a medium sized company and that you have the responsibility for hiring a new electrician for your department. There are 8 applicants for the position. Each applicant has been interviewed by a company interviewer. You will receive each applicant's resume and a copy of some notes made by the interviewer. Using this information, we would like you to rate each of the 8 applicants in several areas: education, work experience, interests, personality, overall suitability for the job, predicted success on the job, and the likelihood that you would hire the applicant.

At the bottom of each applicant's page, you will see a chart on which to indicate your ratings. The chart looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart will help you make your ratings. The L, A, and H at the top of the chart stand for Low, Average, and High. The rating scale defines each of the points of the scale:

Circle a 7 if you think the applicant is way above average.
Circle a 6 if you think the applicant is quite a bit above average.
Circle a 5 if you think the applicant is somewhat above average.
Circle a 4 if you think the applicant is average.
Circle a 3 if you think the applicant is somewhat below average.
Circle a 2 if you think the applicant is quite a bit below average.
Circle a 1 if you think the applicant is way below average.

After rating each of the 8 applicants, we would like you to put them in order of the way you would hire them. On the last page of this booklet is a ranking form.

INSTRUCTIONS CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
To help you make your decisions, here is a description of the electrician's job:

**ELECTRICIAN**

Plans layout and installs and repairs wiring, electrical fixtures, apparatus, and control equipment. Prepares sketches showing location of all wiring and equipment or follows diagrams or blueprints prepared by others. Measures, cuts, bends, threads, assembles, and installs electrical conduits. Connects wiring to lighting fixtures and power equipment, using handtools. Conducts tests to insure electrical compatibility and safety of all components, using standard instruments. Observes functioning of installed equipment or system to detect hazards and need for adjustments, relocation, or replacement. Repairs faulty equipment or systems.
Susan Morrison
2214 South Street
Columbus, Ohio 43218
Phone: 614-481-9288

RESUME

Education:
- Worthington High School
  Worthington, Ohio
  Diploma: June 1973
- Franklin County School of Vocational Education:
  Columbus, Ohio
  Electrician's certificate: June 1975

Work Experience:
- Cotkin Construction
  Columbus, Ohio
  Electrician's assistant-Aug. 1975-present

Interests:
- drag racing, sailing, diving, ice hockey

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name
Education: B.S. - major training program, didn't shop classes well
- major - major training program, didn't shop classes well
- major - major training program, didn't shop classes well

Work Experience: new works as electrician's assistant, builds in new
- major - major training program, didn't shop classes well

Other Comments: very ambitious - wants to change position to
- major - major training program, didn't shop classes well
- major - major training program, didn't shop classes well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

Nancy Moffett
41 Mohegan Street
Columbus, Ohio 43201
Phone: 614-291-3761

Education:
Washington High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma; June, 1973

Columbus Technical Institute
Columbus, Ohio
Electrician's Certificate, June 1975

Work Experience:
Alvin's Appliance and Hardware Store
Columbus, Ohio
Appliance repair technician. July 1975

to present

Interests:
making clothes for self and family,
church school teacher, needlepoint,
Italian cooking

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name Nancy Moffett
Education: took technical classes in college but didn't enjoy them, decided to pursue career in electronics instead.

Work Experience: Has worked at Alvin's doing repair work on small appliances such as toasters, blenders, toasters, etc.

Other Comments: Enjoys repair work at Alvin's but wants to work somewhere elected closer to home so can spend more time with children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Davis
54 West Street
Hilliard, Ohio 41859
Phone: 614-565-2989

RESUME

May 2, 1977

Education:
Lincoln High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma: June 1975

Work experience:
Rapaport Construction Company
Hilliard, Ohio
Construction assistant
June 1975 to December 1975
Electrician's assistant
January 1976 to present

Interests:
Sky diving, sailing, macramé, making candy

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: John Davis
Education: Took manual training course on h.s., enjoyed wood and metal shop, home economics class.

Work Experience: Began as construction assistant after graduation - in trailer, lifting, assisting carpenter; after 6 months, hired for assistant to electrician at job; assisted in installing electric systems in new building.

Other Comments: Likes work as electrician's assistant, wants to pursue career in this field; also wants to move back to Columbus to be closer to family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

James Cook
209 Bodega Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43212
Phone: 614-868-4299

Education: South High School
            Columbus, Ohio
            Diploma: June 1973

Work Experience: Steve's Super Selection
                 Columbus, Ohio
                 Grocery clerk October 1976 to present

Interests: Playing pool, bowling, pinball, making
electric motors

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: James Cook

Education: took college course 1st 2 yrs, then switched to business,
solid bookkeeping skills

Work Experience: worked in grocery store as check out clerk 6 months-
very big groceris in stock shelves, gave work being routed to
interior of building

Other Comments: likes making electric motors - thinks it would
be fun to work as electrician; seems rather uncertain
about future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

Steven Smith
311 Sorrento Street
Groveport, Ohio  43115
Phone: 614-229-7898

Education: Gahanna High School
            Gahanna, Ohio

Work experience: Michael Lippman
                 Groveport, Ohio
                 Electrician's assistant
                 July 1974 to present

Interests: bread making, Community Chest volunteer
           fund raiser, canning, quilting

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: Steve Smith

Education: took college courses in the related subject.
           Work with electricity list, did not want to go
           on to college.

Work Experience: works for independent electrician in
                  Groveport as assistant, primary work repairing
                  family equipment, does some installation of partial
                  or complete systems, basically able to diagnose problems
                  for new or existing.

Other Comments: wants to stay with present employer but Lippman
                 is retiring & Lippman want more work.
                 elsewhere, wants rather shy & soft spoken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

Mary Jones
71 Lee Street
Oberlin, Ohio 48519
Phone: 513-262-3012

Education:
Lafayette Preparatory School
Dublin, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1974
Oberlin College
Oberlin, Ohio
B.A., June, 1977 (expected)
Major: Electrical engineering

Work Experience:
Ford Motor Company
Dearborn, Michigan
electrical technician 6/75-8/75, 7/76-8/76

Interests:
playing chess, skiing, horseback riding, camping

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: Mary Jones
Education: college prep school, liked science courses, especially physics; best, also liked math; will receive degree in electrical engineering in June.

Work experience worked for Ford last 2 summers, assisted in installation of electrical systems in various model cars.

Other comments seems ambitious, wants experience in different types of electrical work, sees position as stepping stone to better position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

William Boyle
68 Hillside Avenue
New Albany, Ohio 47182
Phone: 614-264-8120

Education: New Albany High School
New Albany, Ohio
Diploma: June 1974

Work Experience: New Albany Electrical Contractors
New Albany, Ohio
Electrician's assistant; Sept. 1974-present

Interests: Football, baseball, Little League coach,
auto repairs

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: William Boyle
Education: took general course, liked shop & physics classes
Work Experience: works as assistant to electrician is making home calls, assisting with repairs, helps plan new electrical systems, says institution of new systems
Other Comments: wants to work for larger company, have more opportunity for advancement & self-improvement, seems confident of abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

Barbara Johnson
42 Arizona Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43211
Phone: 614-423-8182

May 3, 1977

Education: Franklin High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1973

Work Experience: Francesco's Foundry
Columbus, Ohio
Electrician's helper; July 1975-present

Riverside Hospital
Columbus, Ohio
Nurse's Aide; August 1973 to May 1975

Interests: Bowling, gymnastics, plays guitar, cake decorating

---

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Education
Work Experience
Interests
Personality
Overall suitability
Predicted success
Hiring decision

| Name | Barbara Johnson |

**Education**
Went to two year course in the field of typing and stenography. During this period, participated in practical experience program at hospital (nurse's aide).

**Work Experience**
Staying in the hospital for a period of time after being discharged. Enjoyed the job but it was not the best fit. Would like to do more clerical work and some repair work with minor repairs.

**Interests**
Aided in the repair of various items. Enjoyed the work but found it to be monotonous.

---

**INTERVIEWER RATING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RANKINGS

Now that you have read over and evaluated each applicant's qualifications, rank them in the order that you would hire them. Fill in the name of the person next to his/her ranking. Rank the best qualified applicant as "1", the second best as "2", and so forth.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
APPENDIX H

We are studying how people make decisions about hiring applicants for different jobs. We would like you to pretend that you are a manager for a medium sized company and that you have the responsibility for hiring a new secretary for your department. There are 8 applicants for the position. Each applicant has been interviewed by a company interviewer. You will receive each applicant's resume and a copy of some notes made by the interviewer. Using this information, we would like you to rate each of the 8 applicants in several areas: education, work experience, interests, personality, overall suitability for the job, predicted success on the job, and the likelihood that you would hire the applicant.

At the bottom of each applicant's page, you will see a chart on which to indicate your ratings. The chart looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart will help you make your ratings. The L, A, and H at the top of the chart stand for Low, Average, and High. The rating scale defines each of the points of the scale:

Circle a 7 if you think the applicant is way above average.
Circle a 6 if you think the applicant is quite a bit above average.
Circle a 5 if you think the applicant is somewhat above average.
Circle a 4 if you think the applicant is average.
Circle a 3 if you think the applicant is somewhat below average.
Circle a 2 if you think the applicant is quite a bit below average.
Circle a 1 if you think the applicant is way below average.

After rating each of the 8 applicants, we would like you to put them in order of the way you would hire them. On the last page of this booklet is a ranking form.
To help you make your decision, here is a description of the secretary's job:

SECRETARY
Schedules appointments, gives information to callers, takes dictation, and otherwise relieves officials of clerical and minor administrative and business details. Reads and routes incoming mail. Takes dictation in shorthand or on stenotype machine and transcribes notes on typewriter. Composes and types routine correspondence and other records. Answers telephone and gives information to callers or routes call to appropriate official and places outgoing calls. Schedules appointments for employer. Greets visitors, ascertains nature of business, and conducts visitors to employer or appropriate person.
RESUME

Mary Jones
290 E. Dublin-Granville Rd.
Worthington, Ohio 43089
Phone: 614-488-9285

May 7, 1977

Education:
Groveport-Madison High School
Groveport, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1976

Work Experience:
Hill Haberdashery
Reynoldsburg, Ohio
Clerical Assistant; August 1976 to present

Interests:
Crocheting, hospital aide, amateur theatre

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: Mary Jones

Education: Like business course, liked psychology
Finance around home, love English Test; best typing test

Work Experience: Worked as assistant to Mr. Hill; takes
decisions, types, answers phone, files, stocks
Works on customer in store

Skills:
Typing 60 WPM; Steno 45 WPM

Other Comments:
Like job but would like piece of
Business to be closer to home & could spend
more time with family. Engage customer with

Education | L | A | H
------------|---|---|---
Work experience | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
Interests | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
Personality | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
Overall suitability | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
Predicted success | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
Hiring decision | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
RESUME

Steven Smith
654 LeConte Ave.
Springfield, Ohio 44109
Phone: 513-882-9189

Education:
Dayton High School
Dayton, Ohio
Diploma: June 1974
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio
Attended: 9/74 - 6/75

Work Experience:
Southwest Ohio Metal Products
Springfield, Ohio
Receptionist; 9/75 to present

Interests:
Softball, water and snow skiing, gourmet cooking, needlepoint

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: Steven Smith

Education: took college prep courses in HS, didn't want to continue college after 1st year, is considering resuming college part time

Work Experience: works as receptionist - answers phone, greets clients & direct them to appropriate office, have light typing & filing

Skills:
Typing: 65 WPM
Shorthand: 55 WPM

Other Comments:
Want better position as typing & typing skills can be used. Enjoy working with people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

William Boyle
149 Walden Road
Columbus, Ohio 43203
Phone: 614-428-9057

May 6, 1977

Education:
Westerville High School
Westerville, Ohio
Diploma: June 1973

Work Experience:
Women's Christian Temperance Union
Westerville, Ohio
Receptionist; June 1973 to Sept. 1973

Fixler Real Estate Agents, Inc.
Columbus, Ohio
Secretary/receptionist; Sept. 1973 to present

Interests:
Bridge, oil painting, bicycling, community chorus member

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: William Boyle

Education: Left college course + married to go on, but got married. Has table operation on 6th classes, will
start a junior program in September.

Work Experience: Brief period as WCTU receptionist. Did not enjoy people there. Tired. Worked as
secretary/receptionist. To aquite extent, yes, ets, accuracy.

Skills: Typing, office work, dictation, typing, book

Other Comments: Seeks job with more opportunity for advancement.
Some quiet expedient of abilities. Self-motivated.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barbara Johnson
22 Park Street
Columbus, Ohio 43212
Phone: 614-488-9155

Education: Columbus West High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma, June 1977 (expected)

Work Experience: Ajax Instant Printing
Columbus, Ohio
Clerk, June 1976 to August 1976

Interests: Cub Scout leader, Sunday school teacher,
photography

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: Barbara Johnson
Education: will graduate from high school in
June, taking business/technical course,
enjoys working with people
Work Experience: summer job at Ajax - did
reception for customers & handled sales
Skills: Transactions
Typing: 35 WPM
Skills: 
Other Comments: rather quiet, shy, seems
undecided about getting a position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nancy Moffett
90 East Andover Street
Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43526
Phone: 614-626-8585

Education:
Whetstone High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1976

Work Experience:
Columbus and Southwestern Ohio Spring Company; Columbus, Ohio
Typist; January 1977 to present
Columbus Tool and Die Company
Columbus, Ohio
Clerk; June 1976 to December 1976

Interests:
Fishing, swimming and diving, sailing, auto mechanics

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: Nancy Moffett

Education: Business course in H.S., liked bookkeeping best, shorthand least, was member of swim team. Plans to go on to business school or junior college while working.

Work Experience: Now works as only typist for small company. Types letters and reports for president. Previous job as clerk. Skills: Typing - 63 WPM, Steno - 57 WPM.

Other comments: Signs ambitious, independent, able to make decisions quickly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

John Davis
1090 Main Street
Gahanna, Ohio 43598
Phone: 614-299-3766

Education:
Gahanna High School
Gahanna, Ohio
Diploma: June 1975

Work Experience:
Hartman Industries
Gahanna, Ohio
Clerk-typist; August 1975 to present

Interests:
Sewing, canning, raises Siamese cats, knitting

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: John Davis

Education: took business course, liked typing &
shorthand course best; member of Future
'Champions of America'. Has plans to continue
education

Work Experience:
does typing - filing, takes dictation.

Skills: typing 65 WPM; stenography 50 WPM

Other Comments: very friendly, seems to be
dedicated. To present employer but can't
move to new location (Texas) with company
because of family commitments. Some to be had

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

Susan Morrison

20 Fairfield Place
Columbus, Ohio 43209
Phone: 614-742-1897

May 2, 1977

Education: Columbus North High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1975

Work Experience: Columbus Office Supply House, Inc.
Columbus, Ohio
Secretary; June 1975 to present

Interests: Horseback riding, swimming, volleyball,
lifeguard at church camp

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: Susan Morrison

Education: took business course in B.S. related field.
Taking class, wants to take evening classes

Work Experience: works as secretary for president
assistant. Does typing of letters and reports,
Answers phone. Takes occasional dictation

Skills: typing 65 WPM, steno 50 WPM

Other Comments: wants to leave present job for
more advancement opportunities. Seems
aggressive but not overpowering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

James Cook
289 E. Oakland Ave.
Columbus, Ohio 43202
Phone: 614-291-3894

Education: Hilliard High School
            Hilliard, Ohio
            Diploma: June 1975

Work Experience: Buckeye Wine Industries
                 Columbus, Ohio
                 File Clerk; Sept. 1975 to June 1976
                 Secretary; June 1976 to present

Interests: Jogging, hunting, sports car racing,
           archery

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: James Cook

Education: took general course first 3 yrs. then
           switched to commercial course. Liked briefing &
           bookkeeping course, company sent to school to learn
           typing & stenography.
           worked for 1 yr as file clerk, after taking
           typing & stenography course was promoted to secretary.

Skills: typing 65 WPM, steno 55 WPM

Other Comments:

wants new job because there is little
opportunity for advancement in present
position. Willing to continue education to
advance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RANKINGS

Now that you have read over and evaluated each applicant's qualifications, rank them in the order that you would hire them. Fill in the name of the person next to his/her ranking. Rank the best qualified applicant as "1", the second best as "2", and so forth.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
APPENDIX I

Age___________ Sex___________ Year in School___________

INSTRUCTIONS

We are studying how people make decisions about hiring applicants for different jobs. We would like you to pretend that you are a manager for a medium sized company and that you have the responsibility for hiring a new salesperson for your department. There are 8 applicants for the position. Each applicant has been interviewed by a company interviewer. You will receive each applicant's resume and a copy of some notes made by the interviewer. Using this information, we would like you to rate each of the 8 applicants in several areas: education, work experience, interests, personality, overall suitability for the job, predicted success on the job, and the likelihood that you would hire the applicant.

At the bottom of each applicant's page, you will see a chart on which to indicate your ratings. The chart looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart will help you make your ratings. The L, A, and H at the top of the chart stand for Low, Average, and High. The rating scale defines each of the points of the scale:

Circle a 7 if you think the applicant is way above average.
Circle a 6 if you think the applicant is quite a bit above average.
Circle a 5 if you think the applicant is somewhat above average.
Circle a 4 if you think the applicant is average.
Circle a 3 if you think the applicant is somewhat below average.
Circle a 2 if you think the applicant is quite a bit below average.
Circle a 1 if you think the applicant is way below average.

After rating each of the 8 applicants, we would like you to put them in order of the way you would hire them. On the last page of this booklet is a ranking form.

INSTRUCTIONS CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE.
To help you make your decisions, here is a description of the salesperson's job:

**SALESPERSON**

Sells merchandise to business establishments, utilizing detailed knowledge of specific characteristics of merchandise, at sales office, store, showroom, or customer's place of business. Calls on customers in person or by phone. Displays merchandise, using samples or catalog. Demonstrates article, emphasizing salable features. Estimates or quotes prices, credit terms, and trade-in allowances. Prepares forms and sales contracts. Prepares reports of business transactions and keeps expense accounts.
RESUME

Susan Morrison
28 Peabody Street
Columbus, Ohio 43214
Phone: 614-299-8107

Education:
Toledo South High School
Toledo, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1973

Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
Attended: September 1973 to June 1975

Work Experience:
Glenn's Gourmet Shoppe
Toledo, Ohio
Sales representative; July 1975 to April 1977

Interests:
Marxist study group leader, mountain climber, traveling, gourmet cooking

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: Susan Morrison

Education: college prep course in U. S. history, economics, biology, English, math, some business courses at O S U - left for financial reasons, plans to return education next quarter or working decision

Work Experience: sold gourmet cooking supplies & equipment to buyers from retail places; traveled around Ohio giving demonstrations.

Other Comments: moved back to Columbus to continue education since interesting, articulate, able to express opinions, able to work independently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nancy Moffett
42 Lowell Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43202
Phone: 614-297-8192

Education:
New Albany High School
New Albany, Ohio
Diploma: June 1976

Work Experience:
Lazarus Department Store
Columbus, Ohio
Sales clerk: July 1976 to March 1977
Assistant buyer: March 1977 to present

Interests:
Hiking, volunteer to fire department, weaving, Chinese cooking

INTERVIEWER NOTES
Name Nancy Moffett
Education: took commercial course in h.s., liked course in retailing & bookkeeping, hopes to go to business school in future
Work Experience: worked in record dept. as sales clerk, promoted to assistant buyer—helps select merchandise to be purchased, keeps record of sales
Other Comments: seems aggressive, cheerful, like people, wants to have present job to get experience in different types of selling positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

Steven Smith
3415 E. Trenton Ave.
Granville, Ohio 43028
Phone: 614-228-3091

Education:
Granville High School
Granville, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1975

Work Experience:
V.L.K. Enterprises
Granville, Ohio
Salesclerk; October 1976 to present

Milt's Tacos
Granville, Ohio
Salesclerk; August 1975 to June 1976

Interests:
Macrame, water ballet, modern dance, 4-H leader

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: Steven Smith

Education: took business management courses, enjoyed bookkeeping, selling, farm management.

Work Experience: After graduation, sold Mexican food at country fair. Left because place went out of business; presently working at V.L.K. Enterprises. Selling and furniture. To retail customer.

Other Comments: likes to skateboard and play frisbee.

Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 4, 1977
Mary Jones
19 Oakland Manor Road
Columbus, Ohio 43204
Phone: 614-328-5699

Education:
Parkview Military School
Mt. Vernon, Ohio
Diploma - June 1976

Work Experience:
Barry's Camp Out
Columbus, Ohio
Salesperson - October 1976 to Present

Interests:
Camping, backpacking, rock climbing, racquetball

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name

Education: Attended private school. College prep
with military emphasis. Did well in high school.
Interested in basic sciences, math, and social
sciences.

Work Experience:
Salesperson, Barry's Camp Out. Retail customer
service experience.

Other Comments:

L A H
Education 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Work experience 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Interests 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Personality 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Overall suitability 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Predicted success 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Hiring decision 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
RESUME

William Boyle
222 Bokirk Place
Worthington, Ohio
Phone: 614-491-8203

Education: Worthington High School
Worthington, Ohio
Diploma: June, 1975

Work Experience: Nelson Tractor Sales
Worthington, Ohio
Salesperson; December 1975 to present

Interests: Football, motorcycling, softball, scuba diving

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: William Boyle

Education: took business, agricultural courses, liked farm science classes best; no plans to further education

Work Experience: works as sales person, sells tractors & other farm equipment to individuals; handles credit, trades-ins, & sales transactions

Other Comments: took 6 month, cross-country motorcycle trip after high school; wants new type of position, wants secure of life style, enjoy sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 1, 1977
RESUME

Barbara Johnson
90 Battery Lane
Columbus, Ohio 43214
Phone 614-426-9898

May 2, 1977

Education:
Columbus East High School
Columbus, Ohio
Diploma, June 1976

Work Experience:
Blair Books
Worthington, Ohio
Sales clerk
August 1976 to present

Interests:
reading, Salvation Army kitchen volunteer,
knitting, embroidery.

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: Barbara Johnson

Education: took Commercial course, learn typing

Work Experience: sell books, magazines, & newspapers

Other Comments: wants to find new position

Personality: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Overall suitability: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Predicted success: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiring decision: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

John Davis
84 Stewart Avenue
Dublin, Ohio 41860
Phone: 614-889-4501

Education:

Dublin High School
Dublin, Ohio
Diploma: June 1977 (anticipated)

Work Experience:

Andy's Ice Cream
Dublin, Ohio
Ice cream truck driver and salesperson
June 1976 - August 1976

Interests:

Stamp collecting, butterfly collection

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: John Davis

Education: Will graduate in June, business course - doesn't enjoy school

Work Experience: Drove ice cream truck for Andy's ice cream last summer sold ice cream to neighborhood people

Other Comments: Enjoyed selling ice cream, thinks sales work would be interesting career, likes working with children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUME

James Cook
82 Sara Court
Dayton, Ohio 41981
Phone: 513-828-3934

May 6, 1977

Education:
Dayton North High School
Dayton, Ohio
Diploma: June 1976

Work Experience:
Barbara's Bedroom Boutique
Dayton, Ohio
Salesperson; August 1976 to present

Interests:
Jewelry making, leather work, ballroom
dancing, fencing

INTERVIEWER NOTES

Name: James Cook
Education: Work business course at Dayton;
Listed retailing & bookkeeping classes that
Wanted to continue education in future

Work Experience: Sells beds & other furniture &
accessories to customers from stockroom
price, makes sales, makes check, quotes
price in cash, accepts credit sales

Other Comments: Wants experience with different type of
sales position. Wants to move to larger
city where there are more opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</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>Work experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RANKINGS

Now that you have read over and evaluated each applicant's qualifications, rank them in the order that you would hire them. Fill in the name of the person next to his/her ranking. Rank the best qualified applicant as "1", the second best as "2", and so forth.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
APPENDIX J

MEAN INTEREST RATINGS GIVEN BY 4 EXPERT JUDGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masc.</th>
<th>Fem.</th>
<th>Andr.</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesperson</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Kean</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>