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INTRODUCTION

Legislation requiring equality in employment opportunities for men and women has resulted in the development and implementation of affirmative action programs. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits sex discrimination in any term, condition or privilege of employment. With the issuance of Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 federal contractors and subcontractors with contract over $50,000 and 50 or more employees were required to development and implement affirmative action programs (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1974). Revised Order No. 4 outlined the specific requirements for these programs (U.S. Department of Labor, 1971). Although the establishment of effective affirmative action programs is not required of all organizations, it is recommended for all organizations.

Affirmative action will help you avoid expensive legal judgments and sudden disruption of your regular operations and will help you qualify for government contracts. It can also help you cut costs and increase productivity through tapping and developing seriously under-utilized human resources. (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1974, p. 12)

Resistance to Affirmative Action Programs

Organizations, in both the private and public sector, are finding it difficult to implement affirmative action and equal employment opportunity programs (Berlin, 1977; Rosenbloom, 1977; Simcich, 1977; Fields, 1975; Lyle, 1973). Berlin (1977) expressed doubts about whether it is possible to have bias-free employment practices. Fields (1975) similarly reported on the problems of college administrators in complying with affirmative
action requirements. Lyle (1973) conducted a study of the affirmative action programs in private industries. In assessing line managers' reactions to these programs, the author found that "most managers believe strongly in their own right to autonomy in making personnel decisions and are jealous of personnel officers' attempts to superimpose rigid dicta restricting their range of choice" (p. 60). In response to questions about the affirmative action program and equal employment opportunities for women with the organization, the managers showed a lack of knowledge about the employment practices of the organizations, as well as a resistance to affirmative action programs. A sample of questions used in this study and the managers' responses are shown in Appendix A. The managers' lack of knowledge about affirmative action programs was exemplified by the large number who did not know if women get equal opportunity or if the firm has set goals and timetables for female employment. The prevailing sex biases of firms is reflected in the managers' responses to items 4 and 5. Responses to item 4 clearly indicate that the managers included in this study are unaware of what sex discrimination is.

Lyle's (1973) report revealed that the administrative problems involved in the development and implementation of affirmative action programs are similar across organizations. One problem arises from the conflicting objectives proposed by timetables and goals. That is, it is difficult to simultaneously achieve the goals for all of the protected groups. Cost was another obstacle in the implementation of affirmative action programs. These additional costs were incurred mainly as a result of equal pay policies. Other expenses resulted from the addition of
health insurance, pension and profit-sharing benefits for female employees.

A study of women and minorities in banking was conducted by Simcich (1977). This study was a follow-up to a study conducted in 1971 where the equal employment opportunity practices of the three largest banks in each of six major cities were evaluated (Alexander & Sapery, 1972). They found that, in 1971, about 73% of all office and clerical jobs at the banks included in the sample were occupied by women, and 15% of all managerial positions were held by women. Although women were over-represented in the banks compared to their share of the city labor force, they were concentrated in low-level positions with little opportunity for advancement.

Alexander and Sapery (1972), along with the rest of the Council on Economic Priorities (CEP) staff engaged in this investigation of bank employment practices, encountered "massive resistance" from the banks being studied. In spite of the bank reports emphasizing their sense of social responsibility, Alexander and Sapery (1972) reported findings of "extensive and unmistakable employment bias" in many banks. In regard to the government's role in regulating the employment practices of banks, Alexander and Sapery stated that the Treasury Department did not enforce the fair employment laws and appeared to have a complacent attitude toward the banks' illegal practices.

The follow-up bank study conducted in 1975 revealed that, although women were employed in 26% of all managerial positions in the banks included in the study, they were still concentrated in low-level positions
4

and underrepresented in higher-level positions (Simcich, 1977). Men were underrepresented in total bank employment. The CEP also found that many women in managerial positions were not in positions that would lead to top executive positions in the bank. These researchers again evaluated the federal regulatory agencies' performance as poor.

Despite its mandated responsibility to oversee employment practices at all federal contractor banks, the Treasury Department's Equal Opportunity Program has been reviewing only one to two percent of these banks annually since 1971. Until June 1974, it has never employed any of the enforcement sanctions at its disposal. At that time, Treasury began issuing show-cause notices requiring banks to explain why enforcement proceedings should not be instituted. Even today, Treasury has yet to use its power to withdraw federal deposits from a single bank. CEP found that Treasury has also approved Affirmative Action Plans (AAPs) that do not meet Department of Labor guidelines. (Simcich, 1977, p. 10)

However, it was noted that in 1974 and 1975 the federal regulatory agencies appeared to become more aggressive in their enforcement of equal employment practices and policies in the banking industry. The overconcentration of women in low-level positions that was seen in the banking industry typifies the employment situation of women across most U.S. industries. Likewise, women are underrepresented in higher-level managerial positions. However, this pattern of sex discrimination is not limited to private businesses.

Opposition and resistance to the implementation of affirmative action and equal employment policies were reported by Rosenbloom (1977) in his analysis of federal equal employment opportunity. As in the banking industry, he found that women were concentrated in low-level positions in the government. He also reported on laws which permitted the exclusion of women from certain jobs regardless of their qualifications and
permitted women to be compensated less than men who were doing the same work.

According to Rosenbloom (1977), administration of the federal EEO program was difficult due to the insensitivity of federal officials to EEO. The Bureau of Personnel Investigations (BPI) which assesses employee suitability, "has, over the years, demonstrated a significant lack of sensitivity to EEO and, in fact, was at the center of the development of a pattern of discrimination within the CSC itself. . . . The BPI, however, was not conducive to hiring and promoting members of minority groups and women" (p. 96).

In spite of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 11246 (as amended by Executive Order 11375), which required equal employment opportunities for women and other protected groups, women are still perceived as possessing characteristics unsuitable for managerial positions and other high-level positions. Lyle (1973) found that both male and female managers working in companies with affirmative action programs evaluated women as

---less committed to a career than men.
---less competitive than men.
---having higher turnover than men.
---having higher absenteeism than men. (p. 59)

These managers also reported that workers "resent or dislike having female supervisors because they are female" (p. 59).

It is not difficult to conceive that the presence of these attitudes and other findings that women are perceived as not possessing managerial

---Civil Service Commission.
characteristics (e.g., Harris, 1977; Schein, 1973, 1975; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974b) combined with feelings of reactance by administrators of affirmative action programs (Rosen & Mericle, 1979) and the phenomena of "organizational homogeneity"¹ (Daddio, 1973) would foster resistance to affirmative action programs promoting the advancement of women into managerial positions. It is likely that the small percentage of management jobs held by women² is a reflection of administrators' reluctance to effectively implement affirmative action programs in their organizations.

Sex Discrimination in Employment

Preemployment discrimination

The previous discussion demonstrates that, in spite of legislation requiring that organizations have fair employment practices and in some cases affirmative action programs, women are still victims of discrimination in employment. Numerous research studies provide evidence of sex discrimination in employment. Heilman and Saruwatari (1979), Harris (1977), Muchinsky and Harris (1977), Cohen and Bunker (1975), Rosen and Jerdee (1974b), and Britton and Thomas (1973) investigated preemployment discrimination. The sex stereotypes of interviewers and recruiters were

¹"Organizational homogeneity" is the philosophy that certain people, because of race, sex, age, or some other nonjob-related characteristic must be excluded from executive positions. Such people are seen as unacceptable and it is not considered "good business" to allow them to hold various leadership positions within the company (Daddio, 1973, p. 156).

²The Council on Economic Priorities (Simcich, 1977) reported that 20% of all managers and administrators in 1975 were women. The majority were concentrated in entry level management positions with only 1% in top executive positions.
studied by Britton and Thomas (1973) and Harris (1977). Britton and Thomas (1973) found that women were perceived as more prone than men to absenteeism and more likely to possess fewer skills required by an employer. The attitudes of interviewers toward women were reflected in the following comments made by them:

Women don't really need to work. They just do it for extra money. They have no stake in the job.

So many women aren't used to working on a job, being responsible to a supervisor, and we get lots of complaints about them.

When they first leave school they have about as many work skills as the boys. Then women work a couple years and get married and have kids and don't have a job. Then they show up on our doorsteps wanting a job. . . . They just don't have what it takes. (p. 185)

Harris (1977) found that job recruiters perceived female job applicants as possessing more interpersonal skills than male applicants. However, female applicants were characterized as possessing less potential for development and less stability than male applicants. They were also perceived as less capable of adequate job performance than male applicants. A sample of the characteristics rated by the recruiters as more characteristic of males than females and vice versa are shown in Appendix B.

The evaluation of job applicants as a function of the applicant's sex and the position for which the applicant was applying was the topic of research by Heilman and Saruwatari (1979), Shinar (1978), Muchinsky and Harris (1977), Cohen and Bunker (1975), and Rosen and Jerdee (1974a). Cohen and Bunker (1975) found a significant interaction between sex of the job applicant and sex orientation of the position. More males were
selected for the position of personnel technician (a traditionally male occupation), while females were more often selected for the female-oriented position of editorial assistant. Muchinsky and Harris (1977) investigated the effect of applicant sex and scholastic standing on the evaluation of job-applicants in sex-typed occupations. Sex discrimination in the selection of applicants, female applicants for "mechanical engineering" positions, while the sex-typed position of editorial assistant was more often given to females. Muchinsky and Harris (1977) tested the effect of sex and academic qualifications on the selection of managerial positions. A significant interaction was found, as well as a significant main effect for sex of applicant. Males received more favorable evaluations for managerial positions than equally qualified female applicants. Females applying for the less demanding "routine" job were rated more favorably than females applying for the position with more challenging and demanding job requirements.
selected for the position of personnel technician (a traditionally male occupation), while females were more often selected for the female-oriented position of editorial assistant. Muchinsky and Harris (1977) investigated the effect of applicant sex and scholastic standing on the evaluation of job applicant résumés in sex-typed occupations. Sex discrimination was found in the three occupations that were studied. When the applicants possessed average scholastic qualifications, female applicants were rated as more suitable for the male-oriented (mechanical engineering) and female-oriented (child development) positions, while the male applicants were perceived as more suitable for the nonsex-typed position of assistant copy editor. The unexpected finding for the male-oriented position was attributed to females in traditionally male academic majors being perceived as "possessing extraordinary capabilities". The unexpected finding for the neutral occupation may have been due to the inappropriate sex-typing of the position. Consistent with Cohen and Bunker (1975), the journalist position was perceived as more appropriate for males than females.

Rosen and Jerdee (1974b) investigated the effects of the applicant's sex and job demands on personnel decisions for managerial jobs. A significant sex of applicant by job demands interaction was found, as well as a significant main effect for sex of applicant. Males received more favorable evaluations for managerial positions than equally qualified female applicants. Females applying for the less demanding "routine" job were rated more favorably than females applying for the position with more challenging and demanding job requirements.
Heilman and Saruwatari (1979) investigated the effect of physical attractiveness and sex on evaluations of job applicants. They found that attractiveness was detrimental for females applying for a managerial position but not a nonmanagerial position. While attractive males were evaluated more favorably for both positions than unattractive males, attractive female applicants were perceived as more qualified than unattractive female applicants for the nonmanagerial position but less qualified for the managerial position. In regard to traits differentially attributed to male and female applicants, male applicants were rated as more masculine, more motivated, less emotional and more decisive than the female applicants.

It is apparent how sex stereotypes are detrimental to the equal employment of women in organizations. The prevalence of stereotypic beliefs among interviewers and recruiters, as well as others making personnel hiring decisions, will limit the access of women to employment opportunities. The belief that women do not possess the managerial characteristics required of individuals in management positions will bar women from these positions, even when they possess and demonstrate qualifications equivalent to males hired for these positions. The impact of nonjob-related characteristics on the evaluation of women for managerial positions is evident in Heilman and Saruwatari's (1979) report on the effect of physical attractiveness. The same detrimental effect is found in the above cited research on sex discrimination due to sex stereotypes, although the effect is more subtle.

Levitin, Quinn and Staines (1971) and Terborg and Ilgen (1975)
refer to the type of discrimination discussed above as access discrimination. That is, "non-job-related limitations placed on an identifiable subgroup at a time a position is filled" (Terborg & Ilgen, 1975, p. 353). In addition to the type of access discrimination discussed above where the appropriateness or suitability of an applicant for a particular position was rated, access discrimination also includes "lower starting salaries, closure of higher skill level jobs and failure to recruit applicants from the subgroup population for certain positions" (p. 353).

**Postemployment discrimination**

The manifestation of access discrimination in lower starting salaries for females compared to males applying for traditionally male jobs is reported by Heilman and Saruwatari (1979), Rosen and Mericle (1979), and Terborg and Ilgen (1975). The results of Terborg and Ilgen's inbasket exercise revealed that female engineers with qualifications equivalent to their male counterparts were given significantly lower starting salaries ($8,836) than male engineers ($9,194).

Heilman and Saruwatari (1979) and Rosen and Mericle (1979) found that the starting salaries recommended by subjects for male and female applicants for managerial positions was affected by the attractiveness of the applicant and the strength of the affirmative action policy under which the applicant was hired, respectively. In the Heilman and Saruwatari study, attractive males received the highest starting salary and attractive females received the lowest starting salary. Unattractive females received higher starting salaries than both unattractive males and attractive females.
Based on the results of Rosen and Mericle (1979), females hired into managerial positions under strong affirmative action policies are likely to receive lower starting salaries than males hired under the same policy. However, males and females hired under weak affirmative action policies are likely to receive equivalent salaries. Actually, Rosen and Mericle found that under the weak affirmative action policy, female applicants received starting salary recommendations of $11,205 compared to $10,830 for male applicants.

The above research results suggest barriers to the advancement of women into traditionally male occupations. Terborg and Ilgen (1975) suggest that offering a low starting salary to job applicants from a particular subgroup may cause the applicant not to accept the job, thereby causing the self-selection of the subgroup out of certain positions.

Treatment discrimination was also investigated by Terborg and Ilgen. This type of discrimination is defined as "invalid differential treatment of subgroup members once they have gained access into the organizations. Slower rates of promotion, assignment to less attractive or less challenging tasks, lower and/or less frequent raises, less training opportunities, etc., represent some forms of treatment discrimination" (p. 353). Terborg and Ilgen found that after being hired and gaining access to the organization, females' second-year salaries were still lower than males', and females were more frequently assigned routine tasks as opposed to challenging tasks.

Studies that have implications for treatment discrimination have been published by Heilman and Guzzo (1978), Jacobson and Koch (1977),
and Hagen and Kahn (1975). Hagen and Kahn (1975) investigated the liking, leadership and exclusion of competent and incompetent men and women. They found that males liked competent females they were observing more than competent females with whom they were interacting. In regard to exclusion from the group, competent females were excluded from the group more often than competent males, and incompetent males were excluded more often than incompetent females.

Heilman and Guzzo (1978) hypothesized that sex discrimination in pay increases and promotions is mediated by causal attributions of success. The success of women is most likely to be attributed to luck, whereas the success of men is attributed to skill and ability (Deaux & Emswiller, 1974). The results of Heilman and Guzzo revealed that the organizational rewards, promotion and pay increase, were distributed according to causal attributions for both men and women. Organizational rewards were rated as more appropriate for both males and females whose performance was attributed to ability rather than luck, task difficulty or effort.

Our thesis was that sex discriminatory reward allocation grows out of the biased explanations used to account for the successful performance of men and women. By demonstrating that men and women were in fact treated identically if the causal basis of their behavior was thought to be the same, we have added strength to this thesis. But, in doing so, we also have pinpointed a necessary target for change efforts in the area of sex discrimination. It appears that attempts to minimize sex discrimination should be focused on intervening into the cognitive processes which give rise to sexually biased causal attributions. (Heilman & Guzzo, 1978, p. 355)

As a precursor to organizational rewards such as pay increases and promotions, performance evaluations are another potential form of treatment discrimination. Jacobson and Koch (1977) studied the evaluation
of leadership performance as a function of the manner in which females were selected as leaders. It was hypothesized that the performance of women selected as leaders on the basis of their sex would be rated less favorably than women selected on the basis of merit. The results of the experiment supported this hypothesis. These results were explained by equity theory.

If a woman is hired or promoted over a man, it may be because she is better qualified and deserves the job. If the man perceives the situation as such, there is no inequity. . . . However, if the man perceives that the woman was given the position simply because of her sex, whether she actually was or not, a state of inequity exists for him. He perceives their inputs as, at best, comparable, yet her outcomes exceed his. (p. 150)

The foregoing discussion of access and treatment discrimination exemplifies the ways in which sex discrimination is manifested in employment practices. The sex stereotypes of recruiters, interviewers, and others making personnel decisions can prevent women from gaining access to managerial positions and other traditionally male occupations (Harris, 1977; Britton & Thomas, 1973). Lower starting salaries for women compared to men also represent a form of sex discrimination (Rosen & Mericle, 1979; Terborg & Ilgen, 1975). After gaining access to organizations, qualified women in managerial positions are likely to be ostracized (Hagen & Kahn, 1975), given routine as opposed to challenging tasks (Terborg & Ilgen, 1975; Rosen & Jodee, 1974b), discriminated against in the distribution of organizational rewards (Heilman & Guzzo, 1978; Rosen & Jodee, 1974a), and have their performance devalued (Jacobson & Koch, 1977).
Affirmative Action Policies and Sex Discrimination

As stated previously, women are stereotyped as possessing nonmanagerial characteristics, and therefore, their advancement into managerial positions is stunted. Since the purpose of affirmative action programs is to correct imbalances in the work force due to past discrimination, such programs facilitate the movement of qualified women into management positions. Organizational resistance to and managerial lack of knowledge about affirmative action policies was discussed above. Because of the stereotypic belief that women do not possess managerial qualities and organizational resistance to affirmative action programs, it is likely that women hired into managerial positions in organizations with strong affirmative actions policies will be perceived as being hired on the basis of their sex.

Rosen and Mericle (1979) and Jacobson and Koch (1977) reported the differential treatment of female leaders and managers as a function of the perceived manner in which they were chosen for their positions. When they were chosen for a leadership position on the basis of sex, the performance of women was devalued (Jacobson & Koch, 1977); however, when selected on the basis of merit, women received more favorable performance evaluations. The authors discussed the implications their findings have for the perception of affirmative action programs.

when a woman is perceived to have obtained a desirable position of leadership . . . on the basis of a relatively arbitrary and unfair selection process, evaluation of her leadership performance . . . suffers. . . . The irony of affirmative action programs is that many people perceive a woman's being hired or promoted to be inequitable when the rationale behind affirmative action was restoration of equity. (p. 155)
Just as equity was restored through the devaluation of performance (Jacobson & Koch, 1977) and through the allocation of organizational rewards (Rosen & Mericle, 1979), it is predicted that the perceived inequity resulting from the hiring of women under affirmative action programs will be restored to equity by attributing unfavorable characteristics to women. Based on these findings by Rosen and Mericle (1979) and Jacobson and Koch (1977), it seems reasonable to expect women hired under strong affirmative action policies to be perceived as being less qualified and possessing fewer managerial skills than women hired under less provocative employment policies.

The proposed study will investigate the characteristics attributed to males and females hired into managerial positions under three different employment policies. It is predicted that women hired under the strong affirmative action policy will be rated less favorably than men hired under the same policy and women hired under weaker employment policies.

Research on the differential characteristics attributed to female managers hired under affirmative action policies and equal employment policies will extend current research in two ways. First, it will identify the characteristics that are attributed to women which may cause the unequal distribution of rewards (e.g., salary or performance appraisal) when women are perceived as being hired on the basis of their sex. Secondly, the majority of research on sex stereotypes in employment stresses the impact of these stereotypes on access discrimination. That

---

1Equal employment policies do not take sex into consideration and are, therefore, perceived as more equitable and fair.
is, how stereotypic beliefs bar women from certain jobs, particularly managerial jobs. The proposed study will have implications for the practice of treatment discrimination as opposed to access discrimination. It will focus on the stereotypes that potentially bar women from deserved promotions and other organizational rewards.
METHODOLOGY

Independent Variables

The sample consisted of 64 male managers attending supervisory training courses in two midwestern universities' continuing education programs. Because of the small sample of female managers (N=7), a sex of subject factor was not included in the experiment of design.

The first independent variable in this study is the type of policy under which personnel decisions are made. Three types of policies were used: 1) affirmative action policy, 2) equal employment opportunity policy, and 3) a control condition in which no mention of equal employment opportunity or affirmative action policies are made. The four policy statements are shown in Appendix C. It will be noted that the affirmative action policy suggests that race and sex be taken into consideration in personnel decisions, while the equal employment opportunity policy does not.

The sex of a newly-hired executive is the second independent variable. The subjects were asked to make trait attributions about this person.

The third independent variable is the type of job for which the individual is hired. The two positions chosen for this study are bank vice-president and assistant to the bank vice-president. A bank was chosen as the work site for two reasons. The first reason is banks have a documented history of discriminatory practices (Smoich, 1977; Alexander & Sapery, 1972). Secondly, a substantial number of bank managers attend
continuing education courses, and the use of this work setting in the study, therefore, increases the relevance of the exercise to the subjects. The positions of vice-president and assistant to the bank vice-president were chosen, because women are more likely to be hired into an "assistant to" position and denied a vice-president position. Past research has shown that, although women are increasingly being promoted into and hired into administrative positions, they are predominately located in positions with no opportunity for advancement and where they have little responsibility and authority (Simcich, 1977; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974b).

Dependent Variables

The trait attribution scale that was used for this study is shown in Appendix C. The questionnaire is a modified version of the questionnaire developed by Rosen and Jerdee (1976). Harris (1977) demonstrated its reliability in assessing sex stereotypes and managerial traits. The appropriateness of the use of this instrument for the proposed study is verified by the results of Schein (1973) and Groverman et al. (1972). The sex role stereotypic characteristics identified by these researchers are represented in the questionnaire developed by Rosen and Jerdee (1976). The managerial characteristics identified by Schein (1973) are also reflected in the instrument. Therefore, the questionnaire is an appropriate instrument to use in the assessment of sex role stereotypes and managerial traits.

The trait attribution scale was used to obtain ratings of the perceived managerial skills of both the newly-hired individual and the
bank president who made the hiring decision. The subjects also made a prediction regarding the new manager's job performance and indicated which applicant he or she would have selected for the position.

Ratings of the perceived management skill of the individual making the personnel selection decision were obtained to determine the traits attributed to individuals working under different types of equal employment policies. Only the performance capacity scale of the questionnaire was used for these ratings. Three of the four scales of the questionnaire were used to obtain the ratings of characteristics attributed to the hired applicants. The three scales that were used are, 1) performance capacity (items 1-13), 2) stability (items 14-23), and 3) potential for development (items 24-37). These are the three scales which contain the managerial traits. The interpersonal skills scale of the original questionnaire (Rosen & Jerdee, 1976) was not used.

In addition to the omission of the interpersonal skills scale, other changes were made in the original questionnaire to increase its usefulness in the present study. Twelve items were deleted from the three scales (senile, cranky, concerned with appearance, accident prone, prone to absenteeism, steady, rigid, dogmatic, easily upset, healthy, strong and nervous). Item 12, qualified, was added to the performance capacity scale. All of the items except likely to quit, impulsive and emotional, represent desirable managerial characteristics; therefore, the ratings for these three items were reversed in the data analysis.
To eliminate the possibility of a sex of experimenter effect, the data was collected by males. Each subject was given a case study which included 1) a statement specifying the organization's affirmative action policy, a statement specifying the organization's equal employment opportunity policy, or (for the control groups) no mention of either equal employment nor affirmative action, 2) bogus résumés of five candidates for two bank positions, 3) job descriptions for the two positions, 4) an indication of the company president's selection decision by highlighting the résumé of the hired applicants, and 5) three rating scales consisting of managerial traits and skills. A sample of the case study is shown in Appendix C. Although four memos are shown in the Appendix, only one or neither of these was presented to any one subject. The subjects were asked to rate the newly-hired individuals and the president on the managerial skills scale. The subjects were also asked to make two ratings regarding the selection decision. First, how well she or he expects the new executive to perform the job, and secondly, which manager he or she would have hired.

To strengthen the type of job effect, each subject rated a male and female for one of the two positions. One-half of the subjects rated a female hired for the vice-president position and a male hired for the assistant to the vice-president position. The other half of the subjects rated a female hired as assistance to the vice-president and a male hired for the vice-president position. Nesting the sex of hired applicant variable with the type of position variable will increased the
number of subjects per condition as well as strengthened the manipulation. If each subject was presented only one type of job, the relationship between the two types of job would not be perceived by the subjects, and the purpose of the variable would, therefore, be defeated.

Résumés

As shown in Appendix C, each subject received five résumés. Although each subject was concerned with only two résumés, five résumés were included in the case study to heighten the reality of the exercise. The résumé which was highlighted indicating that the individual has been hired for the position of vice-president in charge of lending was the résumé of either Philip T. Michaels or Phyllis T. Michaels; the résumé of either James M. Ross or Joan M. Ross was indicated as the résumé of the individual selected for the position of assistant to the vice-president. It should be obvious that these individuals possess the best qualifications for the jobs. The other applicants have less experience and lower grade point averages (GPAs) than the hired applicants. The subjects in the condition where a female applicant is hired for the vice-president position and a male is hired for the assistant position received the résumés of Phyllis Michaels, James M. Ross, Harold Miner, Pamela Connors and Chris Bradford. The subjects in the other condition where a male applicant is hired for the vice-president position and a female applicant is hired for the assistant position received the résumés Phillip Michaels, Joan Ross, Harold Miner, Pamela Connors and Chris Bradford. Since the applicants hired for the positions are equally
qualified, any differences in ratings had to be attributed to the applicant's sex.

Attributional Effects

The relationship between stereotypes and attributions is stated by Gurwitz and Dodge (1977) as follows:

If a group is one for which a stereotype exists, then the entire constellation of traits that constitutes the stereotype may be attributed to individual group members, particularly if little else is known about them besides their group membership. The process of inferring qualities of an individual from presumed qualities of the group serves to perpetuate a vicious cycle of stereotyping: Traits are attributed to the individual because of the stereotype, and the stereotyper's belief in the stereotype is strengthened because he thinks that still another person's characteristics are stereotype-consistent. (p. 495)

Sex stereotypes have, indeed, been found to influence attributions made about individuals. In studying the effect of sex on attributions of causality, Feldman-Summers and Kiesler (1974) asked subjects to make attributions to ability, motivation, task difficulty and luck. Females were perceived as more motivated than males by both male and female subjects. In regard to ability and task difficulty, male subjects perceived females as less able and having an easier task than males, while female subjects perceived females as having a harder task than males.

Deaux and Emswiller (1974) investigated evaluations of performance by males and females on both a masculine task and a feminine task. They found that the males' performance was attributed to skill in both tasks, while equivalent performance on both tasks by the female stimulus person was attributed to luck.
Based on the above findings and stereotypic notions of male superiority, it appears that the unexpected outcome of female success was attributed to motivation or luck, whereas the expected outcome of male success was attributed to ability or skill. Feather and Simon (1971a, 1971b) and Frieze and Weiner (1971) also found that unexpected outcomes were more likely to be attributed to luck than ability, while expected outcomes were more likely to be attributed to ability.

The attributions discussed above can be tested in the present study through an analysis of the ability and motivation items in the questionnaire. The male applicant selected for the vice-president position was expected to receive higher ratings on the ability items than the female applicant for the same position, and the female applicant for the position was expected to receive higher ratings on the motivation item. Identical expectations were held for the male and female applicants selected for the assistant vice-president position.

Rose (1978) suggests that in evaluating the effect of the evaluatee's sex on a personnel decision, the sexual context of the job as well as the evaluatee's sex must be taken into consideration. Therefore, it is necessary to study the attributions that were used to explain the ratings given to the applicants as a result of the cross-sex interactions.

Placed in the context of Kelley’s attributions theory of multiple sufficient causes, the abilities or qualifications of the female performers in Deaux and Emswiller (1974) were discounted and the cause of the females' performance was attributed to external factors, such as luck. In the present study it was predicted that when there is an external event
which sufficiently explains the selection of the female applicant, this external event will be perceived as the basis for the selection decision and the female applicants' qualifications (internal event) will be discounted as a factor in the selection decision. Therefore, it was predicted that in the affirmative action and equal employment conditions the employment policy was perceived as the cause of the selection decision, and attributions were made accordingly. For instance, the female applicant in these conditions would be rated lower than the female applicant in the control condition. In this case (the control condition), the female applicant would be perceived more positively. Kelley's model further proposes that augmentation results when a person is perceived as overcoming an inhibitory force. In the control condition of the present study, it was predicted that the female applicant would be perceived as overcoming barriers that prevent the achievement of women in management positions. Therefore, her qualifications would be viewed more positively by the evaluators in the control condition than in the affirmative action or equal employment conditions.

Similarly, male applicants selected under the affirmative action and equal employment conditions would be perceived as overcoming the barrier faced by men when confronted with employment policies which advocate hiring women into management positions. Based on the findings of Deaux and Emshwiller (1974), Feather and Simon (1971a, 1971b), and Frieze and Weiner (1971), when the subjects are presented two possible causes for male performance, they will make attributions to internal factors rather than external factors. Therefore, it was predicted that the qualifications
and abilities of the male would be perceived as the cause of his selection for the position.

Based on Kelley's theory of multiple sufficient causes explained above, a significant type of policy by sex of person hired interaction was expected for both the vice-president position and the assistant vice-president position. Stronger effects were expected where the female is hired for the vice-president position and the male is hired as her assistant, compared to the condition where the female is hired as assistant to a male vice-president. This prediction was based on the results of Rose and Andiappan (1978) and Rosen and Jerdee (1974b).

Rosen and Jerdee (1974b) studied the effects of applicant sex and job demands on the evaluation of applicants for two managerial positions. They found that when equally qualified males and females were evaluated on their suitability for a challenging managerial position, females were evaluated less favorably than when the applicants were applying for a less challenging managerial position. Although female applicants for the less challenging job had higher acceptance rates than female applicants for the more demanding position, they (female applicants for the less demanding job) still had lower acceptance rates than the male applicants for the less demanding position. Therefore, the present study predicted that the female selected for the assistant vice-president position would be rated more favorably than the female selected for the vice-president position.

Rose and Andiappan (1978) investigated the effect of applicant sex on the decision to hire when the potential subordinates were of the same
sex versus the opposite sex. Their finding of more positive ratings for applicants who would be supervising subordinates of the same sex will not be investigated in the present study. The subjects in the present study evaluated only mixed-sex pairs of individuals, where one of the pair had been selected for the vice-president and one selected for the assistant vice-president position. Of importance to the present study are the evaluations of cross-sex applicants and subordinates. In their estimations of the probability of 1) successful job performance, 2) a long career, and 3) satisfying subordinates, the male subjects gave higher ratings for male applicants with female subordinates than for female applicants with male subordinates. The female subjects rated the male applicants with female subordinates higher on probability of satisfying subordinates than they rated the female applicants with male subordinates. The female applicants with male subordinates received higher ratings on the other two dimensions.

These findings by Rose and Andiappan (1978) along with Rosen and Jerdee's (1974b) results provide support for the prediction that there would be a significant sex of hired person by position interaction.

In addition to making judgments about the persons hired for the positions of vice president and assistant vice-president, the subjects were asked to make inferences about the person making the hiring decision. The predicted attributions made about the bank president making the decision are based on Jones and Davis' (1965) correspondent inference theory. The purpose of the theory is to "clarify the major variables involved in extracting information about dispositions from observed acts" (Jones &
Correspondence refers to the extent to which a person's behavior departs from the norm or the expected behavior and the information that is gained about the person from observing this behavior. As the effects of behavior deviate more markedly from what the average person would do or norms say should be done, we can infer more about the person relative to other people and our attributions become more correspondent. (Schneider, Hastorf & Ellsworth, 1979, p. 49)

Stated in terms directly related to the present study, "correspondence should be high when perceived choice is high and the prior probability of the act occurring is low" (Jones & Harris, 1967, p. 2). Therefore, in the present study when the personnel decision was made under the affirmative action policy and the female applicant was selected, the bank president was expected to be perceived as having little freedom or choice in making the decision. This exemplifies low correspondence. Higher correspondence was expected when the female applicant was chosen under the equal employment policy, and even higher correspondence is expected when the female applicant was selected in the control condition where no employment policy was specified. Correspondence is measured by the extent to which attributions vary with the perceived amount of choice.

Jones and Davis' (1965) model also implies that correspondence increases when the behavior departs from the norm or is an unexpected behavior (Schneider et al., 1979; Jones & McGillis, 1976). That is, correspondence increases when the prior probability of the act occurring is low. Thus, was expected that when the male applicant was selected under the affirmative action policy, correspondence would be high. Correspondence was expected to be lower under the equal employment policy and the
control condition when the male applicant is selected, because it is expected that males rather than females would be hired for managerial positions.

In summary, it was expected that when an unexpected personnel decision was made, there would be a positive correlation between perceived choice and attributions about the person making the hiring decision.

Hypotheses

The following predictions were made.

Sex of subject

It was predicted that there would be no significant difference between the ratings of male subjects and female subjects in any of the conditions. This prediction was based on past findings of Heilman and Saruwatari (1979), Heilman and Guzzo (1978) and Rose (1978), where no significant difference in attributions toward females was found between male and female raters. Similarly, no significant interactions were predicted for this factor. Whereas, no significant difference in ratings due to sex of subject was expected, this factor was included merely as a control measure. If the data analysis supported this prediction, the ratings for the male and female subjects would be collapsed in performing the additional analyses.

Type of policy

It was predicted that there would be no significant main effect for this factor. However, based on the findings of Rosen and Mericle (1979) and Kelley's theory of multiple sufficient causes, a significant type of
policy by sex of hired person interaction was predicted. No significant

differences in ratings were expected for males across the three conditions.
However, it was predicted that the ratings for females would be most favor­
able under the control condition and least favorable under the affirma­
tive action policy condition.

Sex of hired person

For the vice-president position a significant difference in ratings

for males and females was predicted. Males were expected to receive more
favorable ratings than females. This was based on findings of differen­
tial ratings for males and females considered for managerial positions
(Rose & Andiappan, 1978; Harris, 1977; Terborg & Ilgen, 1975; Rosen &

Type of job

An overall significant difference between the ratings for the vice­
president and the assistant vice-president was not expected, because the

case study instrument was designed so that the qualifications of Phyllis/
Philip Michaels and James/Joan Ross match the job requirements for the
vice-president position and the assistant vice-president position, re­
spectively. Therefore, the applicants selected for the two positions were
equally qualified for their respective jobs.

Based on the findings of Rose and Andiappan (1978) and Rosen and
Jerdee (1974b), a significant difference between the vice-president rat­
ings for the male applicant and the female applicant was predicted. It was
expected that the male would receive more favorable ratings than the
female. No significant difference in ratings was predicted for the male and female applicants for the assistant vice-president position.

The type of policy, as well as the sex of the hired person, was expected to effect the ratings due to the type of job. Females hired under the affirmative action policy were expected to receive less favorable ratings for the vice-president position than females hired under the equal employment condition. Females selected for the vice-president position under the control condition were expected to be rated more favorably than those hired under either of the other two conditions. Female applicants selected for the assistant vice-president position were expected to receive more favorable ratings than those hired for the vice-president position under the same policy. These predictions were based on Rosen and Mericle's (1979) finding of managerial reactance and Rosen and Jerdee (1974b).

The ratings for the males were expected to be fairly consistent across policies and positions. Although Rosen and Jerdee (1974a) found slightly higher acceptance rates for males applying for a routine job versus a demanding job, both positions in the present study are challenging and demanding; therefore, a difference in ratings for males due to type of job was not expected.

Person making hiring decision

In the analysis of the ratings for the president making the hiring decision, a significant main effect was predicted for the sex of hired person factor. Ratings were expected to be higher when the male applicant was hired than when the female applicant was hired. It was predicted that the president would be perceived as a better decision-maker when he or
she hired a male for the vice-president position.

A significant type of policy by sex of hired person interaction was predicted. Less favorable characteristics would be attributed to the person hiring females under affirmative action and equal employment policy conditions than one who hires males under these conditions. It was expected that those employers showing independence and risk-taking behavior through noncompliance with organizational policy would be perceived as possessing desirable managerial characteristics.

Data Analysis

**Vice-president and assistant vice-president ratings**

A 3 (type of employment policy) X 2 (sex of hired person) analysis of variance was performed on the ratings for the vice-president and assistant vice-president. Due to the design of the experiment, an analysis of variance in the type of job factor was not possible. Therefore, a series of t-tests were performed to analyze the relationship between type of job, sex of hired person and policy. The ANOVAs and t-tests were performed on the scale scores. Scale scores were computed by averaging the responses for the items within each scale. To further test the above mentioned hypotheses based on attribution theory, ANOVAs were performed on those items which measure ability and motivation. The items on performance expectations (item 38) were correlated with the ratings (item 1 through item 37). It was predicted that these items would be positively correlated with performance expectations. The subjects should rate the hired person more favorably if he or she feels that the most
qualified person was selected and if he or she expects the person to perform the job well. A regression analysis was also performed, with the three scale scores as predictors and item 38 as the criterion. This revealed which scales and characteristics were most important to the subjects in predicting future performance.

Bank president ratings

A 3 X 2 analysis of variance was also performed on the ratings for the person making the selection decision. A frequency distribution was computed for items 14a and 15b to determine which applicants the subjects felt should have been selected for each position. Items 15 and 16 permitted a manipulation check to determine if the sex of the applicant and the employment policy were salient to the subject.

The correspondence between the perceived choice of the bank president and the attributions made about the president were analyzed through correlation of the scale score for items 1-13 with item 15. Within sex groups, it was expected, based on correspondent inference theory, that the correlation between the scale score and item 15 would be lowest when the female applicant was selected under the affirmative action condition and highest under the control condition. Conversely, it was expected that for males the correlation between the scale score and item 15 would be highest under the affirmative action condition and lowest under the control condition.
RESULTS

Since the sex of subject factor was eliminated due to the small female sample, the resulting experimental design was a 2 (sex of hired person) X 3 (type of employment policy) design with type of job crossed within sex of hired person.

The results of the data analysis will be presented below. First, the main effects and interactions for the type of employment policy factor will be presented. Second, the main effects of the sex variables within each type of job will be shown. This will be followed by the results of the analysis of the job factor. Fourth, the results of the ratings for the bank president who made the hiring decision will be presented, and last, the relationship of the performance measures to the other dependent variables will be shown.

Type of Policy

Main effect

Analyses of variance were performed on the scale scores and the expected performance ratings for the three employment policy conditions. As predicted, there was no significant main effect for type of employment policy. However, a significant type of policy by sex of applicant interaction was expected. It was predicted that while the ratings for males would be equivalent across all three employment policies, the ratings for females would differ. This hypothesis was partially supported. There
was no significant difference in the ratings for the males hired under the three different employment policies. The ANOVA summary table for the mean ratings for the three scales for the vice-president position and the assistant vice-president position are shown by policy in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. The means for the scales are shown in Figures 1 and 2.

**Policy by sex of applicant interaction for vice-president position**

It can be seen from Table 1 that the expected difference in ratings for the females hired for the vice-president position was not manifested. It was predicted that the female hired under the affirmative action employment policy would be evaluated less favorably than the females hired under the other two policies. Likewise, the female hired under the equal employment policy was expected to receive lower ratings than the female hired as vice-president by an organization with no visible employment policy regarding equal opportunity employment (the control group).

Although there were no significant differences in the ratings for females across the three employment policies, it is interesting to note that, contrary to the predicted effect, the female vice-president in the affirmative action condition never received the lowest rating of the three policy conditions. This suggests that subjects may have been sensitive to the manipulation of the employment policy and, therefore, gave more favorable ratings than they would have if no employment policy was stated.

A comparison of the ratings in the affirmative action and control conditions for the performance capacity and the potential for development scales suggests this process—evaluation apprehension (Rosenberg, 1965; 1969)—was in operation. On both these scales the female vice-president
Table 1. ANOVA summary table for mean scale and expected performance ratings for vice-president

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance capacity scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>2.937</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.081</td>
<td>1.915</td>
<td>3.910</td>
<td>2.673*</td>
<td>3.239</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>6.881</td>
<td>2.843*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stability scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.813</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential for development scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.813</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance rating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.813</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.813</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.754</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .10.
Figure 1. Mean scale ratings for various conditions.
Table 2. ANOVA summary table for mean scale and expected performance ratings for assistant vice-president

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Performance capacity scale</th>
<th>Stability scale</th>
<th>Potential for development scale</th>
<th>Performance rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>1.258</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1.798</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy X sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.004</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.768</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.735</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Mean scale ratings for assistant vice-president.
in the affirmative action condition received higher ratings than the female vice-president in the control condition.

**Manipulation check**

Further support for this evaluation apprehension explanation comes from the results of the analysis of the item, "How much pressure do you think the bank president was under in making the decision?" A one-way analysis of variance revealed a significant difference (F=5.443, p < .01) in the ratings on this item for the type of policy variable. The mean ratings for each condition are as follows: affirmative action condition, X̄=6.52; equal employment condition, X̄=4.67; control condition, X̄=4.38. The results of the between-policy analysis of this item within each level of the sex of hired person variable are shown in Figure 3. This demonstrates that the bank president was rated as being under pressure in the affirmative action condition regardless of whether he or she hired the male as vice-president or the female as vice-president. For male applicants, the difference between the perceived amount of pressure the president was under in the affirmative action condition as compared to the other two conditions was significant at the .05 level. For the females, there was a significant difference at the .10 level. A one-way analysis of variance with sex as the independent variable was also performed on the item assessing the perceived amount of pressure under which the president made the decision. This revealed no significant difference in the amount of perceived pressure depending on the sex of the person hired. This manipulation check verifies the effectiveness of the policy statements.
Figure 3. Mean ratings for amount of pressure.
differentiating the employment condition under which the president was making the hiring decision. It is obvious that the subjects associated the policy condition with the bank president's decision to hire the chosen individuals.

Another manipulation check was performed by the analysis of the item, "On what basis do you feel the president made these selection decisions?" This analysis showed a significant ($F=2.512$, $p < .10$) difference between employment policies with the bank president being perceived as giving more consideration to the applicant's sex under the affirmative action condition ($X=1.76$) than under either the equal employment condition ($X=1.39$) or the control condition ($X=1.25$).

A comparison of the ratings for the performance capacity scale for the females in the affirmative action condition with the males in the same employment policy condition (Figure 1) lends some support to the notion that subjects were experiencing evaluation apprehension and were more sensitive to the affirmative action condition when a female vice-president was hired than when a male vice-president was hired under the same condition. The females received higher ratings than the males on all three scales. However, the consistency of this pattern of sex differences across policy conditions suggests that it is more of a sex effect than a policy effect.
Policy by sex interaction for assistant vice-president position

No prediction was made regarding differential policy ratings for the female hired for the assistant vice-president position. However, the findings are consistent with the hypotheses that 1) the male and female assistant vice-presidents would be rated similarly, and 2) there would be no significant difference in the ratings for males across the three policy conditions. The interaction of the sex of the assistant vice-president variable with the type of employment policy will be discussed later. As these results are a function of the type of position, it seems appropriate to discuss them in that section of the paper.

Sex of Hired Person

Vice-president

The analyses of variance performed on the items, scale scores and expected performance ratings for the person hired as vice-president yielded no significant differences in the scale scores or performance ratings at the .05 level of significance. However, there was a noteworthy difference ($F=2.843, p < .10$) between the ratings of expected performance for the female vice-president ($\bar{X}=7.37$) and the male vice-president ($\bar{X}=6.70$). The mean ratings for each sex group on the four dependent measures are

---

1 Although, according to published research, an alpha of .05 is the maximum significance level generally used by experimenters as a basis for choosing to reject a null hypothesis (Edwards, 1972), an alpha of .10 was occasionally used in the data analysis. Due to the exploratory nature of this study, it is justifiable to recognize an alpha of .10 as an appropriate level of significance.
shown in Table 3. There were three scale items on which the ratings for the female selected as vice-president differed significantly ($p < .05$) from the ratings for the male hired as vice-president. These items were 1) stable, 2) ambitious, and 3) capable of learning. The female vice-president received more favorable ratings than the male vice-president on all of these items. These results are contrary to the previously stated hypotheses where it was predicted that the female vice-president would be evaluated less favorably than the male vice-president.

Table 3. Mean scale and expected performance ratings by sex and position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice-president</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>6.6107</td>
<td>7.0333</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>6.6242</td>
<td>7.1033</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>6.9756</td>
<td>7.4100</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected performance</td>
<td>6.6970</td>
<td>7.3667</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant vice-president</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>6.4406</td>
<td>6.3282</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>6.5091</td>
<td>6.8067</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>6.8745</td>
<td>6.5619</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected performance</td>
<td>6.3333</td>
<td>5.8667</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyses of covariance were performed with three covariates: 1) age, 2) number of years as a manager, and 3) number of years of experience hiring personnel. This analysis resulted in a significant main effect ($F=3.838, p < .05$) for the sex of vice-president variable on the stability scale. This analysis is shown in Table 4. The ratings on the other two scales were significant at the .10 level: performance capacity ($F=2.778$) and potential for development ($F=3.327$). Of the covariates, the managers' years of experience was significant ($p < .02$) for all three scales.

Based on Feldman-Summers and Kiesler (1974) and the notion that "those who are number two try harder", it was predicted that females hired for the vice-president position would be rated higher on the motivation item than males hired for the same position. The analysis of covariance controlling for age, years as a manager and years of experience hiring personnel resulted in a significant main effect ($F=2.787, p < .10$) for sex. Two of the covariates were significant at the .04 level: age ($F=4.419$) and years of experience hiring personnel ($F=4.348$). Thus the variance in the age of the managers and their years of hiring experience effects these findings related to sex differences. The age of the managers ranged from 21 to 59, and the managers had 2 to 28 years of experience in hiring personnel. A cross-tabulation of the significant covariates with mean ratings are shown in Tables 5 and 6. This finding of a significant difference in the mean ratings of motivation for the female vice-president and the male vice-president supports past research on the effect of sex on causal attributions. As expected, the female vice-
Table 4. Analysis of covariance summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance capacity scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.892</td>
<td>2.062</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.504</td>
<td>5.350</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.895</td>
<td>2.778</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stability scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.177</td>
<td>8.241</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.301</td>
<td>3.483</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.740</td>
<td>3.838</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential for development scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.852</td>
<td>2.493</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.477</td>
<td>9.485</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.142</td>
<td>3.327</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Cross-tabulation of subjects' age with sex of hired person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of hired person</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicated in parentheses are the number of managers in each category.*

Table 6. Cross-tabulation of subjects' years of hiring experience with sex of hired person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of hired person</th>
<th>Years of experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicated in parentheses are the number of managers in each category.*
president received a higher mean rating ($\bar{X}=7.87$) than the male vice-
president ($\bar{X}=7.33$).

Previous research on attributions of causality also suggests that, whereas successful performance by women is attributed to motivation and effort, the success of men is likely to be attributed to ability. Therefore, it was predicted that the male hired as vice-president would be evaluated more favorably on measures of ability than the female hired as vice-president. The results did not support this prediction. The male vice-president was not rated significantly higher than the female vice-president on any of the items which measure ability. These are item 13 (able to work under pressure) and item 35 (able to exert leadership). On these items there was no significant difference in the ratings for the male and female vice-president.

It is interesting to note that on those items for which there was a significant difference ($p < .05$) in the ratings for the male vice-president and the female vice-president, the female vice-president received the more favorable ratings. Two of the three items for which there was a significant difference—ambitious ($F=4.205$, $p < .05$) and capable of learning ($F=4.174$, $p < .05$)—lend further support to the prediction that female success tends to be attributed to motivational factors. Ambition is synonymous with motivation (Sisson, 1969), and motivation is regarded as an integral part of learning (e.g., Bandura, 1977; Hilgard & Bower, 1975; Hilgard, 1956). Item 22, stable, is the third item for which there was a significant ($F=5.845$, $p < .02$) difference in ratings. The male vice-president received a mean rating of 6.67 and the female vice-
president received a mean rating of 7.67. This finding contradicts past research which indicates that females are perceived as less stable than males (e.g., Harris, 1977). Perhaps, the female vice-president's résumé reflects a pattern of stability in her work behavior that is atypical for women workers. Therefore, she is perceived as being very stable "for a woman". However, the same employment pattern for the male vice-president is not perceived as unusual and is, therefore, rated more objectively.

Assistant vice-president

As predicted, the female hired for the assistant vice-president position was rated the same as the male hired for the assistant vice-president position. In Figure 2 are shown the mean scale ratings for the male and female assistant vice-president under each type of employment policy. Although no significant difference in scale scores and performance ratings was expected, it was predicted, as it was for the vice-president ratings, that the male assistant vice-president's achievements would be attributed to ability, while the female assistant vice-president's achievements would be attributed to motivation. Therefore, the male assistant vice-president was expected to receive higher ratings for items 13 and 35 (able to work under pressure and able to exert leadership) than the female assistant vice-president, and the female assistant vice-president was expected to receive higher ratings for item 4 (motivation). This prediction was not supported by the results. Consistent with the scale scores and expected performance ratings, there was no significant difference
in the motivation and ability ratings for the female and male assistant vice-presidents.

Type of Job

Differences in the mean ratings for the two positions were analyzed using \( t \)-tests. It was predicted that there would be no significant difference between the overall ratings for the vice-president position and the assistant vice-president position. There was no significant difference (\( p < .05 \)) in the expected performance ratings for the two positions. However, the mean ratings on the three scales were significantly different at the .05 level. The mean ratings for the two positions on the three scales and the performance measures are shown in Table 7.

Policy effect

To further analyze these differences in ratings due to the type of job, \( t \)-tests were performed for the four measures in all conditions. For the employment policies, the dependent variables in the affirmative action condition were significantly different at the \( p < .10 \) level. Differences in the ratings for the other policy conditions did not reach this level of significance. A comparison of the \( t \)-values for the equal employment condition with those for the control condition revealed greater differences between the mean ratings for vice-president and assistant vice-president in the equal employment condition. This result suggests that the stronger the policy, the more likely the subjects will evaluate the person hired for the vice-president position more favorably than the
Table 7. \(t\)-test for mean scale and expected performance ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean rating</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>(t)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td>6.8113</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant vice-president</td>
<td>6.3834</td>
<td>1.376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td>6.8484</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant vice-president</td>
<td>6.6344</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential for development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td>7.1540</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant vice-president</td>
<td>6.7277</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td>7.1754</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant vice-president</td>
<td>6.8772</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

person hired for the assistant vice-president position.

**Sex effect**

Analyses (\(t\)-tests) were performed comparing the ratings for each position by sex. These results are shown in Table 8 and represent cross-sex evaluations. That is, all of the subjects evaluated either 1) a male vice-president and a female assistant vice-president or 2) a female vice-president and a male assistant vice-president. While there was a significant difference \((p < .05)\) in the mean ratings for the female vice-president and the male assistant vice-president on all four dependent
Table 8.  $t$-test for cross-sex ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male vice-president</th>
<th>Female assistant vice-president</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>6.6107</td>
<td>6.4406</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>6.6242</td>
<td>6.5091</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>6.9156</td>
<td>6.8745</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected performance</td>
<td>7.0690</td>
<td>7.2069</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female vice-president</th>
<th>Male assistant vice-president</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>7.0333</td>
<td>6.3282</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>7.1033</td>
<td>6.8067</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>7.4000</td>
<td>6.5619</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected performance</td>
<td>7.2593</td>
<td>6.5185</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

variables, none of the dependent measures reached this level of significance when a male was hired for the vice-president position and a female was hired for the assistant vice-president position. It appears from these findings along with the results of the analysis of the policy effects that the difference in the mean ratings for the vice-president and assistant vice-president positions are due to the affirmative action policy condition and the condition where the female was hired as vice-president and male as assistant vice-president.
Policy by sex effect

To further investigate these differences due to type of job, t-tests were performed for each of the six conditions (two levels of sex of hired person and three levels of policy) in the experimental design. These results are shown in Table 9. In the condition where a female was hired as vice-president under the affirmative action policy, the mean ratings for the female vice-president and the male hired as assistant vice-president were significantly different ($t < .05$) on three of the four dependent variables. On the performance capacity scale, the female vice-president received a mean rating of 7.16 while the male assistant vice-president received a mean rating of 6.14 ($t=2.50$, $p < .05$). On the stability measure, the females ($\bar{x}=7.19$) were again rated more favorably ($t=3.45$, $p < .01$) than the males ($\bar{x}=6.57$). In rating how well they expected the individuals to perform their jobs, the subjects rated the female vice-president ($\bar{x}=7.27$) significantly higher ($t=2.51$, $p < .05$) than the male assistant vice-president ($\bar{x}=6.00$). This same level of significance was reached in only one other condition. In the control condition where subjects evaluated a female as vice-president and a male as assistant vice-president, the female vice-president ($\bar{x}=7.03$) was rated significantly ($t=2.31$, $p < .05$) higher than the male assistant vice-president ($\bar{x}=6.25$) on the performance capacity measure.

Within-job effects

The results of the analysis of the sex by policy interaction for the vice-president position were presented earlier. However, a discussion of the results of the sex by policy analysis of variance for the
Table 9. *t*-test for cross-sex ratings within each condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female vice-president</th>
<th>Male assistant vice-president</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female vice-president and male assistant vice-president</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>7.1603</td>
<td>6.1410</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>7.1917</td>
<td>6.5667</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>7.5357</td>
<td>6.5298</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected performance</td>
<td>7.2727</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>6.8632</td>
<td>6.6581</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>6.7667</td>
<td>6.5778</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>7.3333</td>
<td>6.7302</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected performance</td>
<td>6.8571</td>
<td>6.4286</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>7.0342</td>
<td>6.2479</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>7.2222</td>
<td>7.2555</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>7.2857</td>
<td>6.4365</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected performance</td>
<td>7.5556</td>
<td>7.2222</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male vice-president and female assistant vice-president</th>
<th>Male vice-president</th>
<th>Female assistant vice-president</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>6.5128</td>
<td>6.1880</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>6.5667</td>
<td>6.778</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>7.116</td>
<td>7.1190</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected performance</td>
<td>7.1250</td>
<td>7.3750</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>6.3077</td>
<td>6.1111</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>6.5000</td>
<td>6.2000</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>6.6270</td>
<td>6.5635</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected performance</td>
<td>7.7143</td>
<td>7.2857</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>6.8513</td>
<td>6.7897</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>6.7333</td>
<td>6.5333</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>6.9381</td>
<td>6.9143</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected performance</td>
<td>6.7143</td>
<td>7.0714</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assistant vice-president position was delayed until this section of the paper in order to present the results as a function of the type of job factor as well as the superior-subordinate relationship.

As was the case with the analysis of variance performed on the mean ratings for the sex by policy interaction for the vice-president position, the analysis of variance performed on the ratings for the assistant vice-president position revealed no significant sex by policy interaction for any of the dependent measures. These results are shown in Table 2. A significant difference in the ratings on the scales and expected performance measure for female vice-presidents across the three policy conditions was predicted. As shown in the ANOVA summary table for the sex by policy analysis of variance for the vice-president position (Table 1), this prediction was not supported by the results of the data analysis. It should be noted that the difference between the ratings for the equal employment condition and the control condition on three measures are in the predicted direction. This suggests that the equal employment policy statement may have been more effective than the affirmative action policy statement in obtaining managers' evaluations of women hired by an equal opportunity employer.

The nonsignificant findings for the female assistant vice-president are consistent with two predictions made regarding the sex and policy factors. First, it was predicted that the ratings for the female assistant vice-president would be similar to the ratings for the male assistant vice-president. This finding is shown in Table 3. Secondly, the prediction was made that the ratings for the male assistant vice-president
would be equal across all conditions. This prediction was supported by the results as shown in Figure 2. It follows from these two predictions that the ratings for the female assistant vice-president should be equivalent across the three employment policy conditions. The results of the analysis of the sex by policy interaction for the assistant vice-president position (Table 2) support this explanation.

**Within-sex job effects**

Predictions were made regarding the effects of position within the same policy and the same sex group. It was predicted that the female vice-president would be rated less favorably than the female assistant vice-president in the same policy condition. The _t_-tests performed on the mean ratings for the three scales and the expected performance measure revealed a significant difference (_p_ < .05) between the ratings for the female vice-president and female assistant vice-president in the control condition and the affirmative action condition. In the control condition there was a significant difference (_p_ < .025) on the stability scale. The female vice-president received a mean rating of 7.32 and the female assistant vice-president received a mean rating of 6.53. In the affirmative action condition the female vice-president (_X=7.16_) was rated more favorably than the female assistant vice-president (_X=6.19_) on the performance capacity scale (_F=1.828, _p_ < .05). The difference in the ratings was not significant for any of the other scales in the affirmative action and control condition or for any of the scales in the equal employment condition. Examination of the mean ratings for those scales on which there was a significant difference showed that the mean ratings
are in the opposite direction as predicted. Whereas it was predicted that the female assistant vice-president would receive more favorable ratings than the female vice-president, the results show that the female vice-president received the more favorable ratings. This is consistent with the findings from the previous analysis of ratings for the vice-president and the assistant vice-president, where the vice-president received higher ratings than the assistant vice-president.

It was predicted the male vice-president and the male assistant vice-president would receive equivalent ratings. The results of the t-tests performed for the males generally support this prediction. There was no significant difference (p < .05) in the ratings for the male vice-president and the male assistant vice-president on any of the scales for the three policy conditions. However, for the equal employment condition and the affirmative action condition there was a significant difference in mean ratings on the performance measure. For the equal employment condition the male vice-president (X=7.71) received a higher mean rating (t=1.905, p < .05) than the male assistant vice-president (X=6.43). In the affirmative action condition, the male vice-president (X=7.22) was also rated significantly higher (F=2.123, p < .025) than the male assistant vice-president (X=8.00).

Rank President Ratings

Analysis of variance

It was predicted that the bank president who hired male vice-presidents under the affirmative action and equal employment condition would be evaluated more favorably than those who hired female vice-presidents.
under these policy conditions. To test this prediction, a 2 X 3 analysis of variance was performed on the ratings for the person hired as vice-president. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 10. The mean ratings for the bank president for each condition are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female hired as vice-president</th>
<th>Male hired as vice-president</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA Policy</td>
<td>EEO Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is apparent that the prediction was not supported for the affirmative action policy. When the female vice-president was hired ($\bar{X}=7.02$), the bank president received ratings similar to those the male vice-president ($\bar{X}=6.87$) received when hired. In the equal employment policy condition, the difference in the means was in the predicted direction but was not significant. Taking these findings into account along with the results of the analysis of variance performed on the item assessing the amount of pressure on the president (Table 10), it seems that the subjects attributed the president's behavior to the organizational policy under which she or he was making the personnel decision rather than attributing the behavior to the president's personal characteristics. This hypothesis is further supported by the results of a correlational analysis between the pressure item and the president's scale score. This data analysis produced a .21 correlation coefficient. There was little correlation between the ratings for the president and the perceived amount of pressure under which he or she was behaving.
Table 10. ANOVA summary tables for president's ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy X sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.837</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.659</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pressure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.555</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.203</td>
<td>4.873</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy X sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.826</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.377</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.114</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlational analysis

To further investigate the relationship between the ratings for the individuals who had been hired and the bank president who made the hiring decision, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed. Within each of the six conditions, the president's scale score was correlated with the scale scores and performance ratings for the vice-president and the assistant vice-president. The correlation coefficients resulting from this analysis are shown in Table 11 and discussed below.

Female vice-president and male assistant vice-president hired in the affirmative action condition There was a significant correlation of all three assistant vice-president scale scores with the president's performance capacity score. On the performance capacity scale the assistant vice-president's scale score correlated .71 ($p < .01$) with the president's scale score. The ratings of the assistant vice-president on the stability scale also correlated significantly ($r = .69, p < .01$) with the president's ratings. On the potential for development scale there was a .73 correlation ($p < .01$) between the president's scale score and the male assistant vice-president's scale score. None of the ratings for the female vice-president were significantly correlated with the president's ratings.

Male vice-president and female assistant vice-president hired in the affirmative action policy condition The ratings for both the male vice-president and the female vice-president on the performance capacity scale correlated highly with the ratings for the president. For the male vice-president there was a correlation of .72 ($p < .03$), and for the
Table 11. Correlation of president's performance capacity ratings with other scale scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President scale score</th>
<th>Affirmative action - female</th>
<th>Affirmative action - male</th>
<th>Equal employment - female</th>
<th>Equal employment - male</th>
<th>Control female</th>
<th>Control male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice-president ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.97***</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.93***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. V-pres. ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.93***</td>
<td>.87***</td>
<td>.98***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.92***</td>
<td>.94***</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

**p < .01.

***p < .001.
female assistant vice president, the correlation with the president's scale was .93 (p < .001). A more important finding in this condition is the high positive correlation (r=.75, p < .05) of the president's ratings with the ratings on the amount of perceived pressure under which the president made the hiring decision. This correlation did not reach the .05 significance level in any of the other five conditions. This finding suggests that the more pressure the president was perceived to work under, the more favorably he or she was perceived. This supports the prediction that the president would be perceived as possessing more managerial characteristics (such as, risk-taking) when hiring a male in the affirmative action condition. This finding of a significant correlation between the pressure item and the president's ratings lends support to the prediction that the bank president would be perceived favorably if he or she hired a male vice-president in the affirmative action condition.

Female vice-president and male assistant vice-president hired in the equal employment policy condition As shown in Table 11, the scale scores for the male assistant vice-president had a higher correlation with the ratings for the president than the correlation of the female vice-president's ratings with the president's ratings. The male assistant vice-president's ratings correlated significantly on all three scales: performance capacity scale, r=.87, p < .01; stability scale, r=.88, p < .01; potential for development scale, r=.92, p < .001. The ratings for the female vice-president were not significantly correlated with the ratings for the president on any of the scales.
Male vice-president and female vice-president hired in the equal employment policy condition All of the scale scores for both the male vice-president and the female assistant vice-president were significantly correlated with the president's scale scores.

Female vice-president and male assistant vice-president hired in the control condition None of the scale scores for the vice-president and the assistant vice-president were significantly correlated with the president's scale score.

Male vice-president and female assistant vice-president hired in the control condition While none of the scale scores for the female assistant vice-president were significantly correlated with the president's scale score, the ratings for the male vice-president were significantly correlated with the president's ratings on two of the three scales: performance capacity, $r = .67$, $p < .01$; potential for development, $r = .73$, $p < .01$.

To summarize the correlational analysis of the ratings for the president with the ratings for the individuals the president hired as vice-president and assistant vice-president, the president's ratings correlated higher with the ratings for the male vice-president and assistant vice-president than with the ratings for the female vice-president and assistant vice-president. This is particularly apparent in the policy treatment conditions where the female was hired as vice-president. In both the affirmative action and the equal employment conditions where the female vice-president was hired, all of the male assistant vice-president's scale scores were significantly correlated with the bank president's scale.
score, while none of the female vice-president's scale scores in either condition were significantly correlated with the president's scale ratings.

**Performance Ratings**

**Regression analysis**

Regression analyses were performed with the scale scores for the ratings of performance capacity, stability and potential for development as predictors and the expected performance measure as the criterion. The results of the regression analysis of the vice-president's expected performance ratings are shown in Table 12. The potential for development scale was the best predictor. When the expected performance rating for the vice-president was regressed on the scale scores for the vice-president, the potential for development scale score made a significant contribution ($B=.6576$, $t=18.557$, $p < .0001$) to the expected performance rating. Likewise, the ratings on the potential for development scale for the assistant vice-president ratings were also significant ($B=.4592$, $t=4.592$, $p < .05$).

To investigate the possibility that the scale scores would have different weights depending on the sex and job title of the person being evaluated, regression analyses were performed within each sex group. These results are also shown in Table 12. Consistent with the findings cited above, the potential for development scale was the most significant ($B=.8303$, $t=24.043$, $p < .0001$) predictor of the performance rating for the male vice-president. For the female vice-president, stability ($B=.4379$, $t=7.419$, $p < .01$), was the best predictor. The performance capacity
Table 12. Regression analysis summary table of mean scale ratings with expected performance ratings for vice-president

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratings collapsed across sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>.6576</td>
<td>18.557</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>.2083</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity^a</td>
<td>.1640^b</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Male ratings          |       |       |       |      |
| Potential for development | .8303 | 24.043 | .0001 | .437 |
| Stability^a           | .4347^b | .005 | ns    |      |
| Performance capacity^a | .1886^b | .009 | ns    |      |

| Female ratings        |       |       |       |      |
| Potential for development | .1245 | .122  | ns    | .386 |
| Stability             | .4379 | 7.419 | .011  | .509 |
| Performance capacity  | .3133 | 1.212 | ns    | .529 |

^aVariable not included in regression equation due to low F-level.
^bTolerance level.

scale also accounted for a large proportion of the variance in the ratings for the female vice-president. These findings suggest that different factors are taken into consideration in the evaluation of male executive's performance and female executive's performance. The lack of significance of the potential for development scale in predicting the performance
of the female vice-president offers to researchers of women in management another explanation for the low advancement and promotion of women in organizations [e.g., Riger & Galligan (in press); Kanter, 1977].

The regression analyses performed on the ratings for the assistant vice-president revealed quite different results from the analysis of the vice-president ratings. None of the scale scores were significant (p < .05) predictors of the expected performance rating. Unlike the scales for the female vice-president, the potential for development scale was the best predictor for the female assistant vice-president. For the male assistant vice-president, the stability scale was the best predictor.

Correlational analysis

Ability ratings with expected performance ratings A positive correlation between the scale items and the expected performance rating was predicted. Pearson correlation coefficients were computed for the scale scores and performance rating. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 13. As predicted, the scale scores for the vice-president were significantly correlated (p < .001) with the vice-president performance ratings. Similarly, there was a significant correlation (p < .001) between the scale scores and performance rating for the assistant vice-president. It is interesting to note the significant positive correlation between the assistant vice-president's stability scale score and the vice-president's performance rating. This is the only assistant vice-president scale which significantly correlated with the vice-president's performance rating. Likewise, no vice-president scales were significantly
Table 13. Correlational analysis mean scale ratings with performance ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vice-president scales</th>
<th>Assistant vice-president scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance capacity</td>
<td>.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for development</td>
<td>.70*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Performance capacity | .07       |
| Stability            | .02       |
| Potential for development | .08      |

| Performance capacity | .01       |
| Stability            | .55*      |
| Potential for development | .18      |

| Performance capacity | .47*      |
| Stability            | .46*      |

*p < .001.

correlated with the assistant vice-president's performance rating.

Test of correspondent inference theory According to the tenets of correspondent inference theory, when an unexpected act occurs there will be a correlation between the attributions made about the actor and the perceived amount of choice. Therefore, it was predicted that when the bank president hired a female vice-president in the control condition or hired a male vice-president in the affirmative action condition, the correlation of the ratings for the president with the amount of perceived pressure would be high. Both of these conditions represent unexpected occurrences. In those conditions where the bank president made the
expected decision, a low correlation between the president ratings and the amount of perceived pressure was predicted. The male vice-president hired in the control condition and the female vice-president hired in the affirmative action condition were expected occurrences.

The predictions were supported. For the affirmative action policy condition in which a male vice-president was hired, there was a significant correlation, $r = .75$, between the amount of perceived pressure and the president's scale score. In the control condition where the male vice-president was hired there was no correlation, $r = .02$, of the president's ratings and the amount of perceived pressure. As predicted for an expected occurrence, when the female vice-president was hired in the affirmative action policy condition, there was no correlation, $r = .07$, between the scale score for the president and the amount of perceived pressure. In the control condition where the female vice-president was hired, there was a high positive correlation, $r = .63$, between the ratings for the person making the hiring decision and the amount of pressure under which he or she was perceived to be making the decision.
DISCUSSION

The differential effect of the three employment policies upon the subjects' evaluation of the hiring decision was most apparent in the ratings for the bank president. The president was perceived as being under more pressure when his or her organization espoused an employment policy recommending that the sex of applicants be a consideration in the selection decision. This was true, regardless of the sex of the person that the president hired. As would be expected, in the affirmative action condition where the president hired the female vice-president, the president was perceived as being under more pressure in making the hiring decision than in the other two employment conditions where a female vice-president was hired. Quite unexpected, but equally as plausible, was the finding that the president was perceived as being under more pressure when he or she hired a male vice-president in the affirmative action condition than when a male vice-president was hired in either of the other two employment policy conditions. Subjects perceived the president as being in a high-pressure situation, because she or he was disregarding the organization's instructions to enforce an affirmative action policy and would, therefore, be likely to suffer the consequences of insubordination.

In assessing the basis of the hiring decision, the subjects felt that the sex of the applicant was a greater consideration in the affirmative action condition than in the other two conditions. These results along with the results of the pressure item suggest that the subjects' evaluations were a function of the type of employment policy the
organization practiced. As the type of employment policy affected the subjects' evaluations of the basis of the selection decision and the amount of pressure involved, the subjects' perceptions of the bank president's performance capacity were also affected by the type of policy. The president who hired a female vice-president in the affirmative action condition was rated more favorably than the president hiring a female vice-president in the equal employment condition or the control condition. There are three possible explanations for this finding. First, the subjects may have given the president high ratings when he or she hired a female vice-president in the affirmative condition to reward him or her for complying with organizational policy.

A second possible explanation is evaluation apprehension. Rosenberg (1965) describes this experience as "an active, anxiety-toned concern that he (the subject) win a positive evaluation from the experimenter, or at least that he provide no grounds for a negative one." The managers in the current study may have given the president who hired a female vice-president under the affirmative action policy higher ratings than the president who hired a female vice-president under the other two policies in order to 1) make a favorable impression upon the experimenter and 2) confirm the experimenter's hypothesis. Therefore, the subjects' evaluation apprehension may have manifested itself in these two ways. According to Orne (1969), "if the experimental task is such that the subject sees himself as being evaluated he will tend to behave in such a way as to make himself look good" (p. 145). To have a positive self-evaluation, the managers gave responses that were socially desirable. Since it is
illegal (U.S. Department of Labor, 1971) and therefore, undesirable to overtly discriminate against women in hiring, as well as in other employment practiced, the managers may have given the president higher ratings in this situation in order to appear unbiased and as supporters of affirmative action policies and practices. The managers also may have given responses that they thought would be desirable to the experimenter, as well as socially desirable. In order to gain the experimenter's approval, the managers responded in the manner that they thought the experimenter wanted them to respond.

The subject's desire to please the experimenter can have a motivational basis other than to gain the experimenter's approval. The managers' perceptions of the affirmative action policy statement as a cue or "demand characteristic" (Orne, 1962) to which they should respond favorably is the third possible explanation for the high ratings given to the president in the affirmative action condition where the female vice-president was hired. The motive in this case would be the manager's satisfaction of knowing that he had made a worthy contribution to science by giving the experimenter the data he wanted and thereby, helping the experimenter prove his hypothesis.

Rosenberg's (1965, 1969) and Orne's (1962, 1969) theories of evaluation apprehension and demand characteristics also provide plausible explanations of the finding that the female vice-president received slightly higher ratings than the male vice-president in all three policy conditions. That is, the managers may have perceived the female vice-president in the unusual position as a superior to the male assistant vice-president
as a cue and were, therefore, sensitive to the importance of their evaluation of the female vice-president. As a result, they rated her higher than the managers rated the male vice-president in the more common situation where the male vice-president was the superior of a female assistant vice-president. The explanation that the managers were more sensitive to the situation where the female vice-president was hired is supported both by the ratings for the president who hired the female vice-president in the affirmative action condition and by the ratings for the assistant vice-president positions. The female assistant vice-president was not consistently rated higher than the male assistant vice-president. This suggests that an evaluation of a female for an assistant position is not as sensitizing as evaluating a female for a superior position.

Another explanation for the high ratings the female vice-president received compared to the male vice-president is that the female vice-president was perceived by the managers as a "superwoman". That is, while the male vice-president possessed the same qualifications as the female vice-president, it was perceived as being extraordinary for a woman to have the skills and abilities reflected in the résumé. Past research (Linsenmeier & Wortman, 1979; Elster, 1977; Bigoness, 1976; Pheterson, Kiesler & Goldberg, 1971) suggests that a woman must demonstrate her competence in performing a job in a traditionally male occupation before she will be evaluated as favorably as a male with equivalent qualifications.

Just as Pheterson et al. (1971) found that evaluations of paintings by females were equivalent to the evaluations of males' paintings when the painting had won a prize but not when the paintings were described
as entrees, Linsenmeier and Wortman (1979) found that female seminar leaders' expertise was devalued compared to male leaders' expertise unless the female leaders' competency had already been proven. Elster (1977) investigated the differential promotion recommendations for males and females in a particular company and found no significant difference. In the present study, the female vice-president's background illustrated to the managers her competence in bank administration. Therefore, consistent with past research findings, she was evaluated as favorably as her male counterpart.

Bigoness (1976) and Hamner, Kim, Baird and Bigoness (1974) investigated the effect of objective performance ratings on the evaluation of male and female workers. They found that when males and females performed the same on a traditionally male task, the female was rated significantly higher than the male. Muchinsky and Harris (1977) also presented objective performance measures in their evaluation of sex-typed occupations. Although the job competence of the female applicant was not a criterion, they found that the suitability ratings for a female engineer who was a recent college graduate were higher than the ratings for a male engineer with similar qualifications. Bigoness (1976) suggests that "when clearly objective criteria were specified and the performances of a male and female were identical, the ratings of those performances displayed no differences" (p. 81). It follows that the same would apply to ratings of potential ability, which would be pertinent in hiring decisions.

Sex-role stereotypes may play a significant role in selection when the sex of the applicant is the only information available to the decision maker. However, their impact may be
reduced somewhat when additional data about the qualifications of the candidate are also provided . . . the research on sex discrimination may have a bias itself. Because data on applicants' background are omitted, sex-role stereotypes may come into play. (Renwick & Tosi, 1978, pp. 94-95)

A comparison of the design and the results of the present study with the results of Harris (1977) illustrates Renwick and Tosi's point. In Harris (1977), the only information given to the subjects about the applicants was their age and sex. The same questionnaire was used for both studies to assess sex stereotypes; yet, while there was a significant difference between the male and female applicants on ratings of performance capacity, stability and potential for development in Harris (1977) with males receiving higher ratings on performance capacity and potential for development, the present study revealed little difference in ratings for males and females on these characteristics. The results of the present study provide support for the use of more objective information in research on sex differences in personnel practices. Providing subjects with objective information concerning applicants' qualifications and background not only seems to reduce sex differences in evaluations, but also, obviously, adds more realism to laboratory studies in personnel research on sex discrimination.

An unfortunate result of some studies (e.g., Bigoness, 1976; Hamner et al., 1974) which have employed objective information on performance and ability is that the accomplishments of women may be overrated. However, this seems to occur only when she possesses outstanding qualifications. If one feels that this compensates for the devaluation of a woman's accomplishments compared to a man's when they both are of
"average" ability, then overrating the female's work seems justified.

The results of this study support past research on attributions of causality as they relate to successful female performance. The female vice-president was evaluated as more motivated than the male vice-president. The lack of support for the prediction that the male's performance would be attributed to ability to a greater extent than the female's performance elicits two explanations. First, the female vice-president may have been perceived as possessing extraordinary qualifications and therefore, was evaluated accordingly on her ability. Although the attitudes of the managers toward women managers was not assessed, a second possible explanation is that the managers held favorable attitudes toward women managers and, therefore, were more likely to attribute their success to ability rather than luck (Garland & Price, 1977).

The conception that the female vice-president was unusually qualified also explains the unexpected finding that females received higher ratings than males on the item measuring stability. This contradicts past research (Harris, 1977; Schein, 1973) but is consistent with Renwick and Tosi's (1978) conviction that if a woman possesses qualifications which demonstrate her commitment to a career as well as her expertise, these qualities might override traditional stereotypes. The importance of the stability measure in the evaluation of the female vice-president was most evident when the stability scale was shown to be the best predictor of performance for the female vice-president but not for the male vice-president.

Potential for development was shown to be the best predictor of
performance for the male vice-president and of little importance in predicting the performance of the female vice-president. In her study of *Men and Women of the Corporation*, Kanter (1977) found that men reported a greater amount of encouragement from superiors to improve and advance . . . generally they saw themselves as acquiring more skills from their jobs than the women, especially in areas critical for promotion. (p. 141)

It appears that the same process that Kanter (1977) describes was operating in the present study. This also implies that different measures are used to predict the performance of males and females. Advancement in the organization may be the sign of success for men, whereas women's success may be measured more by tenure than by promotability.

Essentially, none of the characteristics attributed to the female vice-president were characteristic of the female assistant vice-president. This supports the idea that women with above average credentials are perceived differently than women with average credentials or women in subordinate roles. Attributions about the male and female assistant vice-president were important in the present study to the extent that they provide information regarding cross-sex behavior. There was a greater difference in the ratings for the male vice-president and the female vice-president than in the ratings for the male assistant vice-president and the female assistant vice-president. This suggests that the presentation of objective information regarding the job applicants was more effective in eliciting objective evaluations for the assistant vice-presidents than the vice-presidents. In evaluating the female vice-president, the managers may have perceived her as unusually qualified "for a woman" and, therefore, evaluated her more favorably than the male vice-president,
who had the same qualifications but was not perceived as an exception. Further support for this process is provided by the finding that there was a greater difference between the ratings for the female vice-president and male assistant vice-president than between the ratings for the male vice-president and the female assistant vice-president. Whereas it might be suggested that the significant difference in the evaluations of the female vice-president and the male assistant are due to the male assistant vice-president being devalued (Rosen & Jerdee, 1974b), the finding that the male and female assistant vice-presidents were rated similarly, while the vice-presidents received differential evaluations, negates this explanation.

While the differential effect of the three employment policies was reflected in the ratings for the bank president, the predicted differences in ratings for female applicants due to the type of employment policy were not demonstrated. As suggested by Beattie and Diehl (1979), "stereotyping and differential evaluations are least likely to occur when very clear performance criteria exist and when individuals are sensitized to the possibility of discrimination" (pp. 242-243). Examination of the case study instrument (Appendix C) used in the present study provides evidence of the clarity and objectivity of the performance criteria presented to the subjects. The degree to which the subjects were sensitized to the possibility of discrimination is less evident, but very likely, considering the first piece of information they received after reading the instructions for the case study. This piece of information stated the organization's position toward equal employment opportunity. The mention
of affirmative action or equal employment is certainly going to make a person more aware of and cautious about discriminatory practices. This process of sensitization could have occurred in the control condition where there was no mention of an employment policy, as well as in the other two conditions. According to Beattie and Diehl (1979),

The contemporary women's movement, as well as legislation forbidding discrimination in employment, have contributed significantly to a growing awareness of discriminatory practices. Because of this expanded consciousness of the American public, individuals may guard against discrimination in situations where the possibility of discrimination is more salient. (p. 243)

Because women are not readily accepted in the role of supervising a male [Riger & Galligan (in press); Bass, Krusell & Alexander, 1971; Bowman, Worthy & Greyser, 1965], the possibility of discrimination is more salient in this cross-sex situation than when a male is supervising a female.

The evaluation apprehension that the managers were experiencing and the sensitivity of the managers to the employment policy manipulation are shown, not only by the results of the manipulation check, but also by the initial negative reaction of the managers to the case study. Since participation in this study was voluntary, the managers were permitted to decline participation. Judging from the number of blank questionnaires returned to the experimenter and the comments from the managers concerning the nature of the study, the managers were apprehension about participating in the research project. Approximately 60% of the managers who were asked to participate in the study declined participation.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

As expected in exploratory research, the results of the present study not only answer the specific questions addressed but also provoke more questions. Some issues that should be addressed in future research on the effect of affirmative action policies on attitudes toward women hired under such policies are briefly discussed below:

1) Inclusion of Female Managers in Subject Pool.

The unavailability of female managers in the present study exemplifies the small number of women in managerial positions. This problem is discussed at length by Riger and Galligan (in press) in their article entitled, "Why are There So Few Women Managers?" In addition to causing dilemmas, such as providing few mentors for other women, the scarcity of women managers presents a problem for researchers. It would be interesting to obtain a large enough sample of female managers to analyze their responses to the case study and questionnaire employed in the present study. Past research findings are inconclusive in their investigations of sex of subject effects in evaluating the performance of equally-qualified males and females. While Linsenmeier and Wortman (1979) found a significant different in how men and women rated the competence of male and female seminar leaders, Rosen and Jerdee (1973) found no sex of subject effect in the evaluation of male and female supervisory behavior. Similarly, Renwick and Tosi (1978) found that the sex of the subject caused no difference in the suitability ratings given by the subjects in their evaluation of male and female job applicants. It should be noted
that for all three of these studies college students composed the sample. Although the generalizability of findings from college students has been documented (e.g., Harris, 1977; Bernstein, Hakel & Harlan, 1975; Hakel, Hollmann & Dunnette, 1970), the frequent use of this population illustrates the lack of female managerial representation in personnel research, as well as the difficulty in recruiting cooperative male manager subject pool. Therefore, research with female managers is warranted.

2) How to be Perceived as Favorably as or More Favorably Than Male Applicants

To be perceived as or more favorably than male applicants (e.g., Anderson, 1978; Hendry, 1979), as has been proven in study indicated in order to be perceived favorably, a female applicant’s qualifications will be scrutinized more carefully than male applicant’s qualifications. Typically, male applicants are not considered to encounter discrimination in the employment process. In contrast, it is more likely that female applicants may be regarded as more competitive because she has excelled in an academic major or other field of her choice. However, given that there are few females. Consequently, she may be unlikely to encounter discrimination. On the other hand, a woman in an entry-level position or middle management position may be discriminated against until she proves her competency on the job.

3) Reducing the Salience of the Employment Policy Manipulation.

Additional research on the effect affirmative action and equal
that for all three of these studies college students composed the sample. Although the generalizability of findings from college students has been documented (e.g., Harris, 1977; Bernstein, Hakel & Harlan, 1975; Hakel, Hollmann & Dunnette, 1970), the frequent use of this population illustrates the lack of female managerial representation in personnel research, as well as the difficulty in capturing a cooperative male manager subject pool. Therefore, more research using female managers is warranted.

2) How Accredited Does a Woman Have to be in Order to be Perceived Objectively?

To further test the hypothesis that females are rated as favorably as or more favorably than males only after their competence has been proven (e.g., Linsemmeier & Wortman, 1979; Pheterson et al., 1971), a study investigating the extent to which the female must be qualified in order to be rated equivalent to a male with the same qualifications is needed. This study would address issues such as 1) Where is the cutoff between average and superior in the evaluation of females in traditionally male occupations? and 2) At what job level is a female most likely to encounter discrimination? It is conceivable that in top management positions and fields like engineering where there are few females, a female applicant may be regarded as extraordinary and qualified because she has excelled in an academic major or occupation where there are few females. Consequently, she may be unlikely to encounter discrimination. On the other hand, a woman in an entry-level position or middle management position may be discriminated against until she proves her competency on the job.

3) Reducing the Salience of the Employment Policy Manipulation.

Additional research on the effect affirmative action and equal
employment policies have on attitudes toward female bosses and coworkers is important. While Rosen and Mericle (1979) investigated the effect of equal employment policies on salary recommendations, the present study attempted to determine the underlying sex stereotypes related to the discriminatory behavior found in Rosen and Mericle's study. Although the present study revealed important findings relevant to employee's perceptions of equal employment policies and the organization, it was only partially successful in discovering the effect these policies have on attitudes toward women managers hired into organizations that practice affirmative action in hiring women.

The importance of further investigations of underlying attitudes toward affirmative action, in spite of research, such as the present study, that suggests the nonexistence of sex discrimination when objective criteria is presented is also addressed by Beattie and Diehl (1979).

Stereotyping and discrimination appear to be significantly reduced when evaluations are based upon objective criteria. It is our suspicion, however, that many decisions affecting the employment of women are based upon hidden criteria. (p. 254). . . . Because of the expanded consciousness of the American public, individuals may guard against discrimination. . . . This is not to suggest that fundamental changes of attitude have occurred, but rather that the way in which attitudes are expressed may have changed. . . . When social conditions change, making it socially undesirable to maintain an old attitude, it may be replaced by a different, somewhat more subtle prejudice. (p. 243).
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APPENDIX A

Line Managers Evaluation of and Information about Affirmative Action Programs

1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In general, do women get equal opportunity in the firm?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do females participate in training and career development in proportion to the size of their representation in the work force?</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the average line manager supportive of EEO for women in your opinion?</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your opinion is exclusion from occupations on the basis of sex evidence of sex discrimination in a firm?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the company show sex preferences in advertisements for jobs?</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are you aware of goals and timetables to which the company is committed with respect to female employment?</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B

A Sample of Characteristics Differentially Attributed to Male and Female Job Applicants (by Scale)¹

Male Job Applicants

Performance Capacity

productive
efficient
motivated
logical problem-solving
ability to work under pressure

Potential for Development

eager to achieve
ambitious
capable of learning
independent
able to exert leadership

Stability

reliable
(not) prone to absenteeism
(not) likely to quit
(not) emotional

Female Job Applicants

Interpersonal Skills

effective in groups
co-operative
aware of others' feelings
helpful

¹These characteristics are part of a questionnaire developed by Rosen and Jerdee (1976) to assess age stereotypes. Harris (1977) demonstrated its utility in assessing sex stereotypes, as well as age stereotypes.
CASE STUDY

The purpose of this brief exercise is for you, an individual with managerial skills, to evaluate the decision-making ability of another individual. The decision being evaluated is a personnel decision.

Your task, if you agree to participate, is to evaluate the relevant information from the resumes of the top five candidates for the positions of 1) bank vice-president in charge of lending and 2) the assistant to the vice-president; then, evaluate the appropriateness of the hiring decision made. The resumes of the applicants hired for the positions are highlighted by colored paper. Descriptions of the jobs are included in the following materials. You will also find a copy of the memo from the bank's board of directors indicating their hiring recommendations. After evaluating the resumes and the selection decision made, you will be asked to respond to a few items relating to the selection process.

If you desire feedback on the results of this exercise, please fill out the last page of this packet of material. To insure the confidentiality and anonymity of your responses to this exercise, please separate that page from the rest of the materials and hand it in separately.

Thank you, in advance, for your cooperation.

*The resume of the applicant hired as vice-president is on a coral sheet of paper. The resume of the applicant hired as assistant to the vice-president is on green paper.*
Date: October 15, 1979
To: President, City National Bank
From: Board of Directors, City National Bank
Re: Selection of Vice-President in Charge of Lending

We, the Board of Directors of City National Bank, support your decision to hire Phyllis T. Michaels as vice-president in charge of lending. Her qualifications meet the requirements of the job, and we feel she will be an asset to our organization.

In compliance with the organization's affirmative action policy which requires that the sex of the applicant be taken into consideration when making personnel decisions, we reviewed the applications with the applicants' gender in mind. Keeping in mind that our affirmative action guidelines require us to take reasonable actions to overcome any barriers to equal employment opportunity for minorities and women, it does not suggest that we hire or promote individuals who are not qualified for the job. It is apparent from Ms. Michaels' credentials that she is qualified for the position and is capable of fulfilling the responsibilities of the job.

We also support your decision to hire James M. Ross as Ms. Michaels' assistant. We feel he possesses the skills necessary for the position of assistant to the vice-president in charge of lending. We are confident he will serve the organization well in this capacity.
Date: October 15, 1979
To: President, City National Bank
From: Board of Directors, City National Bank
Re: Selection of Vice-President in Charge of Lending

We, the Board of Directors of City National Bank, support your decision to hire Philip T. Michaels as vice-president in charge of lending. His qualifications meet the requirements of the job, and we feel he will be an asset to our organization.

In compliance with the organization's affirmative action policy which requires that the sex of the applicant be taken into consideration when making personnel decisions, we reviewed the applications with the applicants' gender in mind. Keeping in mind that our affirmative action guidelines require us to take reasonable actions to overcome any barriers to equal employment opportunity for minorities and women, it does not suggest that we hire or promote individuals who are not qualified for the job. It is apparent from Mr. Michaels' credentials that he is qualified for the position and is capable of fulfilling the responsibilities of the job.

We also support your decision to hire Joan M. Ross as Mr. Michaels' assistant. We feel she possesses the skills necessary for the position of assistant to the vice-president in charge of lending. We are confident she will serve the organization well in this capacity.
Date: October 15, 1979  
To: President, City National Bank  
From: Board of Directors, City National Bank  
Re: Selection of Vice-President in Charge of Lending

We, the Board of Directors of City National Bank, support your decision to hire Phyllis T. Michaels as vice-president in charge of lending. Her qualifications meet the requirements of the job, and we feel she will be an asset to our organization.

As an equal opportunity employer, our organization makes personnel decisions without regard to the race, sex, religion or national origin of applicants. To hire or promote a person solely because of race or sex would be as reprehensible as refusing to hire or promote a person on such grounds. It is apparent from Ms. Michaels' credentials that she is qualified for the position and is capable of fulfilling the responsibilities of the job.

We also support your decision to hire James M. Ross as Ms. Michaels' assistant. We feel he possesses the skills necessary for the position of assistant to the vice-president in charge of lending. We are confident he will serve the organization well in this capacity.
Date: October 15, 1979
To: President, City National Bank
From: Board of Directors, City National Bank
Re: Selection of Vice-President in Charge of Lending

We, the Board of Directors of City National Bank, support your decision to hire Philip T. Michaels as vice-president in charge of lending. His qualifications meet the requirements of the job, and we feel he will be an asset to our organization.

As an equal opportunity employer, our organization makes personnel decisions without regard to the race, sex, religion or national origin of applicants. To hire or promote a person solely because of race or sex would be as reprehensible as refusing to hire or promote a person on such grounds. It is apparent from Mr. Michaels' credentials that he is qualified for the position and is capable of fulfilling the responsibilities of the job.

We also support your decision to hire Joan M. Ross as Mr. Michaels' assistant. We feel she possesses the skills necessary for the position of assistant to the vice-president in charge of lending. We are confident she will serve the organization well in this capacity.
JOB DESCRIPTION

Position

Vice-President (In Charge of Lending)

Job Summary

The function of this job is the coordination and control of departmental activities concerned with the extension of commercial credit at a profit to bank customers in accordance with established policies and procedures.

Job Duties

1. Establish departmental lending policies and operating procedures.
2. Develop and maintain an interest rate structure.
3. Supervise, direct and control the activities of loan officers.
4. Prepare lending activity reports for the Board of Directors.
5. Develop and manage large and/or complex loan accounts.
6. Perform the department's personnel management and administration activities.
7. Provide detailed information for preparation of the department budget.
8. Keep abreast of local and national economic, financial, political and legislative events which could impact on lending activities.
9. Maintain professional and community relations.

Qualifications

Bachelor's degree with a minimum of seven years experience in banking, or a minimum of ten years experience in a banking institution. At least five years in a bank management position is required. A working knowledge and demonstrated competence in bank lending operations is essential. A knowledge of all bank operations is desirable.
JOB DESCRIPTION

Position
Assistant to the Vice-President (in Charge of Lending)

Job Summary
This job is concerned with the administration of loans and deposits and the development of business in connection with specifically assigned accounts and prospective customers.

Job Duties
1. Provide loan service to assigned accounts and service other accounts in the department.
2. Maintain and develop loan and deposit balances of assigned accounts.
3. Develop new business from prospects and customers.
4. Perform assigned daily routines in a manner that will contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of the department.
5. Keep abreast of general banking trends.

Qualifications
Bachelor's degree with a minimum of three years experience in banking, or a minimum of six years experience in banking. A working knowledge of lending operations in banking is required. A knowledge of all banking operations is desirable.
Phyllis T. Michaels  
811 South Duff  
Ames, Iowa

Job Objective

To work in an organization where I can utilize and further develop my skills in banking.

Education

B.S. in Industrial Administration with minor in Economics at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1970.  
College Grade Point Average - 3.25.  
Graduate Courses in Economics and Finance at Iowa State University, 1975 - present.

Experience

June 1975 to present  Manager, Citibank Branch Office, Story City, Iowa  
Directed the branch staff in providing services to customers; established and clarified responsibilities; established objectives in all areas of the branch's performance; improved the profitability of the branch.

Developed an organization structure to ensure the effective utilization of required manpower and accomplish branch growth and profit objectives.

Supervised all types of bank credit extension to ensure conformance to bank policy and procedure.

Reviewed loans made with lending personnel to achieve proper loan reporting and administration.

June 1972 to May 1975  Assistant Branch Manager, Citibank, Story City, Iowa  
Interviewed loan applicants and approved loans; supervised preparation of documentation on new loans; reviewed and initiated collection efforts on delinquent loans.

Supervised the Operations Officer; answered inquiries from customers and staff; supervised branch expenditures; participated in service club activities.
February 1970 to May 1972
Cashier, National Bank of Nevada, Nevada, Iowa

Established and implemented departmental policies and operating procedures; prepared required reports; developed service fee rates competitive with bank philosophies.

Insured the bank's compliance with the Bank Security Act of 1968; maintained awareness of changing trends in banking.

Directed the department's personnel administration activities; responded to customer correspondence.

September 1968 to January 1970
Student assistant, Business Office, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa

Professional Affiliation
American Bankers Association

References
References Furnished Upon Request
James M. Ross  
121 Main Street  
Ames, Iowa

**Job Objective**

I am seeking a management position in a banking organization.

**Education**

B.S. in Industrial Administration with a minor in Finance at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1973.  
College Grade Point Average, 3.20.

**Experience**

February 1977 to present  
**Junior Loan Officer**, Manhattan Savings and Loan,  
Ames, Iowa

Collected and analyzed data to determine credit worthiness of customers; assisted the loan officers, as needed, in lending operations; maintained up-to-date credit files.

January 1975 to January 1977  
**Operations Officer**, Manhattan Savings and Loan,  
Ames, Iowa

Supervised all staff members performing operations duties.  
Supervised the personnel program including hiring, training and performance evaluation.  
Exercised official signing authority.  
Participated in the marketing activities; maintained good relationships with public fund depositors.  
Assisted customers by answering inquiries.

March 1973 to December 1974  
**Bond Teller**, Manhattan Savings and Loan, Ames, Iowa

Processed transfers of stock; served as bank agent in the purchase and sale of securities.  
Accepted interest coupons and bonds from customers.  
Advised the Bond-Coupon-Collection Manager.

**References**

References provided upon request.
Chris J. Bradford  
3492 E. Lincoln Way  
Ames, Iowa

Job Objective: A position in a challenging work environment in which I can use my skills in banking.

Education: B.S. in Business Administration with a minor in Finance at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, 1975.  
College Grade Point Average - 2.85

Work Experience: September 1978 to present  Credit Investigator, University Savings Bank, Des Moines, Iowa

- Performed intensive investigations to gather information necessary for the credit approval personnel to make judgments on loan applications.
- Received and evaluated loan applications; prepared daily reports on applications received by the bank.
- Maintained credit files.

October 1975 to August 1977  Collections Officer, Penneys Department Store, Des Moines, Iowa

- Reviewed all delinquent accounts; communicated with delinquent debtors.
- Initiated action to collect delinquent accounts; utilized appropriate methods of collection.

References Provided Upon Request
Pameia J. Connors
184 Vine Street
Iowa City, Iowa

Job Objective: A bank management position in a growth-oriented organization.

Education: B.S. in Business Administration with minor in Finance at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, 1977.
College Grade Point Average - 2.00

Work Experience: 9/77 to present Assistant Manager, Morley Financial Consultants, Iowa City, Iowa

Assisted in the supervision of all lending functions; interviewed loan applicants and recommended action on loan applications.

Developed and maintained customer and business relations.

References Furnished Upon Request
Harold R. Miner
4279 Michigan Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Job Objective

I would like a position as a banking executive in a progressive work setting.

Education

B.S. in Accounting at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1972.
College Grade Point Average, 2.50
Graduate Courses in Accounting, 1973 - present

Work Experience

8/77 to present  Head Teller, Minneapolis Savings Bank, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Assisted loan officer during peak load periods.
Supervised the tellers and ensured the proper performance of all functions; trained new tellers.
Planned and estimated the cash business.
Prepared monthly and daily reports.

8/76 to 7/77  Multiple Teller, Citibank, Story City, Iowa

Accepted and processed deposits of all types; cashed checks.
Received payments on loans and charge card accounts.
Prepared teller sheet and balanced cash.

9/72 to 5/76  Teacher, Ames High School, Ames, Iowa

Taught courses in accounting, business education and finance.

References

Provided Upon Request
On the line next to each of the characteristics, place the number that corresponds to your opinion of how accurately the characteristic describes the person hired for the position of vice-president.

The rating scale is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all accurate</td>
<td>very accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) productive
2) efficient
3) accurate
4) motivated
5) innovative
6) creative
7) sets long range goals
8) logical problem solving
9) willing to gamble
10) mentally alert
11) energetic
12) qualified
13) able to work under pressure
14) careful
15) reliable
16) dependable
17) conscientious
18) likely to quit
19) honest
20) trustworthy
21) impulsive
22) stable
23) emotional
24) ambitious
25) eager to achieve
26) eager for more responsibility
27) eager to get ahead
28) future oriented
29) receptive to new ideas
30) capable of learning
31) interested in learning
32) adaptable
33) versatile
34) confident
35) able to exert leadership
36) vigorous
37) adventurous

38) Indicate on the rating scale below how well you expect the new vice-president to perform the job:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next, rate the person that was hired as assistant to the vice-president.

On the line next to each of the characteristics, place the number that corresponds to your opinion of how accurately the characteristic describes the person hired for the position of assistant to the vice-president.

The rating scale is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very accurate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) productive __________ 
2) efficient __________ 
3) accurate __________ 
4) motivated __________ 
5) innovative __________ 
6) creative __________ 
7) sets long range goals __________ 
8) logical problem solving __________ 
9) willing to gamble __________ 
10) mentally alert __________ 
11) energetic __________ 
12) qualified __________ 
13) able to work under pressure __________ 
14) careful __________ 
15) reliable __________ 
16) dependable __________ 
17) conscientious __________ 
18) likely to quit __________ 
19) honest __________ 
20) trustworthy __________ 
21) impulsive __________ 
22) stable __________ 
23) emotional __________ 
24) ambitious __________ 
25) eager to achieve __________ 
26) eager for more responsibility __________ 
27) eager to get ahead __________ 
28) future oriented __________ 
29) receptive to new ideas __________ 
30) capable of learning __________ 
31) interested in learning __________ 
32) adaptable __________ 
33) versatile __________ 
34) confident __________ 
35) able to exert leadership __________ 
36) vigorous __________ 
37) adventurous __________ 

38) Indicate on the rating scale below how well you expect the new assistant to the vice-president to perform the job:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now, I would like you to rate the person who made the hiring decision.

On the line next to each characteristic place the number that corresponds to your opinion of how accurately the characteristic describes the bank president who made the selection decisions. The rating scale is shown below:

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
not at all accurate  very accurate
```

1) productive
2) efficient
3) accurate
4) motivated
5) innovative
6) creative
7) sets long range goals
8) logical problem solving
9) willing to gamble
10) mentally alert
11) energetic
12) qualified
13) able to work under pressure

14) Do you agree with the bank president's selection decision?  Yes  No

If not, which employee would you have selected as

a) vice-president
   ____ Bradford
   ____ Connors
   ____ Michaels
   ____ Miner
   ____ Ross

b) assistant to the vice-president
   ____ Bradford
   ____ Connors
   ____ Michaels
   ____ Miner
   ____ Ross

15) How much pressure do you think the bank president was under in making the decision?

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
none  very much
```
16) On what basis do you feel the president made these selection decisions?

   __ a) The applicant was selected strictly on the basis of merit; consequently, the most qualified applicant was hired.
   __ b) The applicant was selected primarily on the basis of merit; however, some consideration was given to the applicant's sex.
   __ c) While the applicant appears to be competent, the major factor was the applicant's sex.
   __ d) The applicant's sex was the only factor considered in the selection process.

For the purpose of analysis, please provide the following information about yourself:

1) For how many years throughout your entire career have you been in a supervisory position? _______ years

2) How many years, if any, have you been in a position where you are responsible for hiring personnel? (Include all experience you have had during your entire career). _______ years

3) In what type of organization do you work? _______ banking

     _______ educational
     _______ manufacturing
     _______ media
     _______ other: specify

4) What type of equal opportunity employment policy, if any, does your organization practice?

   __ a) My organization strongly enforces its equal opportunity policy.
   __ b) My organization recommends, rather than strongly requires, that employees practice the firm's equal opportunity policy.
   __ c) My organization has an inactive equal opportunity policy.
   __ d) I am unaware of my organization's equal opportunity policy and the extent to which it is enforced.

5) What is your age? _______

6) Sex: _______ male _______ female
If you would like to receive the results of this project, please fill in your name and address in the spaces provided below and separate this sheet from the rest of the materials. Thank you very much for your participation in this project.

NAME __________________________________________

ADDRESS __________________________________________

_________________________________________________

(zip code)