

THE GENDER OF JOB APPLICANTS:
DIFFERENT STANDARDS FOR LACK OF COMPETENCE?

by

JERILEE VALENZUELA

B.A., The University of British Columbia, 2003

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

SOCIOLOGY

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
September 2005

© Jerilee Valenzuela, 2005

ABSTRACT

This thesis reports on the results from an experiment designed to investigate a situation in which two applicants, a man and a woman, are assessed regarding their potential for an engineering position. The situation is one in which both applicants show low levels of performance; the decision for the participants is then whether these applicants merit special consideration, and whether one or both should be kept on the waiting list. In one case, the man is slightly better than the woman, in the other the situation is reversed, and in the third case, the two applicants show similar grades. One hundred sixty-five (81 men and 84 women) students participated in this study. Dependent measures include choice of applicant, potential competence and suitability, and suggested salary. Results indicate that, for the most part, participants responded to the difference in grades. There were however, some effects from gender of applicant and of participant. Regarding competence advantage and salary advantage, results strictly reflect the grade differences between the two applicants. Concerning choice and suitability advantage, however, effects from sex of applicant and of participant emerged, respectively. I propose that the differences across the results are due to the types of measures and the way they could have been understood by the participants. A thorough discussion of the results and their interpretation is presented. I assess these results in terms of recent trends towards equity of sex roles in our society.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Tables.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Chapter I. Theoretical Background and Hypotheses	1
Chapter II. Method	26
Chapter III. Analyses and Results	35
Chapter IV. Discussion, Suggestions for Further Research, and Conclusions	48
Bibliography.....	57
Appendix A - Folder 1	62
Appendix B - Folder 2	73
Appendix C - Opinion Questionnaire	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Choice of Applicant	41
Table 2. Competence Ratings	42
Table 3. Competence Advantage of Male Applicant Over Female Applicant	43
Table 4. Suitability Ratings	44
Table 5. Suitability Advantage of Male Applicant Over Female Applicant	45
Table 6. Recommended Salaries for Each Applicant	46
Table 7. Salary Advantage of Male Applicant Over Female Applicant	47

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was formulated within the context of Dr. Martha Foschi's current Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) supported project (grant #). This project concerns gender-based double standards for competence.

I would foremost like to thank Dr. Martha Foschi for her guidance, patience and wealth of knowledge. She was more than an advisor to me she was my mentor. I look forward to all of our future research endeavours.

I would also like to thank Dr. Rima Wilkes for her editorial support and advice on my thesis.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the support of my friends, family and loved ones.

CHAPTER I. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

In everyday life, we often find ourselves in situations where we must perform a valued task. Some examples of such situations are: being interviewed for a job, writing an exam, and playing in a championship game. Some of these tasks are performed individually while others are group tasks. Some may be evaluated by an external source, while others are evaluated by the performers themselves. Regardless of who the evaluator is, performers are often categorized into two groups: those who have ability and those who do not. Often the evaluations are based not only on the performance of the task but are biased by the attributes of the performers, such as sex category, beauty, or organizational rank. The assignment of either competence or lack of competence is important because it often results in the performers either receiving or not receiving rewards (e.g., bonuses, job promotions, professional contacts). (I use the terms “competence”, “ability” and “skill” as synonyms.)

In this thesis I investigate gender effects on the assignment of incompetence and focus on the treatment of individuals who have been evaluated as having failed at a task. In particular, I am interested in studying gender effects in the inference of incompetence from that evaluation. It is of value to research lack of competence, as not every individual who performs a task will be successful. If a person fails at a task, how does it affect his or her behaviour, or even how others treat that individual? The word “failure” is enough to elicit negative connotations when heard; its consequences are usually substantial (e.g. loss of a job, inability to graduate, loss of a scholarship). It is also important to study the effects of gender on the inference of incompetence since the categories of “man” and “woman” to which people are assigned are often attributed

differences in value, and the perceived level of incompetence may vary depending on the gender of the individual. The background for my research is expectations states theory.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Expectation states theory is a research program that is comprised of a set of interrelated theories; these have been extensively studied and tested (Berger, Fisek, Norman and Zelditch 1977; Wagner and Berger 2002; Ridgeway 2003). The program centres on the construction of generalizations regarding self's and others' status on a valued task. Of particular interest is the assignment of status in small, collective, task-oriented groups. This assignment stems not only from the evaluation of the performances, but also from the information generated by the social world to which the performers belong (e.g., attributes of self and others, either by themselves or in comparison, beliefs about the credibility of the source of the evaluations). Expectation states theory is concerned with the processes through which status organizes interactions, and the consequences these processes have on the participants' behaviour and interpersonal interactions.

Two key concepts that are central to the expectation states program are "status characteristics" and "performance evaluations". A "status characteristic" is any attribute that is valued in a given social system, and that implies competence. These attributes are seen as having at least two levels (e.g., being either male or female, having either high or low creativity) ranging from specific to diffuse. A specific status characteristic has explicitly defined associations with performance expectations. For example, having low competence in math will lead to an association with low performances on a math quiz. A diffuse status characteristic, on the other hand, carries general performance expectations, which can be used to infer ability on an

indeterminate number of tasks. In many societies, race, ethnicity, socio-economic class, and gender are examples of diffuse status characteristics.

The assignment of status to group members can thus be made indirectly (based on status characteristics) or directly (through the outcome of the performance, and its evaluation). Once status and therefore ability have been assigned to self and the other group members, performance expectations are generated. These are beliefs about the future performances of self and others on a valued task. Expectations will, in turn, affect the behaviour of group members towards each other. Performance expectations are intervening variables; they mediate the relationship between either status characteristics or performance scores, or both, on the one hand, and the power dynamics which emerge, on the other hand. If one group member is expected to perform at either a higher or a lower level in comparison to another, a power and prestige structure will result (e.g. differences in performance opportunities received and accepted, distribution of evaluations, and amount of influence exerted by group members). Expectation states theory focuses on the use of these generated expectations and the way in which they facilitate the construction of the power and prestige dynamics within groups. The program is concerned with the emergence of inequalities within groups and how the inequalities affect the behaviour of individuals within the group. A person who is expected to excel at a task is given more opportunities to speak and to contribute ideas, and is therefore in a better position to receive positive evaluations. On the other hand, a person who is expected to do poorly receives fewer opportunities to contribute to the task and thus receives fewer such evaluations. All hypotheses of the expectation states program are scope-bound, that is, they are stated within well-defined scope conditions – statements that specify the limits to which the hypothesis applies (Foschi 1997). Two important scope conditions are (1) the actor is motivated to doing the task well (i.e.,

he or she is task-oriented) and (2) the actor is willing to accept ideas from group members, as well as contribute to the group for the solution of the joint task (i.e., he or she is collectively oriented).

Support for the theory's core hypothesis has been substantial (for reviews of this evidence, see Wagner and Berger 2002). Early in the program, Joseph Berger constructed the basic standardized setting that would not only be used to test the propositions of expectation states theory, but also to further develop the program (Webster and Sobieszek 1974). Participants worked on a task known as "contrast sensitivity task". In the original version of the design, participants, who typically work in dyads, are shown a series of slides that contain either one or two patterns that were comprised of black and white rectangles. If presented with a slide with one pattern, participants are asked to indicate whether the slide is predominantly white or black. If shown a slide with two patterns, the participants are asked to choose which of the slides contain a greater area of white or black. Although the participants are shown the same slides as a group, they are to answer individually. The communication within the group are controlled through the use of a response box connected to a unit, known as ICOM (interaction control machine) that enables the experimenter to program the feedback to the participants. The response box has buttons for the participant to make a choice, as well as lights, which indicate the response of the other group member. The interaction between the two is seen from the point of view of one person at a time; thus this person is seen as "self" and the partner is seen as "other". Depending on the variable of interest, the participants vary on a manipulated factor (i.e. age, gender, race, ethnicity, performance scores). First each participant signals an initial choice on the response box. After making a choice, the experimentally, pre-arranged choice of the other group member will light up on the box; thus the participant is able to see whether there is

agreement or disagreement with the partner. Each participant is then asked to make a final decision. If there is a disagreement between the two group members, and one of them changes his or her initial choice, the person is said to have accepted influence from the other group member (this is called an "other response"). If a participant, in spite of a disagreement remains with his or her initial choice, the person is said to have rejected influence (that is, to have made a "self response"). The proportions of either self or other response indicate whether the participant believes he or she has more or less competence at the task than the partner.

Berger constructed the contrast sensitivity task in order to minimize participants' familiarity with it. The ambiguity of the task and the lack of knowledge regarding the skills of the partner make it hard for the participants to decide with certainty who has more competence at the task at hand. Thus the participants are forced to rely on the only known difference, the manipulated variable, in assigning competence to each other. Since the task was novel, no one could be certain of his or her knowledge or skill at the task. In addition, other features were implemented to maximize the uncertainty of the participants: they have a short amount of time to view the slides, each pattern consists of many rectangles, and the task is ambiguous (i.e., the probability of choosing one pattern over the other was about 0.50). Through the use of this design a behavioural measure of the amount of influence accepted or rejected by the participants is elicited.

The standardized setting has proven to be a highly useful instrument for the development of the theory. It is important to note that there have been extensions and variations of this setting, and other designs have also been used in expectation states experiments (See for

example, Balkwell, Berger, Webster, Nelson-Kilger, and Cashen, 1992; Crundall and Foddy 1981; Ridgeway 1982).

Standards and the Inference of Competence/Lack of Competence

The two main branches of expectations states theory are “power and prestige”, and “status characteristics and expectation states” (Wagner and Berger 2002). The first branch deals with the emergence of differentiated power and prestige orders in groups in which members are not initially differentiated in status. The second branch investigates the formation of expectations based on status characteristics, specifically how differences in status characteristics affect the formation of expectations, which, in turn, affect power and prestige orders.

This thesis focuses on the second branch of the research program, status characteristics theory. Through differences in status, power and prestige structures are constructed within the dyad whereby the person with the higher status exerts influence to a greater extent than the person with lower status (Wagner and Berger 2002). If self is performing a task with a partner who is in a disagreement with him or her, and self holds higher expectations for his or her future performance, then self will tend to reject the other’s input. Research has supported this finding when future performance on the task has been either implicitly or explicitly linked to past performance scores and evaluations (Webster 1969), and when the performance has been explicitly or implicitly linked to status characteristics (Moore 1968; Pugh and Warman 1983; Foschi and Buchan 1990).

Much of the earlier work in the status characteristics literature investigated either the use of past performance evaluations, or the use of status characteristics, or both in generating performance expectations (Moore 1968; Pugh and Warman 1983; Webster 1969). Recently, the literature has expanded to include the role of standards in the formation of expectations (Webster 1969; Foschi and Foddy 1988; Foschi, Warriner and Hart 1988; Foschi and Freeman 1991; Foschi, Enns and Lapointe 2000). "Standards" are requirements that an individual sets when evaluating a person's performance on a task. Thus standards act as rules through which one can infer ability or lack of ability. When the standard is met, the person is attributed ability; when the standard is not met, the person is attributed lack of ability. The inference of ability is separate from the performance evaluation. A task may be judged as having been successfully accomplished; however, if the standard has not been met, ability cannot be ascribed. If ability has been assigned to an individual, strong expectations of his or her performance are generated. If lack of ability has been ascribed, weaker expectations are formed.

Standards are often different for each evaluator, as well as for each individual who is being evaluated. The interpretation of the standards may also vary depending on the nature of the task (i.e. sex-linkage, level of difficulty). This variation is seen when the same performance output is evaluated as a success in some instances and a failure in others. Depending on the status of the evaluator in relation to the person being evaluated, the application of standards can vary from "strict" to "lenient". A "strict" standard is one that requires stronger evidence of ability, whereas a "lenient" standard requires weaker evidence. Foschi and Foddy (1988) propose five dimensions to assess the standards being applied in evaluating performances. These include, among others, the proportion of correct answers, and the difficulty of the task. In this

thesis I will discuss the variability in the use of strict or lenient standards in relation to the activation of double standards.

The notion of standards first appears in the expectation states literature in Webster (1969). Using the standardized setting described earlier, participants were recruited to work in dyads for a “study of group interaction” (Webster 1969). For this experiment, standards were held constant. Participants in the study were assigned scores and were given a chart, to be used to interpret the scores they received. All of the participants received the same scores and standards with which they could interpret their results. Thus a homogenous group was created for the research. Although he had included standards in his experiment, Webster had intended only to use them as a constant; he was not studying the impact of standards in the formation of expectations. His main intention was to test the importance of the perceived competence of the source of evaluations, as well as the participants’ performance expectations for self and other. Webster was interested in testing the extent to which the evaluation from different sources would be accepted by the participants on the basis of the source’s perceived level of competence.

The first study in this program that examined the impact of standards on the formation of performance expectations was Foschi, Warriner and Hart (1985). Subjects participated in same-sex dyads. Each dyad was randomly assigned to one of five conditions: four experimental and one control. Within the four experimental conditions, half of the participants received better scores than the partner, and in the other half the scores were reversed. The first situation created HL (high for self, low for other) expectations; the second yielded the reverse pattern, or LH expectations. Each group was then further divided into two levels of standards. In one level, one person definitely had ability while the other did not. In the other level, standards were such that

the scores could not be conclusively interpreted. The two levels of standards manipulated the strength of the participants' expectations for self and other. If the subject believed that he or she had more ability at the task than the partner, then the participant was said to hold higher expectations for self than for other; if the subject believed that his or her partner had more ability at the task in relation to him or herself, then the participant was said to hold a weaker expectation for self than for other. The intensity of the expectations generated was predicted to affect the standards for either ability or lack of ability. For example, if the participant held higher expectations for self than other, yet self's standard for ability was not met, the participant held a weaker expectation for self (in comparison to the participant meeting his or her own standard for ability). Thus the hypotheses proposed were as follows: (1) if self held strong [H L] expectations, he or she would reject more influence from a disagreeing partner, than if self held weak [H L]; (2) if self held strong [L H] expectations, he or she would accept more influence from a disagreeing partner than if self held weak [L H]; (3) if self held [H L] expectations, regardless of their strength, he or she would reject more influence from a disagreeing partner than if self did not hold any expectations for self or other; (4) if self held [L H] expectations, regardless of their strength, he or she would reject less influence from a disagreeing partner than if self did not hold any expectations for self or other.

Using a modified version of the standardized setting developed by Berger, participants worked on a "pattern recognition" task in same-sex dyads. As neither status characteristics, nor status cues were variables of interest, the participants did not see or meet the partner. The experimenter gave information regarding the partner's age, sex and year at the university; this information equated the two persons. The pattern recognition task required the participants to view an initial pattern for a few seconds and then attempt to match it correctly to one of two

patterns on another slide. For the first twenty trials, the subjects worked alone and were not given any feedback on their partner's performance. Following these initial trials, each person received a computer printout, which showed the scores for self and other. In the control condition, no printout was given. Depending on the experimental condition, the scores were either 14 for self and 6 for the partner, or the reverse combination. The scores manipulated the first variable of interest, performance outcome. The second manipulated variable, standards, was also shown on the printout. These standards provided a means of interpreting the scores received by self and other. If the participants were in one of the two strong-expectation conditions, they were informed that the scores received could definitely determine that one person had ability (indicated by a score between 12 to 20) while the other definitely did not (a score of 0 to 8). If they were in one of the two weak-expectation conditions, subjects were given standards that informed them that the scores could not determine the level of ability with certainty (a score of 17-20 indicated ability whereas a score of 3-0 indicated lack of ability). Next, the subjects participated in a series of twenty trials wherein they worked together as a team. Participants were told that they would receive points on every trial in which they were correct. Once self had made an initial choice, the partner's was communicated. In sixteen out of twenty trials, a disagreement between self and other was relayed. The proportion of self-responses during the sixteen trials measured rejection of influence, which in this research tradition is seen as a behavioural measure of the expectations. Finally, participants were asked to fill out an opinion questionnaire which served as a manipulation check of the independent variables, and assessed misunderstanding and/or suspicions.

Foschi et al. (1985) found support for three out of their four hypotheses. The hypotheses on the effect of evaluations (Hypotheses (3) and (4)) were clearly supported in each case that the

proportion of self-responses differed from those in the control group. As predicted, participants who held higher expectations for self than for other rejected more influence than those in the control group, and participants who held lower expectations for self than for other rejected less influence than those in the control group. A difference in the proportion of self-responses was clearly seen when self held strong [H L] expectations, relative to when self held weak [H L] expectations (Hypothesis (1)). However, this difference was not apparent in the [L H] conditions (Hypothesis (2)). This was traced to a failure to create strong and weak expectations in these conditions. Sex of subject was not a variable of interest in this study, as the task was not sex-linked and the subjects participated in same-sex dyads. Nevertheless, a sex difference emerged in the [L H] conditions. The women differentiated between the strong and weak conditions and reacted as expected but the men did not. However, the study had not been designed to include a sufficient number of subjects to assess this issue thoroughly.

Building on the results of Foschi et al.'s (1985) study, Foschi and Freeman (1991) designed a follow-up experiment to explore whether or not sex of subject would affect the results in same-sex dyads performing a sex-neutral task. Since the strong and weak [L H] conditions were the ones that had shown sex differences in results for Foschi et al. (1985), this subsequent study included only those two conditions. A similar hypothesis was used as in the previous study, namely, that participants in the strong [L H] condition would reject less influence than subjects in the weak [L H] condition (the hypothesis was tested for both men and women). Four additional variables of interest were included for their possible role in the formation of expectations by men and women: motivation, importance assigned to the task, seriousness of performance and perceived control over outcome. These factors were included to assess whether

differences in their levels could account for the sex-of-subject differences found in Foschi et al. (1985).

Subjects performed the tasks in same-sex dyads and were randomly assigned to either the strong or weak conditions. In all of the sessions, the partner was a confederate. In order to minimize experimenter bias and other possible confounding variables, the same female experimenter conducted all of the sessions and attention was paid to the uniformity of speech and appearance throughout the experiment. Other revisions to Foschi et al. (1985) were as follows: contrast sensitivity rather than the pattern recognition task was used, four additional disagreement trials were included in the second series, and, both scores and percentages were used to make the standards more understandable. After the initial phase, all participants were informed that self had achieved a score of 9 out of 20 (or 45%) and that the partner had achieved a score of 15 out of 20 (or 75%). A manipulation of standards was also included on the printout. In the strong condition, the following standards were given to ensure certainty in the interpretation of the results: 12 (60%) or less indicated lack of ability and 13 (65%) or more indicated ability at the task. In the weak condition, the following standards were given to ensure that the scores could not be interpreted conclusively: 6 (30%) or less indicated lack of ability and 17 (85%) indicated ability.

Overall, the results showed that the hypothesis was supported for women but not for men. In the opinion questionnaire, the women in the strong condition, contrary to the three other conditions, reported that their partners had more ability relative to themselves. Results from all four additional variables showed a significant effect for standards; internal analyses revealed that

the effects were mainly due to the female data. The women accepted the scores and the standards, and formed corresponding expectations more readily than did the men.

Although it was not their intended variable of interest, both Foschi et al. (1985) and Foschi and Freeman (1991) found that sex differences were used in the interpretation of standards. Building on these findings, Foschi et al. (2001) investigated whether or not gender was a factor in forming expectations in same-sex dyads who were working on a neutral task. Similar to past studies, the experimenter relayed feedback to the participants regarding their scores on a visual perception task. Depending on the condition, participants either received a higher or lower score for self than for other, or no scores at all. No standards with which to interpret these scores were given in any of the conditions. The researchers also investigated additional variables using self-reports from the participants. Three sets of such factors were investigated in this study: task and performance requirements (i.e., standards to infer ability and lack of ability), perceived competence of other in relation to self, and perceived competence of the source of evaluations.

The authors found significant effects for level of feedback, but not for sex of dyad, on the proportion of self-responses. There were no sex-differences in standards for ability and a marginally significant difference in the standards for lack of ability. However, a significant effect for sex of dyad was found in some of the variables investigated through self-reports. Self-reports about one's task competence relative to the partner and about the experimenter's competence indicate gender-as-status effects. When asked about their perceptions of their partner's choices and overall competence on the task, there were significant effects for both level of feedback and sex of dyad. The effects for level of feedback correspond to the manipulations

of the variable. As for the sex of dyad differences, relative to the men, the women were more likely to rate their partners as having more ability and competence at the task. Moreover, a sex difference was seen when the participants were asked about the experimenter's competence. Women gave better ratings than men regarding the experimenter's qualifications and knowledge.

Double Standards for Competence/Lack of Competence

Foschi et al. (1985), Foschi and Freeman (1991) and Foschi et al. (2001) have shown that standards play a key role in the formation of performance expectations. What was not anticipated in the studies was the emergence of sex differences in the use and acceptance of standards given by a credible source; women were more likely to accept and use standards than men. Even when standards were not clearly defined, a sex-of-dyad difference emerged (Foschi et al. 2001). The results of the experiments suggest that during the interaction of self and other, factors emerge which could account for the differences in the interpretation, use, and acceptance of standards. These factors include group prejudices (i.e. status of subject and partner), interpersonal liking and task motivation.

Standards, in relation to these factors, have been the subject of interest for numerous studies. Several researchers have focused on the role of group prejudices and its effect on the use of standards (Foschi 1989; Foddy and Smithson 1989; Foschi, Lai and Sigerson 1994; Foschi, Sigerson and Lembesis 1995; Foschi 1996; Foschi and Valenzuela 2004). It is hypothesized that, although the task is performed at the same level, varying sets of standards will be used depending on the individuals' status (i.e. race, gender and socio-economic standing). This is what constitutes a "double standard" – the use of different standards for competence in

evaluating members of different social categories, even when the performance outcome is of the same (or highly similar) level. Typically, when a double standard is activated, stricter standards will be used to evaluate individuals who hold lower status. Foddy and Smithson (1989) state that this process is an “order-preserving” principle – that the strictness of standards is inversely related to the evaluation of the state of a status characteristic. In other words, those who hold a higher state receive a more lenient set of standards than those who hold a lower state. Foschi (2000) calls the practice of using double standards “a powerful exclusion mechanism” as lower-status individuals are expected to obtain higher performances than their high-status counterparts. Thus the use of double standards helps maintain the status quo within the group. What makes the role activation of double standards even more powerful is the fact that its use is often subtle and not necessarily conscious to the assessor.

Foschi (1989) propose a theoretical account of the use of double standards, incorporating work from both attribution theory and expectation states theory. Attribution theory examines how perceived causes of performance outcomes are affected by the performer’s membership in a social category, whereas expectation states theory examines evaluation of the performances by actors who differ in status. Foschi (1989) propose that under certain conditions, two actors who are differentiated in status will activate the use of stricter double standards to assess the competence of the lower-status individual. For example, performances by women will be judged with a stricter standard than those by men. The application of a more lenient standard for the man ensures that more ability will be attributed to him. Double standards thus contribute to preserving the power and prestige order of the group, whereby “man” carries higher status than “woman”. If Foschi’s (1989) theory holds true, then Pugh and Wahrman (1983) would be correct in stating: “being as good as a man is not enough to enable a woman to succeed” (p.760).

Foschi (1996) carried out two expectations states studies in order to test and further investigate her 1989 theory. In both experiments, subjects participated in opposite-sex dyads on a visual perception task, first individually and then as a group. The objective was to study whether, under certain conditions, different standards for competence would be used to evaluate members of varying social categories (in this case, gender). Foschi (1996) hypothesized that if evaluators believe that gender was a diffuse status characteristic, then a successful performance by a man would be seen as a consistent situation regarding status and level of performance, whereas a successful performance by a woman would be seen as an inconsistent case. Due to her low status, it was predicted that a woman's successful performance would be judged with a stricter standard; the higher the inconsistency between status and level of performance, the stricter the standard. Thus, when a man and a woman performed at the same level, (1) the woman's performance would be evaluated using a stricter standard for ability than would the man, and (2) both female and male assessors would use a stricter standard to assess female performers, regardless of their role (self or other). In the first experiment, subjects worked in opposite-sex dyads on a masculine task whereby both actors performed at an average level. A sex-linked task was chosen as Foschi (1989) had hypothesized that the nature of the task would affect the activation of double standards. Particularly, under specified conditions (e.g. average performance, low accountability), double standards were predicted to emerge in the presence of a masculine task.

Results from the first experiment showed that women were held to a stricter standard for ability than men and that the difference was more pronounced when the referent of the standard was the partner rather than self. Although the sex linkage of the task was a weaker manipulation

than had been intended, findings from the control group indicated that men felt superior to their female partner at the task, while women did not hold such beliefs.

In the second experiment, Foschi (1996) explored the importance of accountability to her double-standards theory. "Accountability" is defined as the extent to which self anticipates having to justify his or her actions. In expectation states work, participants have generally enjoyed low accountability for their actions. Foschi wanted to investigate whether increasing accountability to a medium level would reduce or even eliminate double standards. The second experiment used the same method as the first one; the only difference was that accountability was manipulated to have two levels, medium and low. In the low accountability condition, participants did not have to write their name on their response forms and questionnaires and were told that they would not be seeing their partner. Moreover, their partner would not see self's responses to the questionnaire. For the medium accountability condition, subjects were told that they would be meeting with the partner at the end of the session to discuss their responses to the questionnaire.

Results from the second experiment showed that there was a significant effect for sex-of-other when accountability was low, but not when it was increased. Thus this experiment reveals that the use of gender-based double standards is limited in its scope as it decreases in magnitude when accountability is increased.

In addition to the standardized setting, Foschi has also used a second type of experimental design to study the activation and use of double standards. In this design, participants evaluate the performances of others. This design was first used in Foschi et al.

(1994). These authors were interested in the activation of gender-based double standards in the assessment of competence when the performances are equal. It was hypothesized that although the task would not be explicitly linked to gender, the female performer would tend to be held at a stricter standard than would her male counterpart. Foschi et al. (1994) also considered the effects from the assessor's own status level in the formation of expectation states. They argued that, relative to their male counterparts, female assessors would be less convinced of the male superiority over women at the task. Thus the authors hypothesized that a sex-of-subject (assessor) effect would emerge whereby men would exhibit double standards to a larger extent than women.

In order to investigate their hypotheses, Foschi et al. (1994)'s design recreated several features of a hiring process. Subjects participated in mixed-sex groups and were told that the purpose of the project was to obtain their input in the selection of job candidates for various summer positions in engineering. Specifically, the authors selected jobs in electrical, mechanical and nuclear engineering, which are typically held by men. Subjects were told that they were part of the final stages of the hiring process and that they must make careful decisions. Gender-based status generalizations were possible as the participants were given limited information regarding each of the applicants. The participants were first- or second-year undergraduate students and were expected to be unfamiliar with the specific requirements of the applicants' degrees. The participants were given a short period of time to assess the applicants and make their final decisions, and were allowed low accountability for their decisions.

Each subject received three folders, each containing a job description, application information from two applicants, a grade list (which included overall averages) and a decision

form. Subjects were told that other groups of students, from an “earlier session”, had selected the candidates as semi-finalists for the positions. The first folder contained application information from two men who were vying for a position in electrical engineering. Although the two applicants had similar educational backgrounds, one candidate was markedly better than the other as he had obtained a higher-grade average (82% compared to 75% obtained by the other candidate), and had received a scholarship (the other did not receive any awards). This folder was a non-critical folder. Its purpose was to serve as a “distractor” for the other two folders. Moreover, it allowed the participants to become familiar with the task and served as an indirect measure of how well subjects understood the instructions.

The second folder contained application information on same-sex pairs; both applicants were either male or female, who were applying for a position in the field of mechanical engineering. All candidates in this folder were highly similar in age, educational background, work experience and average grades (all achieved a 70%). This folder served as a control condition for the use of double standards. Since all of the applicants were highly similar, they all had equal chances of being selected for the position. Moreover, since their academic records were average, the candidates would only be meeting the minimum requirements for eligibility, thus the number of times “neither” is chosen should be larger than in the first folder.

The third folder was the critical one and included a male and female applicant vying for a position in nuclear engineering/physics. In one condition, the male applicant had received a slightly higher average grade (73%) than the female applicant (71%); in the other condition the grades were reversed. Aside from grades and gender, the applicants were highly similar to one another in age, degrees received, and work experience. Average grades were used so that the

performances would not be a clear indication of either success or failure, and thus would more easily allow double standards to occur (Foschi 1989).

For each folder, the participants completed a decision form on which they indicated their choice. All of the subjects were given the option of choosing either one of the candidates for the position, or neither one of them. They were also asked to rate each candidate in terms of their competence and suitability for the job. After finishing the third decision form, subjects completed a questionnaire, which was used as a manipulation check for information received on the folders (e.g. job titles, sex of candidates and average grades).

Foschi et al.'s (1994) findings supported their hypothesis that male subjects would use a double standard more often than female subjects. When the male applicant was the better performer, he was chosen more often than the female applicant; when the female applicant was the better performer, participants either chose her fewer times than they chose the male applicant or they selected neither one of the candidates. Female subjects chose the candidate who received higher grades, regardless of gender. The mean competence advantage of the better performer also showed a significant effect for sex of subject. The male subjects gave a significantly higher advantage to the male better performer than to the female better performer - the women gave the same advantage to the better performer regardless of his/her sex category.

Using the application-files design introduced by Foschi et al. (1994), Foschi et al. (1995) examined the impact of four status-related factors on the assessment of job applicants: sex of assessor, sex of applicant (diffuse status characteristic), applicant's academic record (specific status characteristic) and type of decision. Unlike the previous experiment, Foschi et al. (1995)

introduced a new situation whereby the assessors evaluated one performer at a time. The authors were interested in the effects of various types of status characteristics on performance evaluation. They proposed that the activation of status characteristics was situational and their effects varied depending on certain factors: degree of relevance to the task at hand, type of decision, levels of specific and diffuse status characteristics, and level of acceptance of the status values of these characteristics. It was hypothesized that when assessing an applicant, the performer's academic record will have a stronger effect than his or her gender, and that this effect will more likely be present in reward allocation than in competence assignment. In other words, a specific status characteristic, with explicit relevance to the task, will elicit stronger effects than a diffuse status characteristic with implicit relevance to the same task.

The participants received two of four files, one with either a man or woman with average grades, and one with either a man or woman with outstanding grades. Similar to Foschi et al. (1994), each file contained a job description, application information (name of applicant, educational background, grades, hobbies, job experiences) and a decision form. Participants were asked to select one applicant, as well as to give competence and job suitability ratings. In addition, the subjects were asked to recommend a starting salary for the chosen candidate - a measure of reward allocation.

Results showed that in the assessment of applicants, neither a sex of candidate nor a sex of subject difference emerged; there were only effects from academic records. However, when asked to allocate rewards in the form of suggested salaries, an effect for sex of candidate emerged. This suggests the use of subtler forms of double standards. When the applicants performed at an average level, the men were assigned significantly higher rewards than the

women. However, at the outstanding level, this difference was not only minimized, it was reversed. Foschi et al. (1995) suggested that perhaps participants thought that if a woman showed the same outstanding level of performance as a man, then this indicated that she was superior to him. As Wagner, Ford and Ford (1986) predicted, perhaps disconfirmation of expectations has a stronger impact on expectations than confirmation.

Foschi and Valenzuela (2004) was an extension of Foschi et al.'s (1994) study and investigated the effects of cues that were either consistent or inconsistent with sex category. Specifically, they were interested in the effects of an applicant's self-presentation style on a hiring decision. They argued that if gender were viewed as a status characteristic, a man who was self-promoting about his abilities and a woman who was modest about hers would be a consistent situation that reinforces the gender-based status order. It was hypothesized that if gender carried status, and the male applicant was more confident in self-presentation than the female applicant, then his competence advantage would be larger than if the situation was reversed. On the other hand, if gender did not carry status, then both situations would be seen as either inconsistent or consistent and the competence advantage would be given to the applicant who had a confident self-presentation style, regardless of gender.

Participants received three sets of files, each containing application information on two applicants. All of the files were adapted from, and were similar to those used in Foschi et al. (1994). The third set, the critical folder, differed from the other two in that either a cover letter or a point-form summary of qualifications was included for each applicant. In this folder, all participants received application information regarding a male and female candidate. Both had highly similar educational backgrounds, work experience, hobbies, and course averages (71-

73%). The subjects either received a file wherein the man had a confident self-presentation style and the woman's was neutral; or a file containing the reverse situation; or a file with only a point-form summary of qualifications. The same confident and neutral letters were used for the first two of those conditions. After assessing the application information, the subjects were to indicate their choice of applicant on a response form, which also included competence and job suitability ratings.

Foschi and Valenzuela (2004) found that the participants did not use gender as a status factor. In addition, the participants had indicated a higher level of accountability than had been intended by the experimenters. Analysis of competence ratings indicated an effect for self-presentation style, while choice and suitability measures revealed a sex-of-subject difference and partial effects from self-presentation style. For choice of applicant, regardless of self-presentation style, the women were more likely to choose the female over the male candidate. The men, on the other hand, chose the female applicant more than her male counterpart when her style was confident and his was neutral. In the conditions when the male applicant was more confident, and when both were neutral, the men chose the male and the female applicant approximately the same number of times

HYPOTHESES

Similar to what Foschi and Valenzuela (2004) have found, other work on status characteristics also points to a decrease in the status value of gender (see, e.g. Foschi and Lapointe 2002; Okamoto and Smith-Lovin 2001; Stewart 1988). However, other studies continue to conclude that gender is still treated as a status characteristic. Some studies such as

Foschi et al. (1994) have found that men but not women treat “man” as a superior state, whereas other studies indicate that both genders hold such beliefs: It is my intention in this thesis to gain further insights into this matter.

As in other expectation-states studies, I will investigate a situation whereby the group consists of one assessor, A (self), who has to evaluate the performance of two others, B and C. These two individuals differ on a single status characteristic and achieve the same or highly similar performance results. A’s task is to infer the competence of B and C based on their performances. My thesis research will include the following scope conditions:

- a.) A is motivated to assess B’s and C’s competence. At the same time, A enjoys a low level of accountability for his/her decisions – that is, A is free to use any information available to him/her in making those decisions.
- b.) B and C differ on a status characteristic that A believes to have status value (e.g. gender, whereby “man” has higher status than “woman”).
- c.) B and C have completed individual performances on a task that A values, and both performers have achieved the same or highly similar results of below average quality. The evaluation of the performances has been done by a “source” outside the group, and is accepted by A as being objective and unbiased.
- d.) A is given limited information regarding B and C and therefore has no other grounds except those specified above on which to base assessments of competence. In particular, A has no prior experience in judging competence at the task, makes no explicit association between it and status, and views the situation as one for which there are neither clearly set nor widely accepted standards for competence.

Two expectation states studies with similar scope conditions as those listed above have assumed that status effects are more likely to emerge when the performances by the two persons are of average rather than extraordinary quality (Foschi et al. 1994, 1995). What if the performances are below average in quality? I test the relative effects of status and poor performance in the above setting. Status is operationalized as sex category of performer, and poor performance as low grades. I consider the following situations. In all the critical conditions B is a man and C is a woman, and both perform at a poor level: (1) B performs at a higher level than C; (2) C performs at a higher level than B; (3) B and C perform at a similar level. My dependent variable is the assignment of competence advantage to the man over the woman. I propose the following alternative hypotheses for this thesis.

Hypothesis 1a. If findings from (3) show gender to be a status factor (that is, if the man is given an advantage over the woman), then his advantage will be larger in (1) than in (3), as a result of performance outcomes that are consistent with gender as status. On the other hand, this advantage will be smaller in (2) than in (3) due to the inconsistency between performance outcomes and gender as status.

Hypothesis 1b. If findings from (3) show gender not to be a status factor (that is, if the man is not given an advantage over the woman), then (1) and (2) will not be seen as either consistent or inconsistent with gender as status. Only performance outcomes will be used in assessing the competence advantage of one person over the other. If this is the case, relative to (3), whoever has the better performance outcome will have a larger competence advantage over his or her competitor in both (1) and (2).

CHAPTER II. METHOD

In this project I investigate double standards for lack of ability in relation to gender-neutral jobs. Although jobs in engineering have typically been held by men, there have been increasing numbers of women entering this profession. Moreover, environmental engineering was specifically chosen to increase gender neutrality of the jobs. In order to test my hypotheses I used the same application-files design as Foschi et al. (1994). As discussed earlier, participants in this setting assessed files of fictitious job candidates who were vying for a position as an engineer-in-training for various engineering firms in Canada. They were asked to make hiring recommendations, to rate the candidates in terms of competence and suitability, and to suggest monthly salaries for each person.

SUBJECTS AND EXPERIMENTERS

Subjects were 81 male and 84 female first- and second-year undergraduates attending the University of British Columbia. (In order to ensure that there would be at least five or more subjects per session, twelve people were scheduled for each session. As a result of this scheduling method, three more women were run for the experiment.) Participants were recruited from introductory level undergraduate courses, excluding those in Psychology, Sociology and Engineering, within the faculties of Arts and Sciences. Professors were e-mailed for permission to recruit in their classes. Two research assistants and I visited the classes. One of us delivered the recruitment speech and the other two handed out and collected recruitment forms. We emphasized that participation was voluntary, that filling out the forms did not imply agreement to participate, and that this information was necessary for us to be able to contact prospective participants. Information such as name, age, gender, courses taken and knowledge of English

was asked on the recruitment form. In addition, I unobtrusively asked about previous participation in psychological experiments - the form prompted students to indicate what activities they had taken part in at the university (e.g. clubs, seminars and laboratory studies). Strict inclusion criteria were used in determining prospective subjects – they had to be either first or second year students, between the ages of 18-21 and they must not have taken psychology courses beyond an introductory level. The research assistants and I scheduled prospective participants over the phone for the sessions. They were paid \$15 for their participation.

Subjects took part in mixed-sex groups ranging from five to twelve in size; a minimum of five was required in order to decrease the likelihood of suspicions. The experiment was a 2 (sex of subject) x 3 (grade difference between two applicants of poor performance) between-subjects factorial design with 27 subjects per cell for the men and 28 for the women. (In the rest of the thesis I will refer to the second independent variable, simply as, “grade difference”. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the six conditions. In all cases, the main dependent factor of interest was competence assignment.

I acted as the main experimenter, and two other female students took turns in assisting in the sessions. I delivered the instructions at all of the sessions. Special attention was paid in maintaining uniformity in the delivery, as well as in the appearance of all of the research assistants. The room, folders and all other experimental materials used were also uniform in their appearance. In order to control for any experimenter effects, the research assistants and I were blind as to the experimental condition to which any of the subjects had been assigned.

PROCEDURES AND MATERIALS

Subjects were told that they would be participating in a novel project created by the university, in collaboration with industry. They were informed that the purpose of the project was to obtain the input of several people in hiring recent graduates from the faculty of Applied Science. Their task was to select suitable candidates for junior engineering positions in areas of environmental engineering.

The instructions emphasized that the project was an innovative idea and that it had been developed to give recent graduates the opportunity to gain technical experience in their fields. I informed the subjects that their input was part of the final stages of the process that would determine which candidate would obtain the job in each case. They were also told that several people, such as undergraduate and graduate students, as well as university faculty and staff would be taking part in the project. We stressed that all of the information they provided would be kept confidential and would not be associated with them as individuals. Although the participants would not have to meet with the applicants nor explain their decisions to the researchers, it was stressed that their input was valuable to the project and that careful decisions should be made. Thus, although they were given low accountability for their choices, they were encouraged to choose the best candidate for the position. We asked the subjects to work on the two sets of applications one at a time and in the order in which they had received them. They were told that they only had ten minutes to work on each set. This ensured that the project was completed in the allotted one hour and twenty minutes - the time the subjects were told the task would take. In addition, double standards are more likely to emerge when an evaluator is pressured for time, as it is a shortcut in decision-making.

Each of the participants was given a folder, which included two sets of materials. Inside each set was a job description submitted by a “company”; a completed application form submitted by two “applicants”, a grade list for each of the applicants, along with information pertaining to the courses they had taken in the last two years of studies, a response form on which the participants were to indicate their final decision, and a blank sheet of paper on which to take notes of any relevant information regarding each of the sets of files (e.g. names, grades and work experiences). These notes were to be used when completing the questionnaire at the end of the session.

Both sets had descriptions for an entry-level position as an engineer-in-training, in the field of environmental engineering. The job descriptions were adapted from and were similar in format to job advertisements found on the Internet. They included information about the company, the location of the job, the academic requirements for the position and a summary of the responsibilities it entailed. The names of the two fictitious companies were blacked out.

The application forms provided information about each applicant. Various individuals filled out the forms so that the handwriting on the application forms would be different, thus enhancing the realism of the project. Basic demographic information was included (e.g. first and last names, age, gender, address, and telephone number), as well as information on each applicant’s education, average grades, awards received (if any), most recent work experience (two items listed per applicant), extracurricular activities, language (written, read, and spoken) and citizenship. The last names of the applicants, their addresses and telephone numbers were blacked out. Each candidate’s first name was used as an indicator of the person’s sex-category (e.g. Robert; Kathy; Alan; Ken). All of the candidates were recent graduates and had received a

Bachelor's in Applied Sciences degree pertaining to the field in question. Their work experiences were all gender-neutral; they were all part-time positions and were highly comparable to one another (e.g. library assistant; customer service representative for the university bookstore). In addition, all of the applicants had previous short-term work experiences that were of relevance to their degrees (e.g. assistant to the project manager for an engineering company; intern for an engineering firm). This made it plausible for the applicants to be seeking opportunities to work for companies that were directly relevant to their fields. The extracurricular activities listed by each of the candidates were also highly comparable to each other and were gender-neutral (e.g. basketball; tennis; piano). In all of the application forms, the candidates indicated that they were Canadian citizens and that they spoke, read and wrote English.

The grade lists provided for each of the candidates included the courses they had taken in the last two years of their studies, the marks received in each course and their overall average grade. Since all of the participants were in either their first- or second-year of studies, it was reasonable to assume that they would not be familiar with the courses listed, or with the average grades obtained by most students in the engineering department. Since the subjects were unfamiliar with the fields in question, and no previously set standards were given to them in order to interpret the grades, they had to rely on their limited knowledge of engineering and information regarding the applicants. This context contributes to the implementation of scope condition (d) mentioned earlier.

For each set, the participants received a response form on which they were to indicate their decision. While working on the files, they had all the information regarding the applicants in

front of them. Participants were also asked to take notes while completing the decision form; these notes would later be useful when answering the opinion questionnaire. They were first asked to indicate which one of the two applicants would be the best candidate for the job; this choice was the main operationalization of the dependent variable. The option of choosing neither of the candidates was also available for the participants in case they could not make a choice. This was also an additional way for status effects to be revealed (i.e., if more “neither” responses are given when the woman is the better applicant than when the man is the better candidate then a double standard is activated). In addition to the choice of applicant and the manipulation checks, the response forms also included competence and suitability ratings (on a 7-point scale) for each applicant. For clarity, a definition for each competence and suitability were included in the decision form. Competence was defined as having the technical skills and knowledge to successfully perform the duties required of the position. Suitability, on the other hand, was defined as having those qualifications, as well as possessing other qualities/attributes that (the subject thought) would contribute success to the company. These definitions were slightly altered for the second set (this will be discussed further at a later point). At the end of each response form, participants were also asked to suggest a monthly salary, ranging from \$2550 – \$3650, for each of the candidates. Subjects were asked to indicate figures that would reflect their opinion of each candidate’s qualifications. The salary portion of the response form was intended to be an additional unobtrusive measure for double standards. For example, if, overall, the female applicant was chosen more often, yet she was given a lower salary than the male applicant, then it would indicate that double standards had been activated. The four measures constitute different ways of assessing competence advantage.

The first set had two male applicants vying for an engineer-in-training, Chemical/Biological

Engineering position in Winnipeg, Manitoba. The two candidates, Robert and Ken, were highly similar in many respects: educational background, work experiences and hobbies. Robert, however, had a better average-grade than Ken, had achieved an 80-82% average, and had received a scholarship. He was 22 years old and indicated that he could write, speak and read English and Cantonese. Ken, on the other hand, had received an average grade in the 74-76% range, had not received any scholarships, was 24 years old and could write, speak and read English and French. This folder served as a non-critical "distractor" file and was received by all subjects. It was used as a check that all of the participants understood the instructions and the task at hand, and that they took the project seriously.

The critical set had a male and female applicant competing for a position as an engineer-in-training with a Civil/Environmental Engineering firm located in Vancouver, British Columbia. Both candidates were similar in many respects; they were 23 years of age, had received a Bachelor in Applied Science with an environmental engineering option from the University of British Columbia, had no scholarships, and indicated only English as the language they could read, speak, and write. The applicants' work experiences and hobbies were highly similar. One indicated working at the university library, while the other worked at the university bookstore. In addition, both had obtained short-term positions as assistants at an engineering firm. Since much of the information was comparable in both application forms, the main differences between the two candidates were their sex and grades. The applicants in this folder were the poorly performing candidates and had received an overall average grade that was below the generally accepted minimum average requirement at the university, namely 67%. In Condition (1), the man had received an average mark that ranged from 62-64% while the woman had achieved a mark in the 56-58% range; in Condition (2), the grades were reversed; and in

Condition (3), both candidates received average marks in the same range of 56-58%. The third condition was control condition. As discussed in the Hypotheses section, this condition would serve as an indirect indication of the participants' views on gender. Since the applicants' had received marks that were below the minimum average requirement, subjects were asked to rate these candidates in terms of their potential competence and suitability (the likelihood they would have such characteristics), as opposed to their actual competence and suitability.

After completing the second set, participants were asked to fill out an opinion questionnaire that was similar to the one used in earlier studies (Foschi et al. 1994; Foschi and Valenzuela 2004). They were told that since the project was a novel one, their input was needed in order to assess its success. In actuality, the questionnaire served as a means of obtaining further information on the participants. It also served as a check on various manipulations such as grades of applicants and job titles, and as a means of assessing suspicions and/or confusion. A section on feelings towards the project and the task was also included. These questions measured the participants' task-orientation by asking students to rate on a 6-point scale how interested, concerned, and involved they were in the project. There were also questions regarding the participant's opinions of the project as a whole; they were asked to rate how valuable the task was and whether it should be continued annually. At the end of the questionnaire, open-ended questions were included to serve as a further manipulation check for task-orientation as well as suspicion.

The participants were then divided into two groups and taken to separate rooms for further discussion of the project. By dividing the set of participants into two smaller groups, individual participation could be encouraged and the other research assistant and myself could

thoroughly assess any suspicions and/or misunderstandings. A protocol for debriefing was used in all of the sessions, in order to maintain consistency. In order to assess suspicions, participants were again asked for their opinions of the project, before we revealed its true nature. Once the discussion ended, the subjects were told that the project was not real and that it was an experiment. We explained the real reasons for the project, the design of the study, and the need for deception. A second group discussion followed whereby any questions or concerns were addressed (if needed, individual discussion was available to the participants). Since deception was used, special attention was paid in answering all of the questions and participants were reassured that their personal information and data were confidential. Furthermore, since there was a chance that their peers, friends or siblings would be recruited for future sessions, we asked the subjects not to reveal the nature of the study. Each participant signed a secrecy contract and was then paid for their time and cooperation

CHAPTER III. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

On the basis of the information obtained from the post-experimental questionnaire and the debriefing sessions, four women and three men are excluded from the analysis. They represent 4.24% of the participants, an exclusion rate comparable to past experiments with a similar design (Foschi et al. 1994, 1995, Foschi and Valenzuela 2004). The excluded subjects can be classified as follows: three volunteered clear suspicions regarding the project and the true nature of the study, one showed lack of task orientation, and three showed clear inconsistencies in their decisions (e.g., paying the chosen candidate, in both folders, a markedly lower salary than the one paid to his or her competitor). Rejection rules were conservative and constructed beforehand. No pattern was evident in the distribution of exclusions across conditions. The analysis presented below includes only the 158 retained participants (26 in each of four conditions and 27 in each of two as shown in Table 1). For the salary measure, however, the total number of subjects is 155 (as shown in Table 6), as three subjects declined to assign a salary.

I analyzed all of the results using two-way ANOVAs with sex of subject and grade difference as the independent factors. Levene's test for homogeneity of variance is passed in all ANOVA's except one (data on competence advantage), as I describe later. In the text below, means are followed by standard deviations in brackets; Tables 1-7 appear at the end of this chapter. Here I present the results and statistical analyses for the experiment; an interpretation and discussion follows in Chapter 4.

Manipulation Checks - Results from the Post Experimental Questionnaire

1. Disposition Towards the Task

The post-experimental questionnaire consisted of a variety of items, some of which pertained to the subjects' perceptions of the engineering jobs and their own decision-making task, while the rest were fillers added to maintain the realism of the project. The questions about the subjects' disposition towards the task were formulated using 6-point bipolar scales; the results are as follows: 1 (involved) to 6 (uninvolved): 2.69 [1.11]; 1 (interested) to 6 (uninterested): 2.72 [1.17]; 1 (motivated) to 6 (unmotivated): 2.95 [1.00]. There are no significant differences across conditions in the first two measures, as expected. The question pertaining to motivation, however, yielded a significant effect from grade difference ($F(2,152) = 5.615, p = 0.004$). For this measure, the means per condition range from 2.61 to 3.40; the subjects who had the man performing better than the woman were the most motivated, while those with both applicants performing equally were the least motivated. However, since the mean value for the condition with the least interested participants was 3.40, findings from all three conditions are still within the values that indicate motivation was more than average.

Subjects also rated several statements, each on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 6 (strongly disagree). The mean results from those statements were: "I felt an obligation to the applicants to be fair in my evaluations:" 1.57 [0.98]; "I had a hard time making my decisions:" 2.98 [1.32]; "I felt a responsibility to the applicants:" 1.58 [0.80]; "I felt a responsibility to the project:" 2.14 [1.09]; and "This project is a valuable one:" 2.20 [1.12]. As expected, there were no statistically significant differences across conditions and all values were within the anticipated ranges.

2. Impressions of the Jobs

The questionnaire also included several 6-point bipolar scales, which I used to assess the subjects' perceptions of each of the engineering jobs. For the first folder the means and standard deviations are as follows: 1 (easy) to 6 (difficult): 4.60 [0.77]; 1 (routine) to 6 (creative): 3.75 [1.15]; 1 (unimportant) to 6 (important): 5.22 [0.76]; and 1 (not valuable) to 6 (valuable): 5.12 [0.77]. As expected, there are no statistically significant effects from any of the first three measures. The question pertaining to the value of the job, however, yielded a significant effect for sex of subject ($F(1,152) = 5.80, p = 0.017$). Nevertheless, the means per condition range from 4.90 to 5.50, and thus still indicate that all of the participants rated the job as valuable. It is interesting to note that this significant difference results from the women assigning more value to the job than do the men. Perhaps the female participants were less familiar (and more impressed) with technical matters than were the men, as even today, there are still fewer women than men enrolled in engineering programs (Barber 1995). (As I indicated in Chapter 2, none of the participants was an engineering student).

For the second folder the means and standard deviations for those scales are as follows: 1 (easy) to 6 (difficult): 4.65 [0.85]; 1 (routine) to 6 (creative): 4.17 [1.17]; 1 (unimportant) to 6 (important): 5.10 [0.86]; and 1 (not valuable) to 6 (valuable): 5.06 [0.80]. Three out of four of these measures yield a statistically significant effect for sex of subject; only the measure for creativity of the job yields non-significant results. Once again it is interesting to note that, in the three measures yielding a significant effect, the differences result from the women rating the job as more difficult, valuable, and important than did the men. Despite the differences, the ranges of the means across conditions indicate that the subjects perceived the job to be difficult (4.36 to 5.01), important (4.79 to 5.40) and valuable (4.81 to 5.38).

Manipulation Checks - Results from Response Form, Folder 1

1. Choice of Applicant

As expected, there is a strong preference for the male candidate and both male and female participants make highly similar choices. The chi-square for choice of applicant yields non-significant results for sex of subject (Pearson Chi-Square: 1.710, $df = 2$, $p = 0.425$). The men choose Robert (the better candidate) 68 times (87.18%), Ken 9 times (11.54%), and neither candidate once (1.28%); the women choose Robert 67 times (83.75%), Ken 13 times (16.25%), and neither 0 times.

2. Competence

On average both the men and the women consider the better performer to be more competent than the other candidate. As expected, there are no statistically significant effects for sex of subject in the competence advantage assigned to the better performer. The men give Robert a mean competence advantage of 0.91 [0.71] while the women grant him an average advantage of 0.98 [0.73]. There is, however, an unexpected significant effect from grade difference in Folder 2 ($F(1,152) = 3.651$, $p = 0.028$).

3. Suitability

Overall, both the men and the women consider Robert to be more suitable for the position than Ken. In terms of suitability advantage of the better performer over his competitor, there are no statistically significant effects from either independent variable, as expected. Both the men and the women give the better applicant an overall advantage over the other candidate: the mean advantage given by the men is 0.50 [1.13]; the figure from the women is 0.77 [1.26].

4. Salary

As in the case of the other dependent measures, on average participants recommend a higher salary for the better candidate. Regarding the salary advantage of the better candidate, average values show that the participants recommend a higher salary for the better candidate; there are no statistically significant differences from either variable, as expected. The mean salary advantage suggested by the men is \$162.34 [209.66] while the women suggest a figure of \$170.89 [178.42].

Dependent Variables - Results from Response Form, Folder 2

1. Choice of Applicant

Results on choice of applicant appear in Table 1, separately for male and female subjects. The chi-square is significant for both: for men (Pearson Chi-Square: 9.540, $df = 4$, $p = 0.049$), for women (Pearson Chi-Square: 16.784, $df = 4$, $p = 0.002$). Overall, results reveal a preference for the male candidate by both the male and female subjects.

2. Competence

Table 2 presents the average competence values assigned by men and women to each of the two candidates by condition. In Table 3, these results are expressed in terms of the competence advantage of the male applicant over his female counterpart. The ANOVA shows a significant effect from grade difference ($F(2, 152) = 28.967$; $p = 0.000$). Both the male and female subjects give the male applicant an advantage in Condition (1), a disadvantage in Condition (2), and a value in between those two in Condition (3). Levene's test for homogeneity is significant ($p = 0.019$). Most authors consider it valid to carry out the ANOVA despite having the Levene's test fail (see, for example, Kerlinger 1986, and Pagano 1998).

3. Suitability

Table 4 shows the average suitability values assigned by both the male and female participants to each of the two candidates by condition. Table 5 presents the mean values in terms of suitability advantage of the male applicant over his female counterpart. The ANOVA indicates a significant effect from sex of subject ($F(1, 152) = 8.256; p = 0.005$). The female subjects consider the male applicant more suitable than his female competitor in all three conditions. The male subjects prefer the male applicant in Conditions (1) and (2), although not as clearly as do the female subjects.

4. Salary

Table 6 presents the mean values of suggested salaries by both male and female subjects for each of the two candidates. Table 7 shows the results for the salary advantage of the male candidate over the female applicant. The ANOVA indicates a significant effect from grade difference ($F(2, 149) = 18.775, p = 0.000$).

Table 1. Choice of Applicant				
<u>Male Subjects</u>				
	Male Applicant	Female Applicant	Neither	
Condition (1): Man Better than Woman	14	8	4	26
Condition (2): Woman Better than Man	6	12	8	26
Condition (3): Man and Woman About Equal	15	4	7	26
	35	24	19	78
<u>Female Subjects</u>				
	Male Applicant	Female Applicant	Neither	
Condition (1): Man Better than Woman	17	1	8	26
Condition (2): Woman Better than Man	10	13	4	27
Condition (3): Man and Woman About Equal	10	6	11	27
	37	20	23	80

Table 2. Competence Ratings. Means Followed by Standard Deviations in Brackets.

Male Subjects

	Male Applicant	Female Applicant
Condition (1): Man Better than Woman	4.62 [0.98]	4.19 [0.98]
Condition (2): Woman Better than Man	3.98 [1.10]	4.38 [0.80]
Condition (3): Man and Woman About Equal	4.03 [1.09]	3.84 [1.10]

Female Subjects

	Male Applicant	Female Applicant
Condition (1): Man Better than Woman	4.70 [0.90]	4.02 [0.99]
Condition (2): Woman Better than Man	4.29 [1.03]	4.84 [0.86]
Condition (3): Man and Woman About Equal	3.94 [0.96]	3.91 [0.98]

Table 3. Competence Advantage of Male Applicant Over Female Applicant. Means
Followed by Standard Deviations in Brackets.

	Male Subjects	Female Subjects
Condition (1): Man Better than Woman	+ 0.42 [0.76]	+ 0.68 [0.61]
Condition (2): Woman Better than Man	- 0.39 [0.84]	- 0.56 [0.64]
Condition (3): Man and Woman About Equal	+ 0.19 [0.69]	+ 0.04 [0.59]

Table 4. Suitability Ratings. Means Followed by Standard Deviations in Brackets.

<u>Male Subjects</u>		
	Male Applicant	Female Applicant
Condition (1): Man Better than Woman	4.63 [1.174]	4.59 [1.033]
Condition (2): Woman Better than Man	4.08 [1.16]	4.15 [0.97]
Condition (3): Man and Woman About Equal	4.38 [1.31]	4.19 [1.37]
<u>Female Subjects</u>		
	Male Applicant	Female Applicant
Condition (1): Man Better than Woman	4.84 [1.12]	4.14 [1.08]
Condition (2): Woman Better than Man	4.94 [0.83]	4.62 [1.00]
Condition (3): Man and Woman About Equal	4.40 [1.15]	3.94 [1.28]

Table 5. Suitability Advantage of Male Applicant Over Female Applicant. Means
Followed by Standard Deviations in Brackets.

	Male Subjects	Female Subjects
Condition (1): Man Better than Woman	+ 0.04 [1.11]	+ 0.70 [0.80]
Condition (2): Woman Better than Man	- 0.08 [0.94]	+ 0.32 [0.82]
Condition (3): Man and Woman About Equal	+ 0.19 [0.80]	+ 0.46 [1.23]

Table 6. Recommended Monthly Salaries. Means Followed by Standard Deviations in Brackets.

<u>Male Subjects</u>		
	Male Applicant	Female Applicant
Condition (1): Man Better than Woman N = 26	2896.15 [212.10]	2823.08 [234.19]
Condition (2): Woman Better than Man N = 25	2822.00 [238.96]	2894.00 [245.09]
Condition (3): Man and Woman About Equal N = 26	2900.00 [228.47]	2834.62 [205.31]
<u>Female Subjects</u>		
	Male Applicant	Female Applicant
Condition (1): Man Better than Woman N = 26	2950.00 [295.30]	2811.54 [245.07]
Condition (2): Woman Better than Man N = 25	2870.00 [241.52]	2918.00 [242.76]
Condition (3): Man and Woman About Equal N = 27	2838.89 [235.88]	2816.67 [200.00]

Table 7. Salary Advantage of Male Applicant Over Female Applicant. Means Followed by Standard Deviations in Brackets.		
	Male Subjects	Female Subjects
Condition (1): Man Better than Woman	73.08 [153.77]	138.46 [144.44]
Condition (2): Woman Better than Man	- 72.00 [110.00]	- 48.00 [108.47]
Condition (3): Man and Woman About Equal	65.38 [138.40]	22.22 [160.13]

CHAPTER IV. DISCUSSION, SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH, AND CONCLUSIONS

Participants in this experiment assessed two folders with two applications each. In both cases, participants recommended whom they thought would be the better candidate of the two. As expected, results from Folder 1 confirm my predictions that the manipulation checks have been overall successful. The second, critical folder allowed me to investigate whether a failing performance by a male and a female candidate would lead to a disadvantage in evaluations for the latter. This disadvantage was seen in the choice and suitability measures but not in competence and salary.

DISCUSSION

Interpretation of the Manipulation Checks

Results concerning seven measures of the subjects' dispositions towards their task (such as involved-uninvolved, interested-uninterested, and responsibility to the applicants) show expected levels in all of them. Furthermore, also as expected, there are no significant differences across conditions in six of these measures. The one showing a significant difference concerns level of motivation: those subjects who were in Condition (3) (man and woman performing at about the same level) showed the most motivation. Perhaps the lack of difference between the two performers motivated more thought on the part of the participants.

With respect to the eight measures relating to impressions of the jobs (four measures taken for each of the two jobs), subjects show values as expected; there are significant differences in four cases and no significant differences in the remaining four. In all four cases where significant differences are found, the women perceived the jobs as more valuable (in

Folder 1), and more difficult, more important, and more valuable (in Folder 2) than did the men. As mentioned in Chapter 3, it is likely that these findings are related to the fact that the women were less familiar with the technical jobs than were the men.

As for the results on the choice measure in Folder 1, as expected, they show a preference for the better candidate and there are also no statistically significant differences in this respect for either men or women. The levels of competence, suitability and suggested salary for the better performer were, in all conditions, higher than the levels corresponding to his competitor. In addition, and as expected, the suitability advantage and salary advantage measures do not yield any significant results. There is, however, such a significance in the findings for competence advantage: those subjects who were to receive Condition (3) in Folder 2 gave more of an advantage to the better performer in Folder 1 than subjects in Conditions (1) and (2). Since subjects were assigned at random to Conditions (1), (2) and (3), I do not consider this finding to be of theoretical significance. Perhaps subjects would have been found to be more similar across all conditions in these respects if the numbers per cell had been larger.

Overall, I conclude that the manipulation checks were fairly successful in establishing attitudes towards the task and the jobs as intended.

Interpretation of the Results from the Critical Folder

1. Choice of Applicant

Results show a preference for the male candidate by both the men and women. When the male and the female candidates had the same grade-point average and very similar records in

other respects (Condition 3), both the men and women favour the male candidate. In fact, the number of “neither” answers is larger than the number of times the female applicant is chosen, for respondents of both sexes. When she has the higher grade-point average (Condition (2)), both the men and the women choose the female candidate more often than they choose any of the other options. The men respond to Condition (1) similarly to the way they respond to Condition (3) – that is, the male candidate is chosen to about the same extent when he is academically better than the female candidate as when the two candidates are highly similar. The women in Condition (1) show an even more markedly preference for the male applicant than do the men in the same situation. The female respondents also prefer the male candidate, when he is the better of the two applicants, more clearly than they prefer the female candidate when she is the better one. Overall, participants of both sexes (but men more than women) show a double standard that favours the male candidate.

2. Competence Advantage

With respect to competence advantage of the male applicant, the results are in line with the grade difference. Both the men and women give an advantage to the better candidate in Conditions (1) and (2). As for the control condition, although the men, compared to the women, give a slightly higher advantage to the male applicant, this is not enough to yield significant results.

3. Suitability Advantage

As in the case of the choice measure, both the men and women show a preference for the male applicant in rating his suitability advantage for the position. The men give him an advantage in Conditions (1) and (3), but grant a slight advantage to the female applicant in

Condition (2). The women, on the other hand, give the male applicant an advantage in all three conditions, with the advantage decreasing only somewhat in Condition (2). In fact, the women confer more of an advantage to the male applicant in all conditions than do the men.

4. Salary Advantage

In Conditions (1) and (2), both the men and the women assign a salary advantage to the better candidate. Although there are no sex-of-subject effects for salary advantage of the male candidate, the women prefer him slightly more than do the men. Thus, in Condition (1), the women give the male candidate more than twice the advantage they give to the female candidate in Condition (2). In Condition (3), both the men and the women give a salary advantage to the male candidate.

Overview of the Results

In line with two recent studies with the same population (Foschi and Lapointe 2002; Foschi and Valenzuela 2004), the findings from this experiment show a minimal level of sexism; overall, participants follow the grade differences in their decisions.

The results from Condition (3) concerning all four dependent variables are as follows. In terms of the choice measure, the men clearly favour the male applicant; the women show the same tendency but not as clearly. The competence advantage findings indicate practically no advantage for the male applicant, from either the men or the women. The salary advantage values mirror those from the competence measure. Suitability advantage results, although showing a sex of subject effect when all conditions are considered, do not show a marked sex difference in Condition (3). In that condition, women favour the male applicant. Considering all

of these findings together, I conclude that the results support the interpretation that, in the assessment of poor performances, gender did not carry considerable status for these subjects. Therefore, it is more appropriate to use the data from the other two conditions to test Hypothesis 1b rather than Hypothesis 1a. The prediction that I test is then that, relative to Condition (3) the man's advantage will increase in Condition (1) and decrease in Condition (2).

I begin with the choice measure. For men, the choice advantage of the male candidate does not increase from Condition (3) to (1), but decreases from (3) to (2). For women, relative to Condition (3), the choice advantage granted to the men increases in (1) and decreases in (2), as expected. Thus, for this measure, the hypothesis is supported in three out of four comparisons.

Regarding competence advantage, the differences between each pair of conditions per sex of subject are as expected. For salary advantage, the mean values for men increase from Conditions (3) to (1) (although minimally), and decrease from (3) to (2) as expected. For women, the values change as expected.

As to suitability advantage, the predictions are supported for one out of two comparisons, for both men and women. For the men the results decrease from (3) to (2), as expected but, contrary to expectations, do not increase from (3) to (1). For the women, the situation is the reverse. I now turn to a discussion of these findings.

The results from two measures, competence and salary advantage, support Hypothesis 1b, the findings from some of the conditions for the other two, however, are not as expected. Thus the issue that must be addressed is why there is clear support for the hypothesis for two out of

four measures. Perhaps the difference stems from the interpretation of the variables by the subjects themselves. Competence advantage and salary advantage are both very highly specific in their meanings, whereas suitability and choice allow the participants to bring in other considerations, such as gender biases, in making their decisions. Although both competence and suitability are defined for the participants on the response form, the latter is not as specific as the former. For the participants, the definition for competence is explicitly associated with having knowledge and skills. Since the average grades are the best source available to the participants in determining the intelligence and capabilities of each applicant, participants will be more likely to use this information in determining competence – thus the results for this measure are affected only by grade differences. This reasoning can also be applied to salary advantage. The definition for the suitability measure, on the other hand, allows the subjects to use any attributes they deemed necessary to rate the candidates (e.g. gender). As for the choice measure, due to the fact that they did not have to explain their decisions, perhaps participants felt that they could use any information they deemed important when choosing a candidate. Although gender did not carry status for the participants, perhaps the bias against women is able to emerge in measures where the subjective interpretation of the participants can be used when making a decision.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In my view, there are three areas that would be interesting for future studies to explore in investigating gender and level of poor performance.

One suggestion is to compound gender with another status variable (e.g. ethnicity, religion, class) that would be viewed as either consistent or inconsistent with gender. Although

there have been studies that have explored status characteristics other than gender (see for example Foschi and Buchan 1990, Riches and Foddy 1989 and Webster and Driskell 1978 on ethnicity), double standards have only studied in expectation states using gender as a status factor. If ethnicity were used, the situation could be as follows. The critical conditions would have two applicants vying for an engineering position, both with low levels of performances, in one condition the participants receive application files from a “white” man performing better than his “black” female counterpart, the reverse situation is created in a second condition, and both applicants perform equally in a third condition. Would being a woman, combined with being a “racial minority” affect how participants evaluate her competence? Since the results from my thesis show some use of double standards, would this situation change if gender were linked with another status characteristic?

Another area of interest would be to include applicants who show status cues that are either consistent or inconsistent with gender (Foschi et al. 1994; Foschi and Valenzuela 2004). “Status cues” are markers that communicate an actor’s status (Berger, Webster Jr., Ridgeway and Rosenholtz 1986). In Western societies we have gradually seen a shift in stereotypical behaviours and attitudes concerning men and women. Although stereotypes have, and continue to be eroded in these societies, have attitudes toward such inconsistent combinations been as progressive? For example, the male applicant could have feminine attributes (e.g., feminine handwriting) or even “feminine” hobbies (e.g., sewing, shopping, arranging flowers), and the female applicant could have male attributes (e.g., masculine handwriting) or even “masculine” hobbies (e.g., assembling model cars, fixing car engines, playing rugby). For a more comprehensive understanding of the role of status cues, I believe that such a study would be useful.

My third suggestion would be to change the sex linkage of the task to be either explicitly more masculine (e.g. nuclear physics, mechanical engineering) or explicitly more feminine (e.g. nursing, education - specifically elementary school teacher). Although Foschi et al. (1994) have explored the use of a more masculine occupation, their study had applicants with average level of performance. On the other hand, I am more interested in the evaluation of applicants who receive below-average evaluations. In the 1994 study, it was found that the men used a double standard, but that the women did not. It would be interesting to explore whether the same results would emerge when the applicants perform at a low level and are vying for a more masculine position. In addition, if the task were changed to become more feminine, it would be valuable to see whether the use of double standards would be reversed to favour the female applicant, or elicit similar results as those found in this experiment.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I investigate the use of gender in assessing the competence of two applicants vying for an entry-level, engineering position. In particular, I examine whether a poor performance by a male and a female candidate will result in a lower competence rating for the latter. Participants were given two folders to examine, each of them containing information on two semi-finalists who were both competing for an engineering position. Results from the first folder confirmed that the manipulation checks had been successful. The second folder was the critical and contained applications regarding a male and female candidate with poor performances.

Results from the critical folder show that the subjects, in general, used the grade

differences in assessing the two applicants; for competence and salary, the advantage was given, by both the men and the women, to the better applicant in Conditions (1) and (2), and that the rankings were about the same for the two applicants in Condition (3). It was only in suitability and choice that a gender bias in favour of the male candidate emerged. For choice, both the men and women, but men more so than women, show a preference for the male candidate. As for suitability, the women favour the male candidate more than do the men as they give the male applicant the advantage in all conditions, regardless of who is the better candidate. The men, on the other hand, show no definite preference in any of the three conditions. I suggest that the gender differences in the results stem from the way the participants interpret each measure. Choice and competence are more specific in their meanings whereas suitability and choice allow the participants to bring in their biases when making their decisions.

In sum, this thesis extends work on double standards and proposes various ways of refining the results and ideas of that research program. I explore the effects of gender and levels of poor performance and have found evidence of some gender bias. Results show that gender does not carry status; this is consistent with two studies using the same population (Foschi and Lapointe 2001; Foschi and Valenzuela 2004) In many workplaces and societies, measures have been taken to erode gender biases and stereotypical beliefs. The findings from this thesis provide encouraging results towards this new direction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Balkwell, J.W., J. Berger, M. Webster, Jr., M. Nelson-Kilger and J. Cashen. 1992. "Processing Status Information: Some Tests of Competing Theoretical Arguments." Pp. 1-20 in *Advances in Group Processes: A Research Annual*, Vol. 9, edited by E.J. Lawler, B. Markovsky, C.L. Ridgeway and H.A. Walker. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Barber, L. A. 1995. "U.S. Women in Science and Engineering, 1960-1990: Progress Toward Equity?" *Journal of Higher Education* 66: 213-34.
- Berger, J., M.H. Fisek, R.Z. Norman and M. Zelditch, Jr. 1977. *Status Characteristics and Social Interaction: An Expectation-States Approach*. New York, NY: Elsevier.
- Berger, J., M. Webster Jr., C. Ridgeway and S. J. Rosenholtz. 1986. "Status Cues, Expectations, and Behavior." *Advances in Group Processes* 3: 1-22.
- Crundall, I., and M. Foddy. 1981. "Vicarious Exposure to a Task as a Basis for Evaluative Competence." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 44: 331-38.
- Foddy, M. and M. Smithson. 1989. "Fuzzy Sets and Double Standards: Modeling the Process of Ability Inference." Pp. 73-99 in *Sociological Theories in Progress: New Formulations*, edited by J. Berger, M. Zelditch Jr. and B. Anderson. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Foschi, M. 2000. "Double Standards for Competence: Theory and Research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 21-42.
- Foschi, M. 1997. "On Scope Conditions." *Small Group Research* 28: 535-55.
- Foschi, M. 1996. "Double Standards in the Evaluation of Men and Women." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59: 237-254.
- Foschi, M. 1989. "Status Characteristics, Standards and Attributions." Pp. 58-72 in *Sociological Theories in Progress*, edited by J. Berger, M. Zelditch Jr., and B. Anderson. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Foschi, M. and S. Buchan. 1990. "Ethnicity, Gender and Perceptions of Task Competence." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 15: 1-18.
- Foschi, M. and M. Foddy. 1988. "Standards, Performances, and the Formation of Self-Other Expectations." Pp. 248-60 in *Status Generalization: New Theory and Research*, edited by M. Webster Jr. and M. Foschi. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Foschi, M. and S. Freeman. 1991. "Inferior Performance, Standards and Influence in Same-Sex Dyads." *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science* 23: 99-113.
- Foschi, M. and V. Lapointe. 2002. "On Conditional Hypotheses and Gender As a Status Characteristic." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 65: 146-162.

- Foschi, M. and J. Valenzuela. 2004 (August). "Gender, Self-Presentation and the Selection of Job Applicants." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Foschi, M., S. Enns, and V. Lapointe. 2001. "Processing Performance Evaluations in Homogeneous Task Groups: Feedback and Gender Effects." *Advances in Group Processes* 18: 185-216.
- Foschi, M., L. Lai, and K. Sigerson. 1994. "Gender and Double Standards in the Assessment of Job Applicants." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 57: 326-39.
- Foschi, M., K. Sigerson, and M. Lembesis. 1995. "Assessing Job Applicants: The Relative Effects of Gender, Academic Record, and Decision Type." *Small Group Research* 26: 328-52.
- Foschi, M., G. K. Warriner, and S. Hart. 1985. "Standards, Expectations, and Interpersonal Influence." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 48: 108-17.
- Kerlinger, F. N. 1986. *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Moore, J.C., Jr. 1968. "Status and Influence in Small Group Interactions." *Sociometry* 31: 47-63.

- Okamoto, D.G. and L. Smith-Lovin. 2001. "Changing the Subject: Gender, Status, and the Dynamics of Topic Change." *American Sociological Review* 66: 852-73.
- Pagano, R. R. 1998. *Understanding Statistics in the Behavioral Sciences*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Pugh, M.D. and R. Wahrman. 1983. "Neutralizing Sexism in Mixed-Sex Groups: Do Women Have to Be Better than Men?" *American Journal of Sociology* 88: 746-62.
- Riches, P. and M. Foddy. 1989. "Ethnic Accent as a Status Cue." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 52: 197-206.
- Ridgeway, C.L. 2003. "Social Status and Group Structure." Pp. 325-75 in *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Group Processes*, edited by M.A. Hogg and R. S. Tindale. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Ridgeway, C.L. 1982. "Status in Groups: The Importance of Motivation." *American Sociological Review* 47: 76-88.
- Stewart, P. 1988. "Women and Men in Groups: A Status Characteristics Approach to Interaction." Pp. 69-85 in *Status Generalization: New Theory and Research*, edited by M. Webster Jr. and M. Foschi. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Wagner, D.G. and J. Berger. 2002. "Expectation States Theory: An Evolving Research

Program.” Pp. 41-76 in *New Directions in Contemporary Sociological Theory*, edited by J. Berger and M. Zelditch Jr. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Wagner, D.G., R.S. Ford, and T.W. Ford. 1986. “Can Gender Inequalities Be Reduced?” *American Sociological Review* 51: 47-61.

Webster, M. Jr. 1969. “Source of Evaluations and Expectations for Performance.” *Sociometry* 32: 243-58.

Webster, M. Jr. and J. E. Driskell Jr. 1978. “Status Generalization: A Review and Some New Data.” *American Sociological Review* 43: 220-36.

Webster, M. Jr. and B. Sobieszek. 1974. *Sources of Self-Evaluation: A Formal Theory of Significant Others and Social Influence*. New York, NY: Wiley.

APPENDIX A. FOLDER 1

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

DATE ISSUED: November 01, 2004

CLOSING DATE: December 31, 2004

REFERENCE #: 02-7231

THE COMPANY:

(name blacked out), a branch of (name blacked out) is a Canadian consulting firm specializing in environmental engineering. This firm pursues challenging national and international projects, and employs engineers at all levels, including engineers-in-training who are working towards their professional registration.

TITLE: Engineer-in-training (short-term appointment)

LOCATION: Winnipeg, Manitoba

ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS:

The job requires a Bachelor in Applied Science degree in either Chemical Engineering or Chemical/Biological Engineering.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSIBILITIES:

A job opening is available for a short-term appointment as an EIT (engineer-in-training), with experience obtained from this job counting towards professional registration in the Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia. The project involves the planning of a filtration and chlorination plant for improved drinking water quality in reservoirs of the Winnipeg regional district. The chosen applicant will work under the supervision of a Senior Project Engineer in tasks related to the design of the plant's chemical and bacterial monitoring system, including quality control tests to ensure water purity.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

APPLICATION FORM

Please include either an official transcript or a copy of your complete academic record. Applications will not be considered without this documentation. To be eligible you must have completed a Bachelor of Applied Science.

1. Personal Information

Surname (blacked out)	Given Name Ken
Address (number blacked out) Empire Drive, Apt. 403	
City Burnaby	Province B.C.
Postal Code V5B (last three characters blacked out)	Telephone 604-294- (last four digits blacked out)
Age 23	Sex M

2. Education

Please list all institutions attended after graduation from secondary school.

Name and address of institution	Year entered	Last year attended	Degree completed	Year of graduation
UBC	2000	2004	Bachelor of Applied Science in Chemical Engineering	2004

3. Awards and Bursaries

Name	Where held	Period held
-	-	-

4. Most Recent Work Experience (list previous two jobs)

Employer's name and address	Dates	Title
(Name blacked out) Aquatic Centre	May 02 – Dec. 03	Lifeguard
(Name blacked out) Engineering Incorporated	Apr. 04 - Present	Assistant to the Project Manager

5. Extracurricular Activities

Ski Club, Intramural Basketball, Floor Hockey

6. Languages

Spoken	Read	Written
English, French	English, French	English, French

Are you a Canadian citizen?

Yes ☐

No ☐

If no, are you legally entitled to work in Canada?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Documentary proof of Canadian citizenship or landed immigrant status is required on the first day of employment.

I certify that the information on this application is correct. I fully understand that any false statements made by me on this application or any supplementary materials may be sufficient cause for rejection of my application or dismissal after employment.

Date _____

Signature

Ken

(first name handwritten, last name blacked out)

Record of Grades

Name: Ken

Student Number: (first two digits blacked out) 737998

APSC = Applied Science

BIOL = Biology

CHBE = Chemical and Biological Engineering

EECE = Electrical and Computer Engineering

GEOG = Geography

STAT = Statistics

Course	Credits	Grades
--------	---------	--------

Academic Year 2002-2003 (3rd Year)

CHBE 330	Computational Methods	3	73%
CHBE 344	Unit Operations I	3	78%
CHBE 346	Chemical and Biological Engineering Thermodynamics	3	74%
CHBE 351	Transport Phenomena II	3	80%
CHBE 356	Process Dynamics and Control	3	72%
CHBE 362	Chemical Engineering	2	77%
CHBE 376	Computer Flowsheeting and Fluid Properties Estimation	3	73%
STAT 251	Elementary Statistics	3	80%
BIOL 112	Biology of the Cell	3	78%
CHBE 365	Biotechnology Laboratory	2	71%
GEOG 200	Atmospheric Environments	3	74%
CHBE 460	Soil and Water Engineering	3	72%
Total Credits		34	

Academic Year 2003-2004 (4th Year)

APSC 450	Professional Engineering Practice	2	71%
CHBE 444	Unit Operations II	3	78%
CHBE 455	Kinetics and Reactor Design	3	75%
CHBE 459	Chemical and Biological Engineering Economics	3	75%
CHBE 464	Chemical and Biological Engineering Laboratory	3	73%
EECE 263	Basic Circuit Analysis	3	72%
CHBE 453	Biotechnology Process Design Project	6	77%
CHBE 482	Biotechnology Fundamentals and Applications	3	76%
GEOG 310	Environment and Resources	3	80%
CHBE 484	Pollution Prevention for Chemical and Process Industries	3	72%
CHBE 465	Rehabilitation and Design of Aquatic Habitat	3	78%
CHBE 480	Hazardous Waste Processing Technology	3	73%
Total Credits		38	

Average Grade for 3rd and 4th Years Combined

___ 50% - 52%	___ 62% - 64%	<u>x</u> 74% - 76%	___ 86% - 88%
___ 53% - 55%	___ 65% - 67%	___ 77% - 79%	___ 89% - 91%
___ 56% - 58%	___ 68% - 70%	___ 80% - 82%	___ 92% - 94%
___ 59% - 61%	___ 71% - 73%	___ 83% - 85%	___ 95% - 97%

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM APPLICATION FORM

Please include either an official transcript or a copy of your complete academic record. Applications will not be considered without this documentation. To be eligible you must have completed a Bachelor of Applied Science.

1. Personal Information

Surname (blacked out)	Given Name Robert
Address (number blacked out) Haro St.	
City Vancouver	Province B.C.
Postal Code V6E (last three characters blacked out)	Telephone 604-682- (last four digits blacked out)
Age 22	Sex M

2. Education

Please list all institutions attended after graduation from secondary school.

Name and address of institution	Year entered	Last year attended	Degree completed	Year of graduation
University of Alberta	2000	2002	-	
UBC	2002	2004	Bachelor of Applied Science in Chemical Engineering	2004

3. Awards and Bursaries

Name	Where held	Period held
(name blacked out) Memorial Alumni Scholarship	UBC	2002-2003

4. Most Recent Work Experience (list previous two jobs)

Employer's name and address	Dates	Title
(Name blacked out) Regional Library	May 02 – Sept. 03	Library Assistant
(Name blacked out) Chlorination Project	May 04 - Present	Assistant Coordinator

5. Extracurricular Activities

Photography (Member of Photo Society), Guitar, Aikido

6. Languages

Spoken	Read	Written
English, Cantonese	English, Cantonese	English, Cantonese

Are you a Canadian citizen?

Yes ☐

No ☐

If no, are you legally entitled to work in Canada?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Documentary proof of Canadian citizenship or landed immigrant status is required on the first day of employment.

I certify that the information on this application is correct. I fully understand that any false statements made by me on this application or any supplementary materials may be sufficient cause for rejection of my application or dismissal after employment.

Date _____ Signature Robert (first name handwritten, last name blacked out)

Record of Grades

Name: Robert

Student Number: (first two digits blacked out) 170009

APSC = Applied Science

CHBE = Chemical and Biological Engineering

EECE = Electrical and Computer Engineer

GEOG = Geography

STAT = Statistics

Course		Credits	Grades
Academic Year 2002-2003 (3rd Year)			
CHBE 330	Computational Methods	3	87%
CHBE 344	Unit Operations I	3	80%
CHBE 346	Chemical and Biological Engineering Thermodynamics	3	86%
CHBE 351	Transport Phenomena II	3	78%
CHBE 356	Process Dynamics and Control	3	83%
CHBE 362	Chemical Engineering	2	80%
CHBE 376	Computer Flowsheeting and Fluid Properties Estimation	3	82%
STAT 251	Elementary Statistics	3	82%
CHBE 364	Environmental Engineering Laboratory	2	85%
CHBE 373	Water Pollution Control	3	81%
APSC 261	Technology and Society	3	82%
CHBE 357	Interfacial Phenomena	3	83%
Total Credits		34	
Academic Year 2003-2004 (4th Year)			
APSC 450	Professional Engineering Practice	2	81%
CHBE 444	Unit Operations II	3	80%
CHBE 455	Kinetics and Reactor Design	3	83%
CHBE 459	Chemical and Biological Engineering Economics	3	78%
CHBE 464	Chemical and Biological Engineering Laboratory	3	81%
EECE 263	Basic Circuit Analysis	3	82%
CHBE 452	Environmental Process Design Project	6	83%
CHBE 484	Pollution Prevention Engineering for Chemical and Process Industries	3	87%
CHBE 485	Air Pollution Control	3	78%
GEOG 207	Geography of Ecosystems	3	85%
CHBE 474	Process Control Engineering	3	83%
CHBE 482	Biotechnology Fundamentals	3	85%
Total Credits		38	

Average Grade for 3rd and 4th Years Combined

___ 50% - 52%	___ 62% - 64%	___ 74% - 76%	___ 86% - 88%
___ 53% - 55%	___ 65% - 67%	___ 77% - 79%	___ 89% - 91%
___ 56% - 58%	___ 68% - 70%	<u>x</u> 80% - 82%	___ 92% - 94%
___ 59% - 61%	___ 71% - 73%	___ 83% - 85%	___ 95% - 97%

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

RESPONSE FORM

Job description (write in key words):

Participant number (please fill in your number here):

1) Who were the candidates for this position?

Candidate # _____

Candidate # _____

Age: _____

Age: _____

Sex: M F

Sex: M F

Degree
completed: _____

Degree
completed: _____

Average Grade for 3rd and
4th Years Combined:

Average Grade for 3rd and
4th Years Combined:

___ 50% - 52%	___ 74% - 76%
___ 53% - 55%	___ 77% - 79%
___ 56% - 58%	___ 80% - 82%
___ 59% - 61%	___ 83% - 85%
___ 62% - 64%	___ 86% - 88%
___ 65% - 67%	___ 89% - 91%
___ 68% - 70%	___ 92% - 94%
___ 71% - 73%	___ 95% - 97%
	___ 98% - 100%

___ 50% - 52%	___ 74% - 76%
___ 53% - 55%	___ 77% - 79%
___ 56% - 58%	___ 80% - 82%
___ 59% - 61%	___ 83% - 85%
___ 62% - 64%	___ 86% - 88%
___ 65% - 67%	___ 89% - 91%
___ 68% - 70%	___ 92% - 94%
___ 71% - 73%	___ 95% - 97%
	___ 98% - 100%

2) Whom would you recommend for the position? (Check one)

- ☐ a. The candidate on the left of this page (candidate # _____)
- ☐ b. The candidate on the right of this page (candidate # _____)
- ☐ c. Neither

3) Regardless of your recommendation, please rate each candidate on the following scales.

Competence: having the technical skills and knowledge to successfully perform the tasks required of the position.

Suitability: having the technical skills and knowledge required of the position, as well as possessing other qualities/attributes that will contribute success to the company.

A) In terms of competence at the job, how would you rate the candidate on the left

(candidate # _____) of the previous page?

Very incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very competent
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

In terms of suitability for the job, how would you rate him or her?

Very unsuitable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very suitable
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

B) In terms of competence at the job, how would you rate the candidate on the right

(candidate # _____) of the previous page?

Very incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very competent
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

In terms of suitability for the job, how would you rate him or her?

Very unsuitable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very suitable
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

4) Since there are more than two semi-finalists for each position, and since the successful candidate will be chosen on the basis of the average recommendation of many participants such as yourself, we would like to ask you to recommend a salary for each candidate. This will help us in the final decision. The salaries you indicate should reflect your opinion of the candidate's qualifications.

Your suggested monthly salary for your chosen candidate (Candidate # _____).
Please check one.

___ \$ 2550

___ \$ 2950

___ \$ 3350

___ \$ 2650

___ \$ 3050

___ \$ 3450

___ \$ 2750

___ \$ 3150

___ \$ 3550

___ \$ 2850

___ \$ 3250

___ \$ 3650

Your suggested monthly salary for the other candidate (Candidate # _____).
Please check one.

___ \$ 2550

___ \$ 2950

___ \$ 3350

___ \$ 2650

___ \$ 3050

___ \$ 3450

___ \$ 2750

___ \$ 3150

___ \$ 3550

___ \$ 2850

___ \$ 3250

___ \$ 3650

APPENDIX B. FOLDER 2

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

DATE ISSUED: November 01, 2004

CLOSING DATE: December 31, 2004

REFERENCE #: 02-1123

THE COMPANY:

(name blacked out), a division of (name blacked out) is a Canadian consulting firm specializing in environmental engineering and engaging in projects in Canada as well as abroad. The company employs engineers at all levels, including engineers-in-training who are working towards their professional registration. Many of its projects deal with rivers and basins, and particularly problems associated with the recovery of polluted rivers.

TITLE: Engineer-in-training (short-term appointment)

LOCATION: Vancouver, B.C.

ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS:

The job requires a Bachelor in Applied Science degree in either Civil or Environmental Engineering, in both cases with an environmental fluid mechanics orientation. Some previous exposure to hydrology and channel flows would be desirable.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSIBILITIES:

A job opening is available for a short-term appointment as an EIT (engineer-in-training), with the experience from this job counting towards professional registration in the Province of British Columbia. The project involves the study of a major river basin in the Fraser Valley near the city of Vancouver, B.C. It also entails the planning of procedures to remove pollutants and to help the river basin recover quickly after a pollution incident (including recovery of water quality and fish habitat). The EIT will work under the supervision of a Senior Project Engineer and will be involved in the design of pollution removal strategies, including the design of flow controls and oxygen-monitoring stations.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM APPLICATION FORM

Please include either an official transcript or a copy of your complete academic record. Applications will not be considered without this documentation. To be eligible you must have completed a Bachelor of Applied Science.

1. Personal Information

Surname (name blacked out)	Given Name Kathy/Alan
Address (number blacked out) West 35 th Avenue	
City Vancouver	Province B.C.
Postal Code V6N (last three characters blacked out)	Telephone 604-263- (last four digits blacked out)
Age 21	Sex F/M

2. Education

Please list all institutions attended after graduation from secondary school.

Name and address of institution	Year entered	Last year attended	Degree completed	Year of graduation
UBC	2000	2004	Bachelor of Applied Science in Civil Engineering (with Environmental Option)	2004

3. Awards and Bursaries

Name	Where held	Period held
-	-	-

4. Most Recent Work Experience (list previous two jobs)

Employer's name and address	Dates	Title
(Name blacked out) Library	Aug 02 – April 04	Library Assistant
(Name blacked out) International Community Development Program	May 04 - Present	Educational Program Assistant

5. Extracurricular Activities

Skiing; Camping

6. Languages

Spoken	Read	Written
English	English	English

Are you a Canadian citizen?

Yes ☐

No ☐

If no, are you legally entitled
to work in Canada?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Documentary proof of Canadian citizenship or landed immigrant status is required on the first day of employment.

I certify that the information on this application is correct. I fully understand that any false statements made by me on this application or any supplementary materials may be sufficient cause for rejection of my application or dismissal after employment.

Date _____ Signature Kathy/Alan (first name handwritten, last name blacked out)

Record of Grades

Name: Alan/Kathy

BIOL = Biology
 CHEM = Chemistry
 CIVL = Civil Engineering
 EOSC = Earth and Ocean Sciences
 MATH = Mathematics
 SOCI = Sociology
 STAT = Statistics

Student Number: (first two digits blacked out) 568006

Course	Credits	Grades
--------	---------	--------

Academic Year 2002-2003 (3rd Year)

BIOL 112	Biology of the Cell	3	62%
CHEM 301	Aqueous Environmental Chemistry	3	65%
CIVL 301	Optimization and Decision	3	61%
CIVL 311	Soil Mechanics II	4	63%
CIVL 315	Fluid Mechanics II	4	65%
CIVL 316	Hydrology and Open Channel Flow	4	64%
CIVL 320	Civil Engineering Materials II	3	60%
CIVL 332	Structural Analysis I	3	62%
CIVL 340	Transportation Engineering I	3	63%
MATH 257	Partial Differential Equations	3	66%
STAT 251	Elementary Statistics	3	62%
SOCI 260	Technology, Work and Society	3	58%
Total Credits		39	

Academic Year 2003-2004 (4th Year)

CIVL 400	Construction Engineering and Management	3	63%
CIVL 402	Engineering Law and Contracts in Civil Engineering	2	60%
CIVL 403	Engineering Economic Analysis	3	61%
CIVL 405	Environmental Impact Studies	3	64%
CIVL 406	Water Treatment and Waste Management	3	63%
CIVL 407	Environmental Laboratory Analysis	3	65%
CIVL 408	Geo-environmental Engineering	3	63%
CIVL 416	Environmental Hydraulics	3	63%
CIVL 430	Design of Concrete Structures	3	61%
EOSC 429	Groundwater Contamination	3	62%
EOSC 331	Introduction to Mineral Deposits and Exploration Geology	3	65%
CIVL 478	Building Science	3	64%
Total Credits		35	

Average Grade for 3rd and 4th Years Combine

___ 50% - 52%	<u>x</u> 62% - 64%	___ 74% - 76%	___ 86% - 88%
___ 53% - 55%	___ 65% - 67%	___ 77% - 79%	___ 89% - 91%
___ 56% - 58%	___ 68% - 70%	___ 80% - 82%	___ 92% - 94%
___ 59% - 61%	___ 71% - 73%	___ 83% - 85%	___ 95% - 97%

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM APPLICATION FORM

Please include either an official transcript or a copy of your complete academic record. Applications will not be considered without this documentation. To be eligible you must have completed a Bachelor of Applied Science.

1. Personal Information

Surname (name blacked out)	Given Name Alan/Kathy
Address (number blacked out) West 29 th Avenue	
City Vancouver	Province B.C.
Postal Code V6L (last three characters blacked out)	Telephone 604-261- (last four digits blacked out)
Age 21	Sex M/F

2. Education

Please list all institutions attended after graduation from secondary school.

Name and address of institution	Year entered	Last year attended	Degree completed	Year of graduation
UBC	2000	2004	Bachelor of Applied Science in Civil Engineering (with Environmental Option)	2004

3. Awards and Bursaries

Name	Where held	Period held
-	-	-

4. Most Recent Work Experience (list previous two jobs)

Employer's name and address	Dates	Title
(Name blacked out) Bookstore	May 02 – Sept. 03	Customer Service Representative
(Name blacked out) Foundation	May 04 - Present	Assistant Program Coordinator

5. Extracurricular Activities

Rock climbing; Running

6. Languages

Spoken	Read	Written
English	English	English

Are you a Canadian citizen?

Yes ☐

No ☐

If no, are you legally entitled to work in Canada?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Documentary proof of Canadian citizenship or landed immigrant status is required on the first day of employment.

I certify that the information on this application is correct. I fully understand that any false statements made by me on this application or any supplementary materials may be sufficient cause for rejection of my application or dismissal after employment.

Date _____ Signature Alan/Kathy (first name handwritten, last name blacked out)

Record of Grades

Name: Alan/Kathy

APSC = Applied Science
 BIOL = Biology
 CHEM = Chemistry
 CIVL = Civil Engineering
 EOSC = Earth and Ocean Sciences
 MATH = Mathematics
 STAT = Statistics

Student Number: (first two digits blacked out) 657002

Course	Credits	Grades
--------	---------	--------

Academic Year 2002-2003 (3rd Year)

BIOL 112	Biology of the Cell	3	56%
CHEM 301	Aqueous Environmental Chemistry	3	59%
CIVL 301	Optimization and Decision	3	55%
CIVL 311	Soil Mechanics II	4	56%
CIVL 315	Fluid Mechanics II	4	56%
CIVL 316	Hydrology and Open Channel Flow	4	58%
CIVL 320	Civil Engineering Materials II	3	54%
CIVL 332	Structural Analysis I	3	57%
CIVL 340	Transportation Engineering I	3	59%
MATH 257	Partial Differential Equations	3	60%
STAT 251	Elementary Statistics	3	58%
APSC 261	Technology and Society I	3	52%
Total Credits		39	

Academic Year 2003-2004 (4th Year)

CIVL 400	Construction Engineering and Management	3	57%
CIVL 402	Engineering Law and Contracts in Civil Engineering	2	55%
CIVL 403	Engineering Economic Analysis	3	58%
CIVL 405	Environmental Impact Studies	3	57%
CIVL 406	Water Treatment and Waste Management	3	56%
CIVL 407	Environmental Laboratory Analysis	3	59%
CIVL 408	Geo-environmental Engineering	3	58%
CIVL 416	Environmental Hydraulics	3	57%
CIVL 430	Design of Concrete Structures	3	53%
EOSC 429	Groundwater Contamination	3	56%
EOSC 320	Sedimentology	3	59%
CIVL 437	Structural Design	3	57%
Total Credits		35	

Average Grade for 3rd and 4th Years Combined

___ 50% - 52%	___ 62% - 64%	___ 76% - 76%	___ 86% - 88%
___ 53% - 55%	___ 65% - 67%	___ 77% - 79%	___ 89% - 91%
<u>x</u> 56% - 58%	___ 68% - 70%	___ 80% - 82%	___ 92% - 94%
___ 59% - 61%	___ 71% - 73%	___ 83% - 85%	___ 95% - 97%

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

RESPONSE FORM

Job description (write in key words):
Participant number (please fill in your number here):

4) Who were the candidates for this position?

Candidate # _____

Candidate # _____

Age: _____

Age: _____

Sex: M F

Sex: M F

Degree
completed: _____

Degree
completed: _____

Average Grade for 3rd and
4th Years Combined:

Average Grade for 3rd and
4th Years Combined:

___ 50% - 52%	___ 74% - 76%
___ 53% - 55%	___ 77% - 79%
___ 56% - 58%	___ 80% - 82%
___ 59% - 61%	___ 83% - 85%
___ 62% - 64%	___ 86% - 88%
___ 65% - 67%	___ 89% - 91%
___ 68% - 70%	___ 92% - 94%
___ 71% - 73%	___ 95% - 97%
	___ 98% - 100%

___ 50% - 52%	___ 74% - 76%
___ 53% - 55%	___ 77% - 79%
___ 56% - 58%	___ 80% - 82%
___ 59% - 61%	___ 83% - 85%
___ 62% - 64%	___ 86% - 88%
___ 65% - 67%	___ 89% - 91%
___ 68% - 70%	___ 92% - 94%
___ 71% - 73%	___ 95% - 97%
	___ 98% - 100%

5) Whom would you recommend for the position? (Check one)

- ☐ a. The candidate on the left of this page (candidate # _____)
- ☐ b. The candidate on the right of this page (candidate # _____)
- ☐ c. Neither

- 6) Regardless of your recommendation, please rate each candidate on the following scales.

Potential Competence: likelihood of developing the technical skills and knowledge to successfully perform the tasks required of the position.

Potential Suitability: likelihood of developing the technical skills and knowledge required of the position, and of possessing other qualities/attributes that could contribute success to the company.

- A) In terms of potential competence at the job, how would you rate the candidate on the left (candidate # _____) of the previous page?

Very incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very competent
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

In terms of potential suitability for the job, how would you rate him or her?

Very unsuitable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very suitable
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

- B) In terms of potential competence at the job, how would you rate the candidate on the right (candidate # _____) of the previous page?

Very incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very competent
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

In terms of potential suitability for the job, how would you rate him or her?

Very unsuitable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very suitable
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

4) Since there are more than two semi-finalists for each position, and since the successful candidate will be chosen on the basis of the average recommendation of many participants such as yourself, we would like to ask you to recommend a salary for each candidate. This will help us in the final decision. The salaries you indicate should reflect your opinion of the candidate's qualifications.

Your suggested monthly salary for your chosen candidate (Candidate # _____).
Please check one.

<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2550	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2950	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3350
<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2650	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3050	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3450
<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2750	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3150	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3550
<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2850	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3250	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3650

Your suggested monthly salary for the other candidate (Candidate # _____).
Please check one.

<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2550	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2950	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3350
<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2650	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3050	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3450
<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2750	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3150	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3550
<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2850	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3250	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3650

APPENDIX C. OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

Now that you have completed the decision-making part of today's session, we would like to ask you a few questions about the process. You are reminded that none of this information will be associated with you as an individual. All of the information you provide us is confidential.

Before you begin, please provide us the following information about yourself:

Participant #: _____

Age: _____

Sex: M F

Year of degree program: 1 2 3 4 5

A. PROCEDURES

We'll start by asking you about the way the session was conducted. We want to know whether the instructions and procedures were clear.

Did you find any of the following things confusing? On each scale, please circle the number that most closely corresponds with your feelings:

Oral instructions were:

Very confusing 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very clear

Written materials (job descriptions, forms, course lists, etc.) were:

Very confusing 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very clear

If you circled 1, 2, or 3 for either of the above, please describe what you found confusing and, as best you can, why you had trouble with it.

B. IMPRESSIONS OF THE JOBS

- (1) What was the title of the first job you were asked to evaluate?
- (2) What were the ranges of grades of the two people whom you were asked to evaluate?

One person: _____ - _____ %
Other person: _____ - _____ %

- (3) We would like to know what sorts of impressions you got when you read the description for this job. Circle the number that best corresponds to your feelings.

The job is:

Easy	1	2	3	4	5	6	Difficult
Routine	1	2	3	4	5	6	Creative
Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	Important
Not Valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	Valuable
Not Analytical	1	2	3	4	5	6	Analytical
Not Technical	1	2	3	4	5	6	Technical

- (4) What qualities/attributes do you feel suitability for this job is related to? Circle the appropriate category or categories:
- | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| a) Mechanical skills | i) Ability to work with other |
| b) Mathematical skills | j) Reasoning ability |
| c) Intelligence | k) Life experiences |
| d) Age | l) Organizational skills |
| e) Gender | m) Interpersonal skills |
| f) Socialization | n) All of the above |
| g) Educational level | o) None of the above |
| h) Work experiences | p) Other (specify) _____ |

Now that you have turned the page, please do not turn back.

- (5) What was the title of the second job you were asked to evaluate?
- (6) What were the ranges of grades of the two people whom you were asked to evaluate?
One person: _____ - _____ %
Other person: _____ - _____ %
- (7) We would like to know what sorts of impressions you got when you read the description for this job. Circle the number that best corresponds to your feelings.

The job is:

Easy	1	2	3	4	5	6	Difficult
Routine	1	2	3	4	5	6	Creative
Unimportant	1	2	3	4	5	6	Important
Not Valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	Valuable
Not Analytical	1	2	3	4	5	6	Analytical
Not Technical	1	2	3	4	5	6	Technical

- (8) What qualities/attributes do you feel suitability for this job is related to? Circle the appropriate category or categories:
- | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| a) Mechanical skills | i) Ability to work with other |
| b) Mathematical skills | j) Reasoning ability |
| c) Intelligence | k) Life experiences |
| d) Age | l) Organizational skills |
| e) Gender | m) Interpersonal skills |
| f) Socialization | n) All of the above |
| g) Educational level | o) None of the above |
| h) Work experiences | p) Other (specify) _____ |

C. IMPRESSIONS OF DECISION-MAKING CONTEXT

The disposition of the decision-maker may affect the decision itself. Here, we would like to know how you felt as you worked with these files. For each pair of contrasting words below, please circle the number that best corresponds with your feelings.

While working on the files I felt:

Relaxed	1	2	3	4	5	6	Pressured
Interested	1	2	3	4	5	6	Uninterested
Motivated	1	2	3	4	5	6	Unmotivated
Concerned	1	2	3	4	5	6	Indifferent
Involved	1	2	3	4	5	6	Uninvolved

(2) What are your feelings about your decisions, and about the students who applied for work through this program? Decide to what extent you agree with each of the following statements, and circle the appropriate number on the scale.

I felt an obligation to the applicants to be fair in my evaluations.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

I felt empathy towards the applicants.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

I feel that my input will be taken seriously by the administrators of this project.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

I had a hard time making my decisions.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

I felt a responsibility to the applicants to make my decisions carefully.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

I felt a responsibility to the project to make my decisions carefully.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

I feel that my input will make a difference when the administrators of this project make their final decisions.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

This project is a valuable one, and should continue to be funded by the project.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

D. OPINION OF THE PROGRAM

(1) As this is the first year of the program, we are interested in how people feel about it. Do you think the program is a good idea? If you were chosen as one of the candidates, in what ways do you think the experience would benefit you? Please explain briefly.

(2) How do you feel about your part in the project? Do you think student input is important? Why or why not?

(3) Have you discussed this project with someone who participated in it before you?

(4) If you have any further comments about the program or about today's procedures, please give them now. Feel free to use the back of this page.