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Abstract

of

THE EFFECT OF AMERICAN INDIAN MASCOTS ON GENDER-BASED HIRING DECISIONS

by

Kimberlea Sanchez

The researcher examined the effect of American Indian mascots on gender stereotypes using a 3 (Prime: stereotypic mascot, neutral mascot, no mascot) x 3 (Gender-typic job: masculine, feminine, gender-neutral) x 2 (Applicant gender: male, female) between-participants MANOVA. Hiring decisions and trait scores indicated endorsement of gender stereotypes. Participants (N = 360) were predominantly female (71.9%), European American (34.2%), and 21.2 years old (SD = 3.1). After prime exposure, participants evaluated applicants. The results indicated a significant multivariate main effect of gender-typic job, Pillai’s Trace = 0.05, F(8, 680) = 2.09, p < 0.05, η²_p = 0.02, and multivariate main effect of applicant gender, Pillai’s Trace = 0.03, F(4, 339) = 2.93, p < 0.05, η²_p = 0.03. Participants hired applicants more for feminine jobs than they did for masculine jobs, and female applicants scored higher on female traits than male applicants. The multivariate main effect of prime was not significant.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In comparison to other ethnic groups in the United States, American Indians and Alaska Natives (AI/ANs) have experienced the most inaccurate depictions and distortions of their culture, and these inaccuracies have been found in every type of media (Fryberg, Markus, Oyserman, & Stone, 2008; Sanchez, 2003). Perhaps this is because of their rarity, as AI/ANs comprise only 1.6% of the total United States population (Norris, Vines, & Hoeffel, 2012). Furthermore, Fryberg, Markus, Oyserman and Stone (2008) found that the invisibility of AI/ANs (i.e., small population size and segregated communities) permits the media to disseminate cultural inaccuracies about them. This is detrimental to not only AI/ANs, but to all targets and consumers of stereotypes, because research has consistently found that exposure to media is powerful enough to both positively and negatively influence an individual’s beliefs (Verhaeghen, Aikman, & Van Gulick, 2011). Stereotypes represent an individual’s belief systems and are cognitive tools used to organize people into categories (Kim-Prieto, Goldstein, Okazaki, & Kirschner, 2010). Stereotypes are mental shortcuts that help reserve an individual’s cognitive energy when sorting people into categories (Fryberg et al., 2008). According to Verhaeghen, Aikman, and Van Gulick (2011), stereotypes save time by “[allowing] humans to navigate easily through the many complexities of the social world by side-stepping intricate decision processes” (p. 503). Stereotyping and categorization processes continue to develop throughout an individual’s lifespan; this increases the chance of individuals endorsing stereotypes in the future.

American Indian Stereotypes

Several researchers found that an individual was less likely to rely on using explicit stereotypes when he or she had more information about targeted individuals or groups on which
to base a judgment (Davis & Penner, 1986; Lee, Castella, & McCluney, 1997). Fryberg et al. (2008) posited that stereotypes are the most powerful when the group targeted by the stereotype is unfamiliar to the stereotype consumer. Furthermore, Fryberg et al. (2008) suggested that American Indians were vulnerable to becoming a target of stereotypes due to their invisibility and unfamiliarity to the dominant culture. One such American Indian stereotype is what Miller and Ross (2004) termed the “historical relic” stereotype. The historical relic stereotype portrays American Indians as a group permanently set in historical times. The manifestation of this stereotype, always referencing them in the past tense, skews the accuracy of media portrayals of contemporary American Indians (Miller & Ross, 2004).

According to Jay (2000), the framework for the historical relic stereotype stems from the history shared between tribal nations and the federal government, particularly during the late 19th century. During that period, American Indians lost over 90 million acres of land, and the government established boarding schools to carry out forced assimilation policies on American Indian children (Jay, 2000). By the end of the 19th century, the dominant culture perceived American Indians as becoming either physically or culturally extinct. Finally, during this time period came the emergence of cinema, which provided yet another medium to capture American Indian stereotypes in film (Kilpatrick, 1999). Researchers have found that the historical relic stereotype has survived into the 21st century, where children are especially susceptible to acquiring it (Fryberg et al, 2008; Sanchez, 2003; Tatum, 2007).

Tatum (2007) argued that understanding the stereotypes children harbor helps researchers study the foundation that ultimately leads to the prejudices individuals might express as adults. Sanchez (2003) proffered the technique of asking children to draw a picture of an “Indian” to measure how young people are when stereotypes begin to manifest. The pictures that most of Sanchez’ participants drew were of a male American Indian, who wore feathers, braids and little
clothing; in addition, some of the children’s pictures included weapons. O’Toole (as cited in Tatum, 2007) replicated Sanchez’ study, and found similar depictions of American Indians. The participants were three- and four-year old preschoolers, who did not reside near a large American Indian population, yet they had internalized an image of an “Indian.” The participants attributed media, such as the film Peter Pan, as their main source of information regarding American Indians. Interestingly, Sanchez (2003) included American Indian children as participants to test whether children with firsthand knowledge of and daily contact with contemporary American Indians would also draw a similar “Indian”. Sanchez found that American Indian children drew the historical relic Indian just as the non-American Indian children had drawn. They, too, had internalized the stereotypical image of American Indians.

Conducting a content analysis, Fryberg et al. (2008) found that the most common stereotypical portrayals of American Indians in the media were as spiritual beings in harmony with nature, and as warriors. According to Fryberg et al., American Indians “are seldom portrayed or described as contemporary people with everyday social roles” (2008, p. 211). However, Fryberg et al. (2008) found that in the rare case that the media portrayed contemporary American Indians, high rates of suicide and alcoholism were the “negative outcomes” that the media usually used to depict this ethnic group. Sanchez (2003) suggested that media portrayals of contemporary American Indians engaging in everyday activities are necessary to counter the abundance of inaccurate stereotypical portrayals of American Indians.

Strong (2004) posited that the prevalence of American Indian stereotypes portraying them as a historical race of warriors has made them suitable candidates for athletic mascots, images she referred to as modern day “red-faced caricatures.” Clarkson (as cited in Kim-Prieto et al., 2010) found, that as of 2002, American Indian mascots ranked in the top 10 choices for high school athletic teams. In addition, American Indian mascots represent almost 1,400 schools and
universities, youth organizations, and professional sports teams in the United States (Neville, Yeung, Todd, Spanierman, & Reed, 2011). Strong suggested that such mascots “would not now be tolerated if they portrayed other racial or ethnic groups” (2004, p. 81). Several researchers have proposed that an insidious cycle continues to keep American Indians as suitable mascot candidates; thus, the prevalence of American Indian mascots perpetuates their continued use, while their continued use validates their prevalence in American culture (Farnell, 2004; Steinfeldt & Wong, 2010; Strong, 2004).

Research has found that American Indian mascots were harmful to both American Indians and non-American Indians because these mascots generated a hostile school environment and activated stereotypes (American Psychological Association, 2005; Farnell, 2004; Fryberg et al., 2008; Kim-Prieto et al., 2010; Sanchez, 2003; Steinfeldt et al., 2010; Steinfeldt & Wong, 2010; Strong, 2004). Davies, Spencer, and Steele (2005) found that “stereotypes communicate to stigmatized individuals the accusations that specifically devalue their group’s social identity” (p. 276). For example, Fryberg et al. (2008) found that American Indian students expressed lower feelings of personal and community worth, and they reported fewer achievement-related possible selves than the students who were not exposed to an image of an American Indian mascot. Fryberg et al. suggested that American Indian mascots remind “American Indians of the limited ways in which others see them” (2008, p. 216). Finally, LaRocque, McDonald, Weatherly, and Ferraro (2011) found that American Indian students exhibited significantly more distress when exposed to American Indian mascot images in comparison to non-American Indian students who were also exposed. Despite the pervasiveness of American Indian mascots, these images continue to be harmful to both American Indians and non-American Indians alike (Neville et al, 2011).

In an effort to examine the effects from being exposed to a stereotype in which the content was not relevant to the stereotype consumer, Kim-Prieto, Goldstein, Okazaki, and
Kirschner (2010) hypothesized that exposing non-American Indian participants to American Indian stereotypes would increase their endorsement of Asian American stereotypes (as measured by scores on the Scale of Anti-Asian Stereotypes). Kim-Prieto et al. (2010) conducted two quantitative and experimental studies, and the results from both studies confirmed their hypothesis. When exposed to an American Indian stereotype (i.e., a picture of the university’s American Indian mascot in Study 1, and a story regarding the history of the university’s American Indian mascot in Study 2), participants endorsed Asian American stereotypes significantly more than the participants in the studies’ control conditions. However, the timing of Kim-Prieto et al.’s (2010) data collection may have increased the likelihood of demand characteristics concerning the delivery of the mascot exposure. Data were collected during the university’s controversial debate surrounding the termination of the American Indian mascot. Therefore, it was possible that participants associated the exposure of the mascot image on the folder (Study 1) or in the story (Study 2) with the surrounding controversy over the use of the mascot. Arguably, the participants increased tendency to endorse ethnic stereotypes was related to the controversy and not necessarily to the effectiveness of the mascot as a stereotype prime. Ultimately, the researchers concluded that the American Indian mascot functioned as a stereotype prime, and that exposure to this prime activated the participants’ other ethnic stereotypes.

**Gender Stereotypes**

Eagly’s social role theory proposed that the origin of gender stereotypes stem from how labor was divided between men and women, with men primarily working outside of the home and women working inside of it (Glick, 1991). Using Eagly’s framework, Weisgram, Bigler, and Liben (2010) posited that the gender traits presumed to be required for specific occupations created the gender segregation currently found in the labor system. For example, the assumption that firefighters are strong, rational, and calm under pressure favors men over women for this
occupation. Young girls, who see that firefighters are predominantly men, tend to elect for occupational interests more consistent with their gender.

The career paths of young children are not arbitrary, but heavily determined by cultural values. Traditionally, women’s power has resided in the home, while men’s power has command of the public sphere (Diekman, Goodfriend, & Goodwin, 2004). This historical division of power between men and women has steered many women away from occupations requiring public demonstrations of power. However, Eagly argued that since women (although not very many) are also firefighters, gender stereotypes are not static, but “dynamic and malleable because they emerge from role-bound activities and characteristics” (Wilbourn & Kee, 2010, p. 207). Therefore, as women move into male-dominated occupations, this shift challenges the traditional gender traits associated with gender-typic occupations.

Occupational values developed in childhood shape an individual’s occupational interests, which may lead an individual to favor gender-typic jobs that match his or her gender (Weisgram, Bigler, & Liben, 2010). The social roles individuals have in life interconnect to the gender traits that he or she presumably possesses. Stereotypically, men’s traits are agentic (Donovan, 2011), with masculine characteristics being: forceful, self-reliant, analytical, independent, ambitious, and assertive (Glick, 1991). In contrast, stereotypical feminine characteristics include the following: nurturing, submissive, passive, compassionate, sincere, intuitive, sensitive, and nice (Glick, 1991; Harvie, Marshall-McCaskey & Johnston, 1998). In addition, in comparison to men, women are stereotypically more communal and affective (Donovan, 2011). According to Glick (1991), gender-typic jobs are occupations that accommodate these presumed gender traits. For example, nursing is a stereotypical feminine gender-typic job because it can accommodate women’s nurturing and sensitive traits, but not men’s aggressive and forceful traits. Unfortunately, gender-
based hiring discrimination often results when positions in gender-typic occupations must be filled (Weisgram et al., 2010).

Glick (1991) defined gender-typic jobs as occupations that are dominated by one gender. When one gender dominates an occupation, their gender traits become associated with the job. Hareli and Klang (2008) found that participants perceived men and women to perform best in and be more suited for gender-typic jobs that were congruent with their respective gender. In addition, Lee, Castella, and McCluney (1997) found that men received ratings that were more favorable when their occupations were stereotypically masculine, and women received ratings that were more favorable when their occupations were stereotypically feminine. Finally, when participants made hiring decisions, the gender-type of the occupation was one consideration used to determine the best-qualified applicant (Hareli & Klang, 2008). This is the essence of gender-based hiring discrimination, whereby it is possible to predict which applicants will face discrimination based on knowing the ratio of men and women within any given occupation (Glick, 1991).

Some researchers have argued that women applying to stereotypical masculine gender-typic jobs do not face discrimination because they possess stereotypical feminine traits; rather, these women experience discrimination because of the perception that they lack stereotypical masculine traits that have become associated with the job (Glick, Zion, & Nelson, 1988). However, even when participants knew that the female applicant possessed the requisite masculine traits, Glick (1991) found that she was still the victim of hiring discrimination for masculine gender-typic jobs. That is, the participants offered the male applicants the masculine gender-typic job significantly more than they did to the equally qualified female applicants. Glick, Zion, and Nelson (1988) proposed that gender-based hiring discrimination was a function of gender traits combined with the gender of the applicant. For example, researchers have
consistently found that managerial positions were associated with stereotypical masculine characteristics (Harvie et al., 1998; Schein, 1975), and that men were preferred for managerial positions over equally qualified women (Cohen & Bunker, 1975; Davis & Penner, 1986).

Although Harvie, Marshall-McCaskey, and Johnston (1998) found that participants hired male applicants for both stereotypical masculine and feminine gender-typic jobs, this was the exception rather than the norm. Several researchers have found that the presumed gender characteristics of a job justified the participants’ hiring discrimination against men (Cohen & Bunker, 1975; Glick, 1991). Despite an applicant’s qualifications, the gender characteristics of a job helped determine the suitability of an applicant during the hiring process. Furthermore, researchers found that for male applicants who once held a stereotypical feminine gender-typic job in the past, participants perceived them as less suitable for a stereotypical masculine gender-typic job in the future (Hareli & Klang, 2008).

Wilbourn and Kee (2010) found that children were more accepting of a woman in a stereotypical masculine gender-typic job than they were of a man in a stereotypical feminine gender-typic job. The researchers asserted that attention toward providing equal opportunities to women for masculine gender-typic jobs has come at the expense of providing men similar opportunities to enter feminine gender-typic jobs (e.g., girls are encouraged to be doctors although boys are rarely encouraged to be nurses). Thus, whereas women have continued to push their way into male-dominated occupations, it has been much less frequent for men to push their way into female-dominated occupations (Cohen & Bunker, 1975; Hareli & Klang, 2008; Weisgram et al., 2010). Wilbourn and Kee (2010) posited that one unintended consequence of pushing women into masculine gender-typic jobs has been the devaluing of feminine gender-typic jobs, and children pick up this devaluation, such that they will justify a man in a feminine gender-typic job only if he holds a masculine gender-typic job, too.
Gender stereotypes harm men who apply for stereotypical feminine gender-typic jobs, but ultimately women incur the most harm from gender-based hiring discrimination (Hareli & Klang, 2008). For example, stereotypical masculine gender-typic jobs have more prestige and power, and typically afford higher salaries than stereotypical feminine gender-typic jobs (Hareli & Klang, 2008; Harvie et al., 1998; Weisgram et al., 2010). Glick’s (1991) research on gender-based hiring discrimination found that “the best single predictor of occupational salary was the masculinity of the job” (p. 362). Furthermore, research has found that participants perceived women in male-dominated occupations as violating their prescriptive gender norms and to possess more stereotypical masculine characteristics than women in female-dominated occupations (Diekman et al., 2004). In addition, the most common adjective attributed to women in male-dominated occupations was the word “unfeminine” (Harvie et al., 1998). Finally, research has found that participants hold lower expectations of women in masculine gender-typic jobs. Heilman, Block, and Lucas (1992) found that participants tended to attribute a woman in a masculine gender-typic job as being the recipient of affirmative action, and felt that she would have less success and a shorter career than an equally qualified male (who presumably was hired solely on his merits and qualifications). Ironically, women in male-dominated occupations are perceived as more mannish than women in female-dominated occupations, but they are also seen as less qualified, less capable and therefore deserve less pay than their male counterparts deserve.

**Hypotheses**

The researcher examined the effect of an ethnic stereotype prime (i.e., an American Indian mascot) on hiring decisions and applicant evaluations. Little empirical research has examined the effect of American Indian stereotypes on psychological functioning (Freng & Willis-Esqueda, 2011; Fryberg et al., 2008; Kim-Prieto et al., 2010; Steinfeldt & Wong, 2010). In addition, research has shown that the majority of non-American Indians do not distinguish
between American Indian mascots and American Indian people; that is, to most non-American Indians, American Indian mascots represent American Indian people (Chaney, Burke, & Burkley, 2011). Thus, it was and continues to be prudent to examine the impact American Indian stereotypes may have on social cognition, as these stereotypes continue to promulgate with frequency in the mainstream media (LaRocque, McDonald, Weatherly, & Ferraro, 2011).

To address this particular dearth in the research, the researcher selected American Indian stereotypes to function as the stereotype prime. In addition, the researcher selected gender stereotypes to ensure that the second stereotype’s content differed from the prime. Fryberg et al. (2008) found that the content of American Indian stereotypes described them as historical relics, warriors, and alcoholics. In contrast, the content of gender stereotypes presumes that men and women are more suited to gender-congruent occupations (Weisgram et al., 2010).

Kim-Prieto et al. (2010) found that exposure to an American Indian mascot led to the heightened stereotyping of Asian Americans. For the present study, the researcher substituted gender stereotypes for Asian American stereotypes. Researchers found that participants relying on gender stereotypes favored job applicants for positions only when those jobs were congruent with the applicant’s gender (Glick et al., 1988). Therefore, the present study’s researcher predicted that participants exposed to an American Indian mascot would heighten their endorsement of gender stereotypes. After exposure to the American Indian mascot, participants would start thinking categorically about people because the mascot triggered (i.e., primed and activated) the participants’ stereotypes of American Indians (Fryberg et al., 2008; Kim-Prieto et al., 2010; LaRocque et al., 2011; Marx, 2012).

**Hypothesis One**

Overall, participants exposed to an American Indian mascot would heighten their endorsement of gender stereotypes.
Hypothesis Two

The researcher predicted an interaction such that for a stereotypical feminine job, participants would perceive a female applicant as being more qualified than a male applicant, and that participants would more strongly recommend a female applicant for this job than they would recommend a male applicant.

Hypothesis Three

The researcher predicted a further interaction such that for a stereotypical masculine job, participants would perceive a male applicant as being more qualified than a female applicant, and that participants would more strongly recommend a male applicant for this job than they would recommend a female applicant.

Hypothesis Four

The researcher predicted an interaction such that for a gender-neutral job, participants would perceive a male applicant as being more qualified than a female applicant, and that participants would more strongly recommend a male applicant for this job than they would recommend a female applicant.

Hypothesis Five

The researcher predicted a further interaction such that for a gender-neutral job, participants exposed to an American Indian mascot would perceive the female applicant as being less qualified for this job in comparison to participants who were not exposed to the American Indian mascot.
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Overview

An experimental design was used in which participants’ endorsement of gender stereotypes was assessed after exposure to one of three images. The data were collected on a paper-and-pencil test that measured participants’ attitudes toward hiring applicants for gender-typic occupations. To measure the participants’ tendency to endorse gender stereotypes, the data were analyzed using a 3 (Prime: American Indian mascot, bear mascot, and no prime-control) x 3 (Gender-typic job: registered nurse administrator, chiropractor, and pharmacist-neutral) x 2 (Applicant gender: female and male) between-participants design.

Participants

The researcher recruited 360 undergraduate students from a large, metropolitan public university located on the West coast. These students were required to fulfill three hours of research participation to complete a lower division, introductory psychology course. For their participation, participants received one-half hour credit. The same female researcher collected data during the Fall 2012 semester by conducting several sessions each day using eight or fewer participants at a time. Participation was open to all ethnicities, ages, and gender; there were no restrictions to participation, and participants participated only once. All participants signed an informed consent form before participating. The majority of participants were female (71.9%; n = 259), and the age of participants ranged from 17 years to 44 years (M = 21.2 years, SD = 3.1). Almost two-thirds of the participants were either sophomores or juniors. The majority of participants were of European American descent (34.2%; n = 123), followed by: Latin American descent (23.9%; n = 86); Asian American descent (20.0%; n = 72); Multi-ethnic descent (9.2%; n
African American descent (8.6%; \(n = 31\)); Other (3.9%; \(n = 14\)); and, of Native American descent (0.3%; \(n = 1\)). The majority were Psychology majors (46.1%; \(n = 166\)). Participants experienced no harm and the researcher verbally debriefed them after participating.

**Materials**

Participants received a packet of materials consisting of: written instructions; one job description; one résumé; a questionnaire asking for the likelihood that the participant would offer an applicant the job, and for the strength of the recommendation; an evaluation form of the applicant; manipulation checks; and a participant demographics form (see Appendix).

**Independent Measures**

**Prime.** Three different image conditions functioned as the manipulation of the prime variable. In the American Indian mascot prime condition, the researcher wore a blue t-shirt with an image of an American Indian head portrayed on the left chest. In the athletic prime-control condition, the researcher wore a blue t-shirt with an image of a bear portrayed on the left chest. The mascot images were approximately 3.5 inches x 3.5 inches in size. Both mascots belonged to professional athletic teams that resided in the Midwest; this minimized the likelihood that participants would wear these teams’ sports merchandise (i.e., hats or clothing) during the experiment. No participants wore either of these teams merchandise during the experiment. In the no prime-control condition, the researcher wore a blue t-shirt with no image.

**Gender-typic job.** Three different jobs functioned as the manipulation of the gender-typic job variable. The researcher used several approaches to select each job for the stereotypical masculine, the stereotypical feminine, and the gender-neutral conditions. First, the researcher reviewed the literature to glean information as to which jobs had been used in past hiring simulation research. Second, after a review of the literature, the researcher chose to use the criteria for job selection developed by Cohen and Bunker (1975) for their research pertaining to
the effect of gender stereotypes on hiring decisions. Cohen and Bunker (1975) specified three criteria that could help define stereotypical gendered-occupations. Their first criterion was to use only jobs that could connote gender domination (i.e., to use jobs that could imply a higher ratio of men to women for stereotypical masculine jobs, or a higher ratio of women to men for stereotypical feminine jobs). Cohen and Bunker (1975) did not use a gender-neutral job condition in their research; therefore, to connote gender-neutral occupations, the present study’s researcher used the criteria of jobs with a relatively equal ratio of men to women. Cohen and Bunker’s (1975) second criterion was that the jobs had to give the impression of being equal in status and responsibility. They argued that providing comparable salaries and job duties in the job descriptions could satisfy this criterion. Cohen and Bunker’s (1975) final criterion cautioned that the jobs should not explicitly connote gender domination to the extent that participants became aware of the true nature of the study.

The present study’s researcher used the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics’ 2011 online listings of women in the labor force to examine which occupations could best connote gender domination without also sensitizing participants to the true nature of the study. After careful deliberation, the researcher selected chiropractor, registered nurse administrator, and pharmacist as the stereotypical masculine job, the stereotypical feminine job, and the gender-neutral job, respectively. Although the stereotypical feminine job could be interpreted as incompatible with Cohen and Bunker’s (1975) third criterion, registered nurse administrators have a comparable salary, responsibilities, and educational requirements to the selected stereotypical masculine and gender-neutral jobs. Furthermore, registered nurse administrator is an occupation that connotes gender domination more implicitly than it does explicitly; that is, administrator-related jobs typically attract more male applicants than females and registered nurse-related jobs typically attract considerably more female applicants than males.
To ensure that all three jobs had the impression of being similar in status, the researcher designed the job descriptions, such that, job duties, minimum qualifications (e.g., work experience, education, and licenses), working conditions, and salary ranges were comparable. The researcher developed the job descriptions using actual job descriptions found on a major managed care consortium’s online job postings as a reference. Salary ranges and educational requirements were the same across jobs. Although the present study did not examine how participants’ perceived the prestige value of gender-typic jobs, past research has examined this aspect. Glick’s (1991) research on gender-based hiring discrimination included prestige and salary ratings of gender-typic jobs by participants on a 5-point scale (with a score of five reflecting an extremely high amount of prestige and salary). Glick’s (1991) participants rated pharmacists as having a 3.88 prestige rating and a 3.80 salary rating. Although Glick (1991) did not have a job titled “Registered Nurse Administrator,” participants did rate registered nurses as having a 3.54 prestige rating and a 3.29 salary rating. There was no chiropractor job in Glick’s (1991) study, so prestige and salary ratings could not be compared to the other jobs. Overall, the jobs selected for this present study met Cohen and Bunker’s (1975) criteria, and the researcher constructed job descriptions for each job to connote comparable prestige and salary.

Applicant gender. Two different conditions, male vs. female, functioned as the manipulation of the applicant gender variable. There were two resumés per each job description, but participants randomly received only one. The only difference between the resumés for each job was the name of the applicant (Mary or Mark). For each job description, applicants all had postgraduate degrees and four years’ work experience. For the applicants’ resumés, each applicant satisfied the minimum qualifications identified for each job description without making the applicant highly or overly qualified. This ensured that participants used his or her own judgment to determine whether the applicant was qualified for the job.
Dependent Measures

The dependent measure was the participants’ tendency to endorse gender stereotypes. Three dependent variables functioned as measures of the participants’ tendency to endorse gender stereotypes.

Likelihood of a job offer. The first scale measured the likelihood that the job applicant received a job offer. There was one item on this scale; it prompted participants to indicate the likelihood that he or she would recommend the applicant for the job. A 5-point scale ranging from 1 (0% likely) to 5 (100% likely) measured participants’ responses. Lower scores on the scale indicated that the applicant was less likely to receive a job offer. This measure came from Glick et al.’s (1988) and Heilman et al.’s (1992) research on hiring discrimination.

Strength of recommendation. The second scale measured how strongly the participants’ recommended that the applicant receive a job offer. There was one item on this scale; participants indicated how strongly he or she would recommend the applicant for the job. A 5-point scale ranging from 1 (0% strongly) to 5 (100% strongly) measured participants’ responses. Lower scores on the scale indicated that the applicant was less likely to receive a strong recommendation to receive a job offer. This dependent variable also came from Glick et al.’s (1988) and Heilman et al.’s (1992) research on hiring discrimination. When the item from this scale was combined with the item from the scale measuring the likelihood of a job offer, Heilman et al. (1992) obtained a high Cronbach’s alpha = 0.96.

Evaluation form. The third scale was an evaluation form designed for the present study to measure the participants’ gender stereotypes. It consisted of 50 traits and 3 subscales (occupational – 10 items, masculine – 20 items, feminine – 20 items) that assessed the participants’ perceptions of the job applicant (i.e., the suitability of the applicant for the job based on occupational values and stereotypical gender characteristics). Punctual and hardworking were
two items on the occupational traits subscale. Rugged and arrogant were two items on the masculine traits subscale, whereas sensitive and intuitive were two items on the feminine traits subscale. A 5-point scale ranging from 1 (0% agreement) to 5 (100% agreement) measured participants’ responses. Lower scores on the scale indicated that the applicant lacked gender-congruent and occupational traits.

The gender-congruent traits for this scale came from Diekman, Goodfriend, and Goodwin’s (2004) research on stereotypes that maintained gender hierarchies. For the stereotypical masculine personality characteristics, Diekman et al. (2004) obtained a Cronbach’s alpha = 0.90, and a Cronbach’s alpha = 0.91 for the stereotypical feminine personality characteristics. If participants endorsed gender stereotypes, then participants should have scored the applicant low on the gender-incongruent traits but high on the gender-congruent traits. For example, for a female applicant, it was expected that participants would score her higher on the stereotypical feminine traits but lower on the stereotypical masculine traits. The occupational traits were included to assess how participants perceived the suitability of applicants. If an applicant scored relatively low on the occupational traits, then this would provide a more in-depth explanation of the hiring decision scores than the scores on the masculine and feminine traits could explain alone. Overall, if participants did not endorse gender stereotypes, then there should have been relatively no difference between the trait scores for the male and female applicants because their qualifications were the same.

**Manipulation Checks**

After completing the dependent measures, participants completed a short questionnaire consisting of manipulation checks for the independent measures. One question asked participants to identify the job for which the applicant submitted a resumé; this question assessed whether he or she noticed the gender-typic job. Another question asked participants if he or she thought that
more men than women, more women than men, or both men and women equally held the job position for which the applicant submitted a resumé. This question assessed whether participants believed each job connoted gender domination or not. In addition, one question asked participants whether he or she saw an image of an athletic mascot during the experiment (a yes answer prompted him or her to describe the image); this question assessed whether participants noticed the prime. Finally, to assess that the participants noticed the applicant’s name (Mark vs. Mary), a question asked participants to identify the applicant’s gender.

**Demographics Questionnaire**

Participants reported their ethnicity, age, gender, school class level, and major.

**Procedure**

After completing the informed consent form, participants received verbal instructions from a female researcher explaining that the aim of the study was to assess how different styles of resumés affect hiring decisions. Instructions informed participants to assume the role of a job recruiter in a healthcare agency who must find suitable employees for several jobs. A copy of the instructions was included as the cover page for the materials; this control hid the gender-typic job and applicant conditions. To manipulate the independent variable of prime condition, the researcher wore one of three t-shirts (American Indian mascot, bear mascot, or no mascot) to each research session. For any given day of data collection, the researcher wore only one of the three t-shirts. Random selection determined which t-shirt to wear to each session. Exposure to the prime lasted for the entire experiment. Participants received the materials after the verbal instructions, and the researcher randomly assigned participants to all conditions. The materials were as follows: instructions; one job description; one resumé; counterbalanced hiring questionnaire, strength of recommendation questionnaire and evaluation form; manipulation checks; and, participant demographics questionnaire. To manipulate gender-typic job,
participants randomly received one of three possible job descriptions in the materials. To
manipulate applicant gender, the researcher altered the name of the fictional job applicant (Mark
vs. Mary). After completing the materials, the researcher verbally debriefed and thanked the
participants for their participation, which lasted approximately 30 minutes.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Characteristics of Dependent Measures

Manipulation Checks

Manipulation checks were conducted for each independent variable. The manipulation of gender-typic job was effective, with 97.8% (n = 358) of the participants correctly identifying the job. In addition, the manipulation of applicant gender was effective, with 96.7% (n = 348) of the participants correctly identifying the gender of the applicant. However, the manipulation of prime condition was not effective, with 63.9% (n = 230) of participants indicating that he or she did not see an athletic mascot image during the experiment. When prompted with this particular manipulation check, virtually all participants were observed to go through the materials packet searching for an image. It remains unknown as to how many participants actually noticed the mascot on the t-shirt and just failed to report it on the manipulation checks. During the debriefing, several participants verbally reported that the mascot (both the bear and the American Indian) were seen; however, they reported on the manipulation checks that they did not see an image because it was not in the materials. Because of the possibility that participants may have underreported seeing either mascot prime on the manipulation checks, the researcher included the prime condition variable in the subsequent data analysis to measure any subliminal effects from mascot exposure.

Finally, to ensure that participants perceived each job as either masculine, feminine or gender-neutral, participants were asked whether he or she believed that: a) more men held the position than women did; b) more women held the position than men did; or, c) both men and women held the position equally (see Figure 1 for the frequencies of participants’ responses).
For participants in the masculine job condition, 66.7% (n = 80) believed that more men held the position than women did. Only 6.7% (n = 8) of the participants in the masculine job condition believed that more women than men held this position. For participants in the feminine job condition, 69.2% (n = 83) believed that more women held the position than men did. Only 8.3% (n = 10) of the participants in the feminine job condition believed that more men than women held this position. For those in the gender-neutral job condition, 56.7% (n = 68) believed that both men and women equally held the position. The remaining participants (43.3%; n = 52) in the gender-neutral condition were equally split in believing that the job was dominated by either gender. These results indicated that the jobs connoted gender domination when appropriate.

**Likelihood of Job Offer and Strength of Recommendation**

Two items asked participants to rate the likelihood and strength of recommending the applicant for the job. Both items were rated on a 5-point scale, with a score of five being the highest likelihood and strongest recommendation for hiring the applicant. The hiring decision score was the average of Items 1 and 2 of the dependent measures (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.83).
**Evaluation Form**

Fifty items consisting of occupational, masculine, and feminine traits allowed participants to evaluate applicants for each job type. Tables 1-3 include descriptive statistics for each dependent measure (i.e., hiring decision and trait scores) on the independent variables.

Table 1

*Means and Standard Deviations for Dependent Measures by Prime (N = 360)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime</th>
<th>Hiring Decision</th>
<th>Occupational</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian ²</td>
<td>4.29 (0.72)</td>
<td>4.41 (0.47)</td>
<td>2.68 (0.58)</td>
<td>2.59 (0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear ²</td>
<td>4.35 (0.66)</td>
<td>4.40 (0.43)</td>
<td>2.54 (0.54)</td>
<td>2.35 (0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Image ²</td>
<td>4.34 (0.57)</td>
<td>4.42 (0.39)</td>
<td>2.56 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.41 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.33 (0.65)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.41 (0.43)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.59 (0.55)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.45 (0.68)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations. ²*n = 120.*

Table 2

*Means and Standard Deviations for Dependent Measures by Gender-Typic Job (N = 360)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender-Typic Job</th>
<th>Hiring Decision</th>
<th>Occupational</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine ²</td>
<td>4.23 (0.63)</td>
<td>4.34 (0.42)</td>
<td>2.61 (0.56)</td>
<td>2.45 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine ²</td>
<td>4.43 (0.51)</td>
<td>4.45 (0.41)</td>
<td>2.67 (0.53)</td>
<td>2.55 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Neutral ²</td>
<td>4.33 (0.78)</td>
<td>4.44 (0.45)</td>
<td>2.51 (0.55)</td>
<td>2.35 (0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.33 (0.65)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.41 (0.43)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.59 (0.55)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.45 (0.68)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations. ²*n = 120.*
### Table 3

*Means and Standard Deviations for Dependent Measures by Applicant Gender (N = 360)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Gender</th>
<th>Hiring Decision</th>
<th>Occupational</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male$^a$</td>
<td>4.35 (0.68)</td>
<td>4.40 (0.48)</td>
<td>2.61 (0.56)</td>
<td>2.37 (0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female$^a$</td>
<td>4.30 (0.62)</td>
<td>4.42 (0.38)</td>
<td>2.58 (0.54)</td>
<td>2.53 (0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.33 (0.65)</td>
<td>4.41 (0.43)</td>
<td>2.59 (0.55)</td>
<td>2.45 (0.68)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations. $^a n = 180.$

In addition to exploring the descriptive statistics of the dependent measures on the independent variables, Cronbach’s alpha and factor analysis were used to test further the reliability of the dependent measures.

**Factor and reliability analyses of trait scores.** For the occupational traits, five traits were reverse coded before calculating an average score for the occupational traits. For the occupational traits, Cronbach’s alpha < 0.70. In addition, average scores were calculated for the stereotypical masculine and feminine traits. For the masculine traits, Cronbach’s alpha = 0.85. For the feminine traits, Cronbach’s alpha = 0.91. The dimensionality of the 50 items from the evaluation form was analyzed using a principal components method. Prior to performing the factor analysis, the data were assessed for the suitability of such a test. An examination of the correlation matrix indicated several coefficients greater or equal to 0.30. In addition, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was 0.90, and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was statistically significant. The combination of these criteria ensured that the data were suitable for factor analysis.

Factor analysis revealed the presence of 11 factors with eigenvalues of 1.0 or higher, explaining a cumulative variance of 61.91%. An inspection of the scree plot indicated a break
after the third factor. An oblique rotation using the PROMAX method was used to interpret these three factors, which accounted for approximately 41% of the combined variance of the 50 evaluation trait scores. Loadings on the 50 evaluation traits on the three rotated factors are shown in the pattern matrix (see Table 4), and in the structure matrix (see Table 5). Based on the loadings from the pattern matrix, factor 1 was interpreted as representing feminine traits, factor 2 as representing career traits, and factor 3 as representing masculine traits.

Table 4

**Factor Loadings for Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Evaluation Form Scales:**

**Pattern Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cute</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Strong</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurous</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Complainer</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugged</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greedy</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fussy</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egotistical</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
The feminine traits factor accounted for 22.67% of the item variance. Twelve items loaded on the feminine traits factor, and 11 of these items came from the feminine traits subscale of the evaluation form dependent measure. These 11 items make up the final dependent measure of femininity (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.91). The career traits factor accounted for 12.29% of the item variance. Fifteen items loaded on the career traits factor, with four items loading negatively. The negative loading items (reliable, honest, competent, and responsible) all came from the occupational traits subscale of the evaluation form dependent measure. These four items make up the final dependent measure of professionalism (Cronbach’s alpha < 0.70). Finally, the masculine traits factor accounted for 6.00% of the item variance. Twelve items loaded on the masculine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boastful</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td><strong>0.53</strong></td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-<strong>0.53</strong></td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiny</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td><strong>0.52</strong></td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brawny</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong></td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td><strong>0.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.35</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexy</td>
<td><strong>0.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.44</strong></td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-<strong>0.40</strong></td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td><strong>0.36</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.34</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td><strong>0.31</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.36</strong></td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td><strong>0.31</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.34</strong></td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscular</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td><strong>0.31</strong></td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Factor loadings ≥ 0.30 are in boldface.
traits factor, and eight of these items came from the masculine traits subscale of the evaluation form dependent measure. These eight items make up the final dependent measure of masculinity (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.76). Finally, see Table 6 for the correlations of the three components yielded by the factor analysis with a Promax rotation of the 50 items from the evaluation form.

Table 5

*Factor Loadings for Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of Evaluation Form Scales: Structure Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Strong</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurous</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Complainer</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugged</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fussy</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cute</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boastful</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egotistical</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greedy</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexy</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brawny</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiny</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscular</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Leader</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliant</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Savvy</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Factor loadings ≥ 0.30 are in boldface.

Table 6

*Correlations for Components Yielded by Factor Analysis with a Promax Rotation of the Evaluation Form Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multivariate Analysis of Variance**

A factorial multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effect of an ethnic stereotype prime on the use of gender stereotypes when making hiring
decisions. Independent variables were prime condition (American Indian mascot, bear mascot, no image), gender-typic job (masculine, feminine, gender-neutral), and applicant gender (male, female). Thus, this was a 3 x 3 x 2 between-participants MANOVA. Dependent variables were scores on hiring decisions, occupational traits, stereotypical masculine traits, and stereotypical feminine traits. The majority of the dependent variables were correlated with one another at a low to moderate level (i.e., 0.30 - 0.70; see Table 7).

Table 7

*Correlations between the Dependent Measures (N = 360)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Measures</th>
<th>Hiring Decision</th>
<th>Occupational Traits</th>
<th>Male Traits</th>
<th>Female Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Decision</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Traits</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01.

Data were prescreened for missing data, outliers, and any violation of the assumptions of MANOVA. The researcher used the IBM SPSS STATISTICS (SPSS), Version 20, FREQUENCIES command to analyze for missing data. There were no missing cases, and skewness and kurtosis were well within expected values. No variables were transformed. Next, the researcher used the SPSS EXAMINE command to analyze data for any univariate outliers and any violation of the assumption of univariate normality. A few univariate outliers were present; however, none were extreme (i.e., more than three standard deviations from the mean). Finally, the researcher used the SPSS REGRESSION command to analyze data for any multivariate outliers; a few multivariate outliers were detected, but none were extreme. In
addition, no multicollinearity was evident. A review of the scatterplot matrix revealed that the assumptions of multivariate normality and linearity were met. Finally, a significant Box’s Test revealed that equal variances could not be assumed; thus, to interpret the MANOVA results, the Pillai’s Trace statistic was used in lieu of the Wilks’ Lambda statistic.

MANOVA results indicated no significant multivariate differences among prime condition, gender-typic job, and applicant gender on the increased tendency to use gender stereotypes when making hiring decisions. In addition, the multivariate main effect of prime condition was not significant. However, the multivariate main effect of gender-typic job was significant, Pillai’s Trace = 0.05, $F(8, 680) = 2.09, p < 0.05$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.02$, power = 0.84. Thus, there was a statistically significant difference in hiring decisions and trait scores based on an applicant’s gender-typic job. The researcher conducted a follow-up univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Tukey HSD post-hoc comparisons between the three levels for gender-typic job. The results revealed no significant univariate group differences among the levels for gender-typic job; however, multiple comparisons between gender-typic jobs on the dependent variables revealed a significant Tukey HSD ($p < 0.05$) for the hiring decision score. Specifically, participants significantly hired both the male and female applicants more when a job was considered feminine ($M = 4.43, SD = 0.51; 95\% \text{ CI} [0.01, 0.40]$) than they did when the job was considered masculine ($M = 4.23, SD = 0.63; 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.40, -0.01]$). Finally, the multivariate main effect of applicant gender was significant, Pillai’s Trace = 0.03, $F(4, 339) = 2.93, p < 0.05$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.03$, power = 0.79. The researcher conducted a follow-up univariate ANOVA between the two levels for applicant gender. The results indicated significant univariate group differences for the feminine traits, $F(1, 358) = 5.22, p < 0.05$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.01$, power = 0.63. Specifically, participants significantly attributed higher feminine traits ($M = 2.53, SD = 0.68$) to the female applicants, but lower feminine traits ($M = 2.37, SD = 0.63$) to the male applicants.
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

The results did not support the hypothesis that participants exposed to an American Indian mascot would heighten their endorsement of gender stereotypes. In addition, the results showed no significant differences between the American Indian mascot, the bear mascot, and the no image conditions on the participants’ hiring decisions and trait scores. However, of the three independent variables, the prime measure was the only one to score poorly on the manipulation checks. Almost two-thirds of the participants reported that he or she saw no mascot image during the experiment. The delivery of the mascot image may explain the failure to find a significant multivariate effect of prime.

The present study was a conceptual replication of Kim-Prieto et al.’s (2010) study, whose research found that exposure to an American Indian mascot activated Asian American stereotypes. Similar to Kim-Prieto et al.’s (2010) independent variable of prime, the present study’s prime variable also had three levels (stereotype-activation prime, athletic prime-control, no image-control). However, Kim-Prieto et al. (2010) manipulated the prime using folders adorned with stickers of either the university’s American Indian mascot or the university’s logo, or no stickers at all. Instead of using folders, the researcher used three different t-shirts to manipulate the prime. Before starting the dependent measures, Kim-Prieto et al.’s (2010) participants received one of the three folders, and this method more likely resulted in each participant noticing the images, as each had to open the folder to access the dependent measures. For the present study, although participants were exposed to one of the three images for the entire
experiment, there was no guarantee that participants were aware of the exposure. Unfortunately, several hypotheses were contingent on the successful manipulation of the prime variable.

In the present study, I was the researcher and I am American Indian. It may be possible that my ethnicity interfered with an effective manipulation of the prime variable. My ethnicity may have unintentionally functioned as an ethnic stereotype prime, in which case, there would have been no variation across the three levels of the prime variable because I collected the data for every research session. This could explain the MANOVA results indicating no significant differences across the three levels of the prime variable.

Moreover, participants may have engaged in spontaneous stereotype suppression (i.e., participants were not instructed to suppress stereotypes, but, instead voluntarily engaged in this behavior) upon encountering an American Indian researcher conducting research in a controlled, academic environment. Monteith, Sherman, and Devine (1998) found that spontaneous stereotype suppression “may occur when social contexts increase the salience of social norms against stereotyping” (p. 67). Therefore, despite reassurances of anonymity for participating, the presence of an American Indian researcher may have led participants to avoid the use of engaging in American Indian stereotypes altogether. Stereotype suppression of American Indian stereotypes would have been detrimental to hypothesis testing.

In addition, the dependent measures for the present study differed from Kim-Prieto et al.’s (2010) measures. The present study’s researcher examined the effect of American Indian mascots on gender stereotypes, and the dependent measures consisted of hiring decisions and trait scores. Kim-Prieto et al. (2010), in contrast, examined the effect of American Indian mascots on Asian American stereotypes, and the dependent measures consisted of scores from the Scale of Anti-Asian Stereotypes. It is possible that Kim-Prieto et al.’s (2010) use of a well-validated dependent measure aided their success in finding a significant effect. The present study’s
researcher constructed the dependent measures using past dependent measures taken from previous studies examining gender-based discrimination in simulated hiring decisions research. The present study’s hiring decision dependent measure was a combination of questions asking for the likelihood of offering and the strength of recommending an applicant for the job. This dependent measure came from Glick et al.’s (1988) and Harvie et al.’s (1998) research on gender-based hiring discrimination. The evaluation form constructed for the present study came from research conducted by Cohen and Bunker (1975), Diekman et al. (2004), and Schein (1975). The combination of the hiring decision dependent measure and the evaluation form provided several measures to assess how participants perceived the fictional applicants.

**Hypothesis Two**

The results did not entirely support the hypothesis that for the stereotypical feminine job, participants would perceive a female applicant as being more qualified than a male applicant, and that participants would more strongly recommend a female applicant for this job than they would recommend a male applicant. The manipulation checks indicated that gender-typic job and applicant gender were effective, and the results indicated a significant multivariate main effect of gender-typic job, and a significant multivariate main effect of applicant gender. That is, hiring decisions and trait scores significantly differed across the three jobs as well as between the male and female applicants. Specifically, follow-up univariate tests indicated that participants significantly hired both male and female applicants more for the stereotypical feminine job than they did for the stereotypical masculine job. In addition, the participants significantly scored the female applicants higher on the stereotypical feminine traits than they scored the male applicants. The hypothesis was partially satisfied, in that, the female applicants were significantly rated higher than the equally qualified male applicants. However, both the male and female applicants were significantly hired more only when the job was feminine.
Finally, the results indicated a significant multivariate main effect of applicant gender. Specifically, participants scored the female applicants significantly higher on the stereotypical feminine traits than they scored the male applicants. Ironically, both applicants shared the exact same résumé, and thus had the exact same qualifications. If participants were not using gender stereotypes, then both applicants should have been perceived with relative similarity (i.e., their scores on the occupational, masculine, and feminine traits should have been virtually the same). However, the results indicated that having a male name versus a female name led to different perceptions of otherwise identical job applicants. This finding was consistent with previous research examining gender-based hiring discrimination (Cohen & Bunker, 1975; Glick, 1991; Glick et al., 1988; Harvie et al., 1998). Therefore, the higher scores of female applicants on the feminine traits, in conjunction with the lower scores of male applicants on the feminine traits, may be explained by the participants’ endorsement of gender stereotypes. Although participants did endorse gender stereotypes while completing the dependent measures, this did not lead to a statistically significant advantage for either applicant, inasmuch that one applicant was hired more than the other applicant for the feminine job (as was predicted). Participants found that both the male and female applicants were disproportionately more hirable for the feminine job than they were for the masculine job. This may imply that men are just as likely as women to be hired for a stereotypical feminine job in the real world; however, it may also imply that women may still face gender-based hiring discrimination when applying for a stereotypical masculine job.

**Hypothesis Three**

The results did not support the hypothesis that for the stereotypical masculine job, participants would perceive a male applicant as being more qualified than a female applicant, and that participants would more strongly recommend a male applicant for this job than they would recommend a female applicant. Although the results did show a significant multivariate main
effect of gender-typic job and applicant gender, follow-up univariate tests revealed significant effects on the stereotypical feminine job and the stereotypical feminine traits, respectively. There were no significant differences on the participants’ hiring decisions for the masculine job or the male applicant.

Past research examining gender-based discrimination in hiring decisions has found that male applicants were overwhelmingly hired more for stereotypical masculine jobs over equally qualified female applicants (Glick, 1991; Hareli & Klang, 2008; Weisgram et al., 2010). Although the present experiment conceptually replicated these previous studies, the present study had a different makeup of participants. Some studies found that men were favored over women for masculine jobs, but the participants were virtually all male (Cohen & Bunker, 1975; Glick et al., 1988). The majority of the present study’s participants were female (71.9%; n = 259), which may explain the results. That is, female participants may be less likely to perceive female applicants as less qualified than male applicants, even if the job is perceived to be masculine. Interestingly, Schein (1975) purposefully used all female participants, and found that women did favor men over equally qualified women for masculine jobs. However, 38 years have passed since Schein’s experiment, and the present study’s findings may indicate that attitudes toward gender-typic jobs may have improved.

Hypothesis Four

The results did not support the hypothesis that for the gender-neutral job, participants would perceive a male applicant as being more qualified than a female applicant, and that participants would more strongly recommend a male applicant for this job than they would recommend a female applicant. The results indicated a significant multivariate main effect of gender-typic job and applicant gender. However, follow-up univariate tests indicated significant effects on the stereotypical feminine job and the stereotypical feminine traits, but not for the
gender-neutral job or the male applicant. There were no significant differences on the participants’ hiring decisions for the gender-neutral job or the male applicant.

Research has consistently found that participants endorsing gender stereotypes favored hiring job applicants only when those jobs were congruent with the applicant’s gender (Glick et al., 1988). Jobs that connote gender domination assist decision makers, intentionally or unintentionally, in making hiring decisions, and this assistance virtually always results in gender-based hiring discrimination. However, gender-neutral jobs do not connote gender domination, and therefore present an ambiguous situation to participants in simulated hiring decision research because neither men nor women dominate the occupation. Both Dovidio and Gaertner (2000) and Monteith et al. (1998) found that participants relied on stereotypes more when the situation was ambiguous in comparison to when there was no ambiguity. Furthermore, Glick (1991) found that participants perceived gender-neutral jobs as being gender-typic. For the present study, over half (56.7%; \(n = 68\)) of the participants in the gender-neutral job condition correctly believed that both men and women equally held the pharmacist job. However, 43.3% (\(n = 52\)) of the participants in this condition did not perceive the job to be gender-neutral, but gender-typic. That is, almost half of the participants perceived the gender-neutral job to be either masculine or feminine. Had a pilot study been conducted with a separate set of participants, each gender-typic job selected for this study could have been examined as to whether the jobs were connoting gender domination the way I intended; otherwise, a new job could have been selected. Although the study’s gender-neutral job is an occupation in the United States with a relatively equal ratio of women to men, a large percentage of the participants did not view the job this way.

**Hypothesis Five**

The results did not support the hypothesis that for the gender-neutral job, participants exposed to an American Indian mascot would perceive the female applicant as being less
qualified for the job in comparison to participants who were not exposed to the American Indian mascot. The results indicated no significant multivariate differences among prime condition, gender-typic job, and applicant gender on participants’ hiring decisions and trait scores. However, the results indicated a significant multivariate main effect of gender-typic job, and post-hoc tests revealed a significant Tukey HSD ($p < 0.05$) for the feminine traits scores between the stereotypical feminine and masculine jobs. The gender-neutral job did not significantly differ from the other jobs; thus, this hypothesis was not supported. This was most likely due to an ineffective manipulation of the prime variable, and a weak manipulation of the level of gender-neutral job on the gender-typic job variable.

**Method Critique**

**Prime Exposure**

Several researchers have found success in empirically demonstrating that exposure to American Indian mascots led to the activation of stereotypes (Chaney et al., 2011; Freng & Willis-Esqueda, 2011; Fryberg et al., 2008; Kim-Prieto et al., 2008; LaRocque et al., 2011; Neville et al., 2011; Steinfeldt & Wong, 2010). However, none of the reviewed research delivered the mascot prime using t-shirts. Virtually all of the participants in the present study thoroughly examined the paper materials to locate the image of the mascot when prompted with the question on the manipulation checks. Few of the participants realized that the mascot image was on the researcher’s t-shirt. Perhaps placing the mascot image within the materials would have been a better method for mascot exposure. This may have been accomplished by using a university with an American Indian mascot as the employer. Thus, the mascot image could have been embedded (subtly) as a watermark on the job description page for participants in the American Indian mascot prime condition. The athletic prime-control condition could have been met by using a watermark image of the university’s logo placed on the job description page,
whereas a job description page void of any images could have functioned as the no prime-control condition. Delivering the images in this manner may have been more salient, and thereby more effective.

Mascot selection may have also hindered finding significant effects. Ironically, some of the universities where previous research was conducted to study the effects of American Indian mascots have since discontinued the use of these mascots. However, the removal of those mascots was extremely controversial (Steinfeldt et al., 2010), and the debate surrounding the removal of the mascot may have influenced the findings of the previous research by creating demand characteristics, especially if data were collected during the controversy. Thus, location may play a bigger role than expected in studying the effects of American Indian mascots. The researcher conducted the present study at a metropolitan, public university in Northern California with no American Indian mascot and no professional athletic teams with such mascots in the vicinity. Location and the debate over the use of American Indian mascots may confound the generalizability of the effects of these mascots on social cognition and behavior.

**Generalizations**

The generalizability of the present study’s results should be taken with caution. The participants were overwhelmingly female, and although European Americans comprised the largest percentage of participants, several other ethnicities were well represented. No one ethnicity held a true majority. The student body demographics of the present study may not reflect the student bodies of Midwestern, Southern, and Eastern universities. Another generalizability issue concerned the gender of the present study’s researcher. A majority of the reviewed literature examining gender-based hiring discrimination were conducted by male researchers. However, the researcher for the present study was female, and it is possible that the researcher’s gender created demand characteristics. That is, using a female researcher to conduct
each research session may have inflated scores that were more favorable for the present study’s female applicants on the stereotypical feminine job and feminine traits. The results indicated a significant multivariate main effect for both the stereotypical feminine job and the feminine traits.

In addition, one limitation to the present study was that the participants only reviewed one applicant (either a man or woman) before making a hiring decision. In reality, it is more likely that decision makers would have numerous applicants to review before making the actual decisions. Arguably, gender-based hiring discrimination may be a more poignant phenomenon that is best measured outside of controlled research environments. However, some studies have found that student participants and actual human resource managers make comparable hiring decisions in simulated experiments (Hareli & Klang, 2008; Heilman, Block, & Lucas, 1992).

Conclusion

Research has examined the harmful effects of gender stereotypes, including stereotype threat (Davies, Spencer, & Steele, 2005), and the hiring discrimination of women for certain occupations (Cohen & Bunker, 1975; Glick, 1991; Harvie et al., 1998). Unfortunately, reality shows that eating disorders and issues with body images for women may result from being constantly objectified. In comparison to men, women tend to have higher rates of depression and lower levels of self-esteem (Nadal & Haynes, 2012). To challenge stereotypes it remains prudent to understand not only their origins but also the effects they have on our social cognition and behavior. Thus, when children devalue stereotypical feminine occupations, and suggest that a man would only hold a feminine job if he also held a stereotypical masculine job (Wilbourn & Kee, 2010), then we must examine the stereotypes that are transmitted to subsequent generations.

American Indians continue to remain an invisible ethnic minority in their own ancestral homeland, and stereotypes about their group abound in every form of media mainly due to their invisibility (Fryberg et al., 2008; Sanchez, 2003). A history of colonization and prejudiced
attitudes toward American Indians created an atmosphere where “the boundary between American Indian as human and American Indian as mascot has become blurred in American culture” (Chaney et al., 2011, p. 43). The invisibility of “real” American Indians and the abundance of American Indian mascots have created a distorted lens from which many people view the indigenous people of our country. Contributing to the literature with empirical studies is one means to examining the effect of American Indian mascots.

Although the results did not indicate a significant effect of American Indian mascots on gender stereotypes, previous research has found significant effects of American Indian mascots on cognition and behavior. Researchers found negative effects such as higher reports of psychological stress (LaRocque et al., 2011), and the expressed feelings of low personal and community worth (Fryberg et al., 2008) on American Indian students exposed to American Indian mascots. Furthermore, Freng and Willis-Esqueda (2011) found that American Indian mascot exposure led to the activation of negative stereotypes of American Indians, and Kim-Prieto et al. (2010) found that this activation spread to other ethnic stereotypes. Because of methodological issues, results from this study did not truly test the hypotheses that the researcher set out to test. Future studies, using more valid manipulations and measures should be carried out to investigate fully the hypotheses that were developed in this paper.
APPENDIX

Materials

Instructions:

- Please read and follow all directions closely. Please go through the materials in the order in which they are presented (do not skip ahead). Do not place your name or any other identifying marks on the materials. If during the experiment you have any questions, please raise your hand and the researcher will assist you. You may discontinue your participation at any time without any penalty other than loss of research credit.

- *The aim of the study is to assess how different styles of resumés affect hiring decisions. You will assume the role of a job recruiter in a healthcare agency who must find suitable employees for available jobs.*
The employer is a university hospital in a metropolitan city located in a mid-western state.

Date of Job Posting: May 22, 2013 (until filled)

Position Title: Chiropractor

Main functions: To diagnose and treat patients with health problems of the musculoskeletal system and treat the effects of those problems on the nervous system and on general health.

Duties:

• Assess the patient’s health by conducting physical, neurological, and orthopedic examinations
• Provide natural, drugless, nonsurgical health treatments
• Analyze the patient’s posture and spine using specialized techniques
• Ability to manually adjust the spinal column for patients whose health problems can be traced to the musculoskeletal system
• Able to work independently and handle responsibility
• Maintains current knowledge of and complies with state and federal laws, rules and regulations

Minimum Qualifications:

• Doctor of Chiropractic degree required
• Current Chiropractic license, or receipt of Chiropractic license upon hire
• Minimum three years medical experience required
• Must be able to stand on feet for long periods
• Must have considerable manual dexterity (but not unusual strength or endurance) to perform adjustments

Working Conditions:

• Scheduled hours are 40 (full-time)
• Work days and work schedule are variable
• Position is eligible for benefits
• Salary Range: $56.57 - $63.53 (based on experience)
Mark/Mary Sullivan
4589 Center Street, Denver, CO 80002
Home: 303-818-9222 – Cell: 303-343-0058 : m.sullivan30@gmail.com

Professional Background
Licensed chiropractor associate with four years’ experience in healthcare. Skilled in providing attention to spinal mechanics, musculoskeletal, neurological, and vascular relationships.

Skill Highlights
- Clinical training and experience
- Strong medical ethic
- Patient evaluation/intervention
- Physical assessments
- Patient-focused care
- Acute and rehabilitative care

Accomplishments
Collaboration
- Collaborated with physicians to plan and implement patient care.

Compliance
- Maintained compliance with regulatory standards by the State of Colorado Board of Chiropractic Examiners.

Patient Advocacy
- Explained treatment procedures, medication risks, and physician instructions to patients.

Professional Experience
Chiropractor Associate
May 2008 – Current
St. Luke’s Hospital Residency – Denver, CO
- Supported patients with customized patient teaching tools.
- Provided treatment within scope of practice as defined by state law.
- Ensured safety and well-being of patients.
- Ensured efficacy of treatments through monitoring of treatment regimens.

Education and Training
University of Colorado, May 2010
Denver, CO
Chiropractic Science
Doctor of Chiropractic, GPA 3.5

University of Colorado, May 2008
Denver, CO
Human Biology
Bachelor of Science, GPA 3.6

Certifications and Affiliations
- Licensed Chiropractor in the State of Colorado
- Colorado Chiropractic Association, Member (January 2010 – Present)
The employer is a university hospital in a metropolitan city located in a mid-western state.

Date of Job Posting: May 22, 2013 (until filled)

Position Title: Pharmacist

Main functions: To dispense medications prescribed by physicians and other healthcare practitioners. A pharmacist also provides information to patients regarding their medications’ use, dosage, and potential interactions or side effects.

Duties:

- Compounds and prepares medications accurately
- Assists in the orientation, training, and education of support personnel and interns
- Exercises independent judgment within the limits of authority
- Makes informed, rational, and timely decisions
- Monitors and inspects the facility medication storage sites to ensure a safe and appropriate storage of the drugs
- Maintains current knowledge of and complies with state and federal laws, rules and regulations

Minimum Qualifications:

- Doctorate degree in Pharmacy (PharmD) required
- Current Pharmacy license, or receipt of Pharmacy license upon hire
- Minimum three years medical experience required
- Contemporary knowledge of automated systems
- Ability to set goals, plan, organize, and take tasks to completion

Working Conditions:

- Scheduled hours are 40 (full-time)
- Work days and work schedule are variable
- Position is eligible for benefits
- Salary Range: $56.57 - $63.53 (based on experience)
Mark/Mary Sullivan
4589 Center Street, Denver, CO 80002
Home: 303-818-9222 – Cell: 303-343-0058 : m.sullivan30@gmail.com

Professional Background
Licensed pharmacist technician with four years’ experience in healthcare. Skilled in providing prescribed medications, drugs, and other pharmaceuticals.

Skill Highlights
- Organization skills
- Patient-focused care
- Patient evaluation/intervention
- Problem resolution
- Strong medical ethic
- Prioritizing/managing deadlines

Accomplishments
Collaboration
- Collaborated with physicians to plan and implement patient care.
Compliance
- Maintained compliance with regulatory standards by the Colorado Board of Pharmacy.
Patient Education
- Educated patients in regards to office policies, recovery measures and medical instructions.

Professional Experience

Pharmacist Technician
May 2008 – Current
St. Luke’s Hospital Residency – Denver, CO
- Coordinated with doctors and registered nurses to develop care plans for patients.
- Authorized drug refills and provided detailed prescription information to pharmacies.
- Maintained patient privacy and confidential patient information.
- Provided patient education.

Education and Training

University of Colorado, May 2010
Denver, CO
Pharmacology
Doctorate of Pharmacology, GPA 3.5

University of Colorado, May 2008
Denver, CO
Pharmacology
Bachelor of Science, GPA 3.6

Certifications and Affiliations
- Licensed Pharmacist in the State of Colorado
- American Society of Health System Pharmacists, Member (January 2010 – Present)
The employer is a university hospital in a metropolitan city located in a mid-western state.

**Date of Job Posting:** May 22, 2013 (until filled)

**Position Title:** Registered Nurse (RN) Administrator

**Main functions:** Plans, organizes, directs, evaluates and coordinates inpatient-nursing services within a service line and develops the execution of strategic plans, providing quality care, and managing cost-effective services.

**Duties:**

- Ensures a superior care experience and a safe environment with patients and staff
- Ensures policies, practices, and procedures comply with all administrative, legal and regulatory requirements
- Hires, retains, and achieves staffing ratios and optimal patient outcomes
- Mentors nursing staff in the development of leadership skills, scheduling practices, professional development, and outcome-based practices
- Manages and resolves human resources, labor relations, employee and department safety and risk management issues
- Participates in developing the hospital's plan for the recruitment and retention of nursing resources

**Minimum Qualifications:**

- Minimum three years nursing experience in patient care
- Preferred at least two years management experience
- Doctorate of Nursing Practice (DNP) required
- Current RN license required, or receipt of RN license upon hire
- Demonstrated strong interpersonal communication skills
- Demonstrated ability to lead and manage through influence and change

**Working Conditions:**

- Scheduled hours are 40 (full-time)
- Work days and works schedule are variable
- Position is eligible for benefits
- Salary Range: $56.67 - $63.53 hourly (based on experience)
Mark/Mary Sullivan  
4589 Center Street, Denver, CO 80002  
Home: 303-818-9222 – Cell: 303-343-0058 : m.sullivan30@gmail.com

**Professional Background**

Registered nurse supervisor with four years’ experience in healthcare. Skilled in providing and evaluating nursing care for patients and coordinating care activities with other disciplines.

**Skill Highlights**

- Staff training/development
- Employee scheduling
- Cross-functional team management
- Consistently meet goals
- Budget and policy development
- Compensation/benefits administration

**Accomplishments**

**Patient Care**
- Ensured quality control through admissions, assessment, treatment, and referral for a broad range of patients.

**Leadership**
- Served as mentor to junior team members.

**Management**
- Implemented innovative programs to increase employee loyalty and reduce turnover.

**Professional Experience**

**Registered Nurse Supervisor**  
May 2008 – Current  
St. Luke’s Hospital Residency – Denver, CO
- Supported patients with customized patient teaching tools.
- Provided treatment within scope of practice as defined by state law.
- Trained, coached and mentored staff to ensure smooth adoption of new program.
- Hired and trained 40 staff.

**Education and Training**

**University of Colorado, May 2010**  
Denver, CO  
Nursing Practice  
Doctor of Nursing Practice, GPA 3.5

**University of Colorado, May 2008**  
Denver, CO  
Nursing  
Bachelor of Science, GPA 3.6

**Certifications**

- Registered Nurse – Licensed by the State of Colorado

**Affiliations**

- Colorado State Nurses Association, Member (January 2010 – Present)
Please read the question carefully and answer using the scale below.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100% Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>75% Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50% Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25% Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0% Likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How likely would you recommend the applicant for the job? *(Please indicate your answer with a numeric response 1 – 5.)* ________
Please read the question carefully and answer using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100% Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>75% Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50% Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25% Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0% Strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How strongly would you recommend the applicant for the job? *(Please indicate your answer with a numeric response 1 – 5.)* _______
On the following pages you will find a series of descriptive terms commonly used to characterize people in general. Some of these terms are positive in connotation, others are negative and some are neither very positive nor very negative. We would like you to use this list to tell us what you think about the suitability of the applicant for the job.

Please use the following scale. Indicate your response with a numerical number.

\[
\begin{align*}
5 &= 100\% \text{ Agree} \\
4 &= 75\% \text{ Agree} \\
3 &= 50\% \text{ Agree} \\
2 &= 25\% \text{ Agree} \\
1 &= 0\% \text{ Agree}
\end{align*}
\]

The applicant is …

1. Tech-savvy
2. Dominant
3. Muscular
4. Sympathetic
5. Beautiful
6. Compassionate
7. Unreliable
8. Aggressive
9. Physically strong
10. Sensitive
11. Whiny
12. Dishonest
13. Competitive
14. Assertive
15. Gentle
16. Fussy
Please use the following scale. Indicate your response with a numerical number.

5 = 100% Agree
4 = 75% Agree
3 = 50% Agree
2 = 25% Agree
1 = 0% Agree

The applicant is …

17. Punctual ______
18. Ambitious ______
19. Egotistical ______
20. Sexy ______
21. Professional ______
22. Adventurous ______
23. Arrogant ______
24. A complainer ______
25. Incompetent ______
26. Independent ______
27. Intuitive ______
28. Irresponsible ______
29. Self-reliant ______
30. Cute ______
31. Inexperienced ______
32. Brawny ______
33. Passive ______
34. Forceful ______
Please use the following scale. Indicate your response with a numerical number.

5 = 100% Agree  
4 = 75% Agree  
3 = 50% Agree  
2 = 25% Agree  
1 = 0% Agree

_The applicant is …_

35. Submissive

36. Rugged

37. Nurturing

38. Boastful

39. Trustworthy

40. Expressive

41. Greedy

42. Daring

43. Analytical

44. A leader

45. Pretty

46. Affectionate

47. Hardworking

48. Sincere

49. Supportive

50. Nice
Please read each question carefully before answering.

1. The applicant submitted a resumé for the following job: *(Circle one response.)*
   - A. Chiropractor
   - B. Pharmacist
   - C. Registered Nurse Administrator
   - D. None of the above

2. When you think about the job that the applicant submitted a resumé for, do you think that …?
   *(Circle one response.)*
   - A. More men hold this position than women
   - B. More women hold this position than men
   - C. Both men and women hold this position equally

3. During the experiment, did you see any images of an athletic mascot?
   If so, what was it? ___________________________________

4. The applicant’s gender was … *(Circle one response.)*
   - A. Male
   - B. Female
How would you describe yourself? (*Please check all responses that apply.*)

_____ Asian/Pacific Islander
_____ Black/African American
_____ Hispanic or Latino
_____ Native American or Alaska Native
_____ White/European American
_____ Other race

What is your age?

________________________

What is your gender? (*Please check one.*)

_____ Male
_____ Female

What is your class level (i.e., freshman, sophomore, etc.) in school?

________________________

What is your major?

________________________
References


